# P

## Paaneah[[@Headword:Paaneah]]

             SEE ZAPHNATH-PAANEAH.

## Paarai[[@Headword:Paarai]]

             (Heb. Paaray', פִּעֲרִי, open; Sept. Φαραεί, v.r. Φααραϊv and [by union with the following word] Οὐραιοεχί; Vulg. Pharai), “the Arbite,” one of David's warriors (2Sa 23:35); elsewhere (1Ch 11:37) more correctly called NAARAI SEE NAARAI (q.v.).

## Pabisch, Francis Joseph, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Pabisch, Francis Joseph, D.D., LL.D]]

             an eminent Roman Catholic scholar and divine, was born at Zlabings, Moravia, March 30, 1825. In his fourteenth year he was sent to the grammar-school of Znaim, and from there to the high-school of Briinn; in 1843 entered the University of Vienna; and in 1847 the archiepiscopal seminary in the same city. In March 1850, he was ordained priest, and was given a chaplaincy near Vienna. In 1851, on the invitation of Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, he came to America, and was placed in charge of Whiteoak, seven miles from Cincinnati. In 1853 he began to give a few hours a week to teaching ecclesiastical history and German in the Seminary of Mount St. Mary's of the West. Later, he studied theology and canon law at the College of the Propaganda in Rome. He was appointed chaplain to the Church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, and after four years of arduous study graduated doctor of theology and doctor of civil and canon law. From 1858 to 1860 he practiced as a jurist to the congregation of the Council of Trent. In 1861 Dr. Pabisch returned to the United States, and on his arrival at Cincinnati was given the chair of ecclesiastical history and canon law at the Seminary of Mount St. Mary's, and in 1863 succeeded to the rectorship. On the financial downfall of that institution, his intellect gave way, and he was taken to the Mount Hope Retreat, near Baltimore, where he died, October 2, 1879. In connection with Reverend Thomas S. Byrne, Dr. Pabisch translated Alzog's Universal Church History from the German (Cincinnati, 1874, 1876, 1878, 3 volumes 8vo), with additions on the history in England and America. See (N.Y.) Cath. Annual, 1881, page 93.

## Pablo, Christiani[[@Headword:Pablo, Christiani]]

             a Dominican monk, who flourished in the middle of the 13th century, but of whose early life nothing is known, is noted for his remarkable attainments. In Jewish history and literature Pablo was a party in the famous disputation at Barcelona with the learned Moses Nachmanides (q.v.), which lasted for four days (July 20-24, 1263). This public disputation took place by a decree of James I, king of Aragon, in order to put. a stop to the daily disputes that occurred between the Jews and those Dominican friars who had studied Hebrew and Arabic. The Dominicans were encouraged by their general, Raymund de Penaforte, whose attention was always directed towards the conversion of Jews .and Mohammedans. That Pablo was a convert from Judaism appears from a letter written by pope Clement IV to the king of Aragon, in which he says: “Ad haec autem dilectus filius noster Paulus, dictus Christianus reditur non modicum profuturus, quia ex Judceis trahens originem, et inter eos literis. Hebraeis instructus, linguam novit . . . et legem et errores illorum.” The disputation referred to was first published, with omissions and interpolations, and a bad Latin translation, by Wagenseil, Tela ignea Satanae (Altorf, 1681). It was then published in the collection of polemical writings entitled מלחמת חובה, where it is the first of the series, and is called פראי פולו וכוח הרמבן עם, The Discussion of Ramban with Fra Paolo (Constantinople, 1710); and recently again by Steinschneider, Nachmanidis Disputatio publica pro fide Judaica (Berlin, 1860), with notes by the editor. Pablo  also obtained a decree from the king of Aragon, by which the Jews were enjoined to open to him the doors of their synagogues and houses to dispute with them, to furnish him with all the books necessary to convince them, and to pay the expense of the cartage of his library, by deducting what they disbursed from the tribute they paid to the king. See Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, p. 660 (Taylor's translation); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:131-136, 149; Lindo, History of the Jews, p. 68; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 301 sq; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. i, 965; iii, 910 sq.; Schmucker, History of the Modern Jews, p. 149; Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirche, p. 24; Jewish Expositor (Lond. 1826), p. 364 sq.; Frankhel's Monatsschrift fur Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judenthums (Breslau, 1865), 14:308 sq.; Huie, History of the Jews (Edinburgh, 1841), p. 126 sq.; Depping, Les Juifs dans le Moyen Age (Bruxelles, 1844), p. 231 sq. (B. P.)

## Pabricius, Franciscus[[@Headword:Pabricius, Franciscus]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born at Amsterdam April 10, 1663. He studied theology and the Oriental languages at the University of Leyden, at which he afterwards filled the chairs of theology and rhetoric. He died July 27, 1738. His chief works are, 1717, 4to): —

2. De Sacerdotio Christi juxta Ordinem Melchizedeci (ib. 1720, 4to): —

3. Christologia Noachica et Abrahamica (ib). 1733, 4to): —

4. De Fide Christiana Patriarcharum et Prophetarum (ib. 4to):-

5. Orator Sacer (ib. 1733. 4to), containing lectures on preaching. — Migne, Diet. de Biographie Chretienne, 2:136; Biog. Universalle, 14:61.

## Pabricius, Johannes (2)[[@Headword:Pabricius, Johannes (2)]]

             son of the preceding, a German theologian, was born at Nuiremberg, March 31, 1616. He studied at Jena, Leipsic, Wittenberg, and finally at Altorf, where he became professor of theology. In 1649 he was appointed preacher in his native city, and died there about 1690. For his works, which are not now of much interest, see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Pacareau, Pierre[[@Headword:Pacareau, Pierre]]

             a French prelate of Jansenistic tendency, was born at Bordeaux. Sept. 2, 1716; and after excellent educational advantages, having made himself master of the Romance, the classical, and the Shemitic tongues, he took holy orders. He became at once a popular preacher, and was honored with a canonicate in the metropolitan church of his native place. An earnest sympathizer with the Jansenists, he greeted the changes which the approaching revolution wrought in Church and State, and was elected bishop March 14, 1791, under the new constitution. He took no part in state affairs, and but rarely had occasion to perform the duties of his ecclesiastical office. He died Sept. 5, 1797, at Bordeaux. He was much prized by his contemporaries for his kindness and benevolence. He wrote Nouvelles considerations sur l'usure et le pret az l'interet (Bord. 1787, 8vo).

## Pacatiana[[@Headword:Pacatiana]]

             (Πακατιανή, of Lat. origin), the western district of Phrygia (1 Timothy 6, subscr. [spurious]). SEE PHRYGIA.

## Pacaud, Pierre[[@Headword:Pacaud, Pierre]]

             a French pulpit orator, was born in Bretagne near the opening of the 17th century, and was early admitted into the Congregation of the Oratory. He very soon became noted as a preacher, and the churches in which he preached were always thronged. In 1745 he published, under the title of  Discours de pilet (Paris, 3 vols. 12mo), a series of sermons anonymously. The heretical opinions which they contain made them objectionable to the ecclesiastics, and as soon as it was learned that Pacaud was their author he was sent into the country and subjected to severe treatment. He died May 3, 1760.

## Pacca, Bartolomeo[[@Headword:Pacca, Bartolomeo]]

             an Italian prelate of note in secular and ecclesiastical history, was born at Benevento Dec. 15, 1756, of a noble family. After studying at the college in Naples and at the Clementine College in Rome, he entered in 1778 the ecclesiastical school which Pius VI had just then founded. Pacca here gained not only the esteem of his teachers, but he was brought to the notice of the pope, who became so much interested in him that he was ordained archbishop in partibus of Damietta, and was despatched to Cologne as papal nuncio. Abroad the same capacity which distinguished him at school was manifest, and he was frequently instrumental in strengthening papal influence at a time when it was difficult to stay the tide of its decline. In 1794 he returned to Rome, only, however, to assume at once the papal novitiate at Lisbon, and there he remained until 1802. His services to the papal chair in this quarter were so great that in 1801 he was created a cardinal by pope Pius VII, and in 1808 was made a papal minister of state, as successor to Consalvis. In this new position Pacca proved an enthusiast. He urged the pope to unbending resistance against Napoleon, and would suffer the pontiff to listen to no proposals except the most favorable for Rome.

When Napoleon gained possession of Rome Pacca was therefore arrested, together with the pope, and imprisoned as a rebel, July 6, 1809. After the Concordat at Fontainebleau in 1813, Pacca was suffered to go free, but his counsel to publish a bull of excommunication made his reimprisonment a necessity, and he was banished to Uzes, until the fall of Napoleon set him free again. He entered Rome May 14, 1814, in the same carriage with the pope, whom he had served so faithfully. In 1815 he was again the companion of the pontiff in his flight from the Eternal City. After the pope's return to Rome Pacca became a member of the Congregation for Missions in China, and in 1816 was sent on a special mission to Austria. In 1821 he was made bishop of Porto and St. Rufinus. In 1830 he was given the sees of Ostia and Velletri, and was made prodatarius of the holy see, and archpriest of the Basilica of St. John of Lateran. He died April 19, 1844. He was actuated to the last by a strong  desire to re-establish the. papacy in its former glory, and was convinced that the power of the pope could be secure only by a firm adherence to the ecclesiastical rights which obtained in the Middle Ages. He was also a great friend of the Jesuits, and it was his influence with the pope that caused their restoration. Pacca narrated his experiences in a most agreeable and skilful manner, under the title Memorie istoriche, etc. (2d ed. Rome, 1830, 3 vols.). He also wrote Relazione del viaggio di pope Pio VII (Rome, 1833), etc. His complete works were published and translated into French and German. See Biographie Universeile, vol. 76, s.v.; Ami de la Religion, Mai, 1844 (Paris); L'Univers (Paris, 1844); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Biographie Univ. et portat. des Contemporains, vol. v, s.v.

## Paccanarists[[@Headword:Paccanarists]]

             SEE BACCANARISTS

.

## Pacchiarotto, Jacopo[[@Headword:Pacchiarotto, Jacopo]]

             one of the most distinguished of the old Italian masters in art, was born at Siena in the latter part of the 15th century. He lived at Siena until 1535, when, owing to his participation in a conspiracy of the people against the government, he was compelled to flee. Lanzi says that he would certainly have been hanged had he not been protected by the Osservanti monks, who concealed him for some time in a tomb. He succeeded in making his escape, and joined II Rosso in France, where he in all probability ended his days not very long afterwards, as nothing further is known of him, and he does not appear to have left any works in France. There are still several excellent paintings, both in oil and in fresco, by Pacchiarotto in Siena. There is a beautiful altar-piece in San Cristoforo, and some excellent frescos in Santa Caterilna and San Bernardino. Speth takes particular notice of these frescos in his Art in Italy, and terms Pacchiarotto the second hero of the Sienese school — Razzi, called Sodoma, being the first. Pacchiarotto is also highly praised by Lanzi. In Santa Caterina is the visit of Saint Catharine of Siena to the Body of Saint Agnes of Montepulcian, in which are heads and figures worthy of Raphael. According to Speth these works can be justly compared with Raphael's alone; and he adds that designating Pacchiarotto as of the school of Perugino is only magnifying the injustice he had already undergone in having his works long reported as the works of Perugino. If therefore he were the pupil of Perugino, “what Perugino supplied was only the spark,” says Speth, “which in Pacchiarotto  grew into a flame.” Pacchiarotto has suffered the same misfortune that many other excellent masters have undergone by reason of their omission by Vasari. About 1818 the king of Bavaria purchased two beautiful small easel pictures in oil and on wood, now in the Pinakothek at Munich, which are recognised as Pacchiarotto's extant masterpieces. The one represents St. Francis d'Assisi, with two angels in the background, and the other the Madonna and her Child, with four angels in the background. They are pronounced two of the best pictures in that rich collection. His works much resemble those of Pietro Perugino; at the same time they are more fully developed in form and are of wonderful force of coloring; in expression also many of his heads are admirable. See Lanzi, Storia Pittorica, etc.; Speth, Kunst in Italien, vol. 2; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts,. vol. 2, s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Paccori, Ambroise[[@Headword:Paccori, Ambroise]]

             a French theologian, was born at Ceaulce in 1649, of very humble parentage. Ambitious as a youth, he made his way to collegiate training in the high school of his native place, and he finally became its director. In 1706 he removed to Paris, and gave himself to authorship. He died at Paris Feb. 12, 1730. He wrote a large number of works, principally on practical religion and education. A list of his principal works is given in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Pace[[@Headword:Pace]]

             (צִעִד, tsa'ad, a step, as elsewhere rendered), not a formal measure, but talent in a general sense (2Sa 6:13).

## Pace Haut[[@Headword:Pace Haut]]

             is the name sometimes given to a broad step before an altar.

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

             a very learned English prelate, was born about 1482, at or near Winchester. He was educated at the charge. of Thomas Langton, bishop of that diocese, whom he served as amanuensis. The bishop, pleased with his proficiency, particularly in music, sent Pace to study at Padua, where he met with Cuthbert Tonstal, afterwards bishop of Durham, and William Latimer, by whose instructions Pace was much profited. Upon his return  home he settled at Queen's College in Oxford, of which his patron Langton had been provost; soon after he was taken into the service of Dr. Christopher Bainbridge, who about this time became a cardinal, and later Pace was summoned to court. His accomplishments rendered him very acceptable to Henry VIII, who seems to have made him secretary of state, or at least employed him in matters of high concern. Though much engaged in political affairs, he went into orders: in the beginning of 1514 he was admitted a prebendary in the church of York, and the same year was promoted to the archdeaconry of Dorset. These preferments were conferred upon him while he was employed by the king in a foreign embassy to Vienna. He then persuaded Maximilian to intervene in Italy, and procured for the emperor the alliance of the Swiss cantons. Upon the death of Colet, in 1519, he was made dean of St. Paul's. London. He was also made dean of Exeter about the same time; and in 1521 prebendary in the church of Sarum. At the death of Leo X, Wolsey, who aspired to the tiara, sent Pace to Rome to plead his cause before the sacred college; but Adrian VI was elected before his arrival there. Being employed not long afterwards as ambassador to Venice, he fell under the displeasure of Wolsey. The reasons for this are that he had shown a willingness to assist Charles, duke of Bourbon, with money, and that he had not forwarded the cardinal's designs for the papal chair. Wolsey used every means to bring him into disfavor with the king. He accused him of treason - and deprived Pace for the space of two years of all royal advice as to the pleasure of his mission. and of all allowances for his maintenance. This severe treatment threw Pace into temporary insanity.

After recovery Pace studied the Hebrew language with the assistane of Robert Wakefield. Being introduced to the king at Richmond, Henry expressed much satisfaction at his recovery, and admitted him to a private audience, in which Pace remonstrated against the cardinal's cruelty to him. Wolsey, urged by the king to clear himself from the charge, summoned Pace before him, and, with the duke of Norfolk and others, condemned the unfortunate prelate, and sent him to the Tower of London. After two years' confinement he was discharged by the king's command. He resigned the deaneries of St. Paul and Exeter, and lived in retirement at Stepevy, near London. He died there in 1532. Pace was a skilful diplomatist, and not less distinguished for his amiability and his great learning. Leland eulogizes Pacs highly; and it appears that he was much esteemed by the learned men of his time, especially by Sir Thomas More and Erasmus. The latter admired Pace for his candor and sweetness of temper, addressed to him more letters than to  any other of his friends, and could never forgive the man that caused his misfortunes. Stow gives him the character of a very worthy man, and one that gave in council faithful advice: “learned he was also,” says that antiquary, “‘and endowed with many excellent parts and gifts of nature; courteous, pleasant, and delighting in music; highly in the king's favor, and well heard in matters of weight.” There is extant a remarkable letter of his to the king, written in 1527, wherein he very freely gives his opinion concerning the divorce; and Fiddes observes that he always used a faithful liberty with the cardinal, which brought him at last to confinement and distraction. Pace published a number of works. The most important is, Defructu qui ex doctrina percipitur liber (Basle, 1517), dedicated to Dr. Colet. It was written at Constance, while Pace was ambassador in Helvetia; but, inveighing much against drunkenness as a great obstacle to the attaining of knowledge, the people there, supposing him to reflect upon them,, wrote a sharp answer to it. Erasrmus was also highly incensed at some passages in it, and calls it an indiscreet performance; or a silly book, in which Pace had, between jest and earnest, represented him as a beggar, hated alike by the laity and clergy. He. bids Sir Thomas More exhort Pace. since he had so little judgment, rather to confine himself to the translation of Greek writers than to venture upon works of his own, and publish such mean and contemptible stuff (Erasm. Epist. 275, and Epist. 287): — Epistolae ad Erasmum, etc. (1520). These epistles are in a book entitled Epistole aliquot eruditorum virorum. Pace also wrote a book against the unlawfulness of the king's marriage with Catharine in 1527, and made several translations: among others, one from English into Latin, Bishop Fisher's Sermon, preached at London on the day upon which the writings of Martin Luther were publicly burned (Camb. 1521). He made a translation from Greek into Latin of Plutarch's work, De commodo ex inimicis capiendo. See General Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Pachacamac[[@Headword:Pachacamac]]

             the supreme god of the Peruvians. This deity had a magnificent temple in a valley called Pachacama, built by the Incas or emperors of Peru. Such immense treasures had been laid up in this temple that Pizarro found 900,000 ducats in it, though four hundred savages had taken away as much as they could carry. The Peruvians had so great a veneration for this deity that they offered him whatever they esteemed most precious, and so great was their awe of him that they durst not look upon his image. Even their  priests and kings entered his temples with their backs towards his altar, and came out again without daring to turn.

## Pachamama[[@Headword:Pachamama]]

             a name of the goddess of the earth among the ancient Peruvians,

## Pacheco, Francisco[[@Headword:Pacheco, Francisco]]

             a noted Spanish painter, was born at Seville in 1571, of a good and influential family. An uncle of his was canon of the cathedral of Seville, and is distinguished as a divine and poet. Afforded all the advantages of culture  which his country could command, Pacheco started out in life with unusual fitness for an artistic course. His very earliest works attracted general attention, and in 1598 he was one of the principal painters employed on the great decorations or catafalque of Philip II. In 1600 he was appointed, together with Alonzo Vazquez, to paint a series of large pictures illustrating the life of St. Ramon for the cloister of the convent of the Merced. In 1603 he executed some works in distemper in the palace of Don Fernando Henriquez de Ribera, third duke de Alcala, from the story of Daedalus and Icarus. In 1611 he visited Toledo, Madrid, and the Escurial, and saw the great works of Titian and other celebrated Italian and Spanish masters, and was so forcibly impressed with the varied and incessant application requisite to make one a great painter that on his return to Seville he opened a systematic academy of the arts, as well for his own improvement as for the benefit of the rising artists of Seville. The improvement he himself acquired is shown by his great picture of the Last Judgment. an altar-piece finished in 1614 for the nuns of the convent of St. Isabel, and by himself described at great length in his treatise on painting. In 1618 Pacheco was appointed by the Inquisition one of the guardians of the public morals, i.e. he was made censor of all the pictures which were exposed for sale in Seville; nakedness was prohibited, and it was his business to see that no pictures of the naked human form were sold. It is to such formal morality as this that the Spanish school of painting owes its characteristic ponderous sobriety, and is so directly unlike Italian painting. Prudery was carried so far in Spain that in the time of Ferdinand VII. even all the great Italian works which could be reproached with nudities were removed from the galleries, and were condemned to a distinct set of apartments called the Galeria Reservada, and only opened to view to those who could procure especial orders. In 1623 Pacheco visited Madrid, and among many other works executed was one which hardly accords with the present notions of the occupation of a great painter, though it has been the practice of great artists from very early ages to paint their statues. SEE NICIAS.

Pacheco dressed, gilded, and painted (estofo) for the duchess of Olivares a statue, probably of wood, of the Virgin, by Juan Gomez de Mora. What this process exactly was it is not evident from this mere mention; but the object generally in these painted. wooden images appears to have been to obtain an exact imitation in the minutest detail — perpetual facsimiles. The effect of such images, called “Pasos,” must be experienced to be comprehended. The Spaniards dress them as well as paint them. Their churches were crowded with such works; but most have now been  removed to museums. Mr. Ford gives some curious details about the toilets of these Spanish images. No man is allowed in Spain to undress the “Paso,” or “Sa'grada Imagen,” of the Virgin; and some images had their mistresses of the robes (“camerera mayor”), and a chamber (“camerin”) where their toilet was made. The duty has, however, now devolved upon old maids; and “Ha quedado para vestir imagines” (She has gone to dress images) has become a phrase of reproach. Pacheco died at Seville in 1654. “His works, though not vigorous, are correct in form, effective in light and shade, studied in composition, and simple in attitude; but they have little color, are dry, and rather feeble or timid in their handling. These defects are more apparent when his pictures are seen together with the works of other Andalusian painters, who have generally made coloring their principal study, and have comparatively neglected purity of form. Besides his many religious pictures, he painted or drew in crayons nearly four hundred portraits.” He also wrote Arte de Pintura, su Antigiiedad, y Gerandeza (Seville, 1649, 4to), a remarkably scarce book, considered an indispensable guide by the painters of the school of Seville; it is a work of great learning on the subject, and is held throughout Spain to be the best work on painting in the Spanish language: it is in three parts —history, theory, and practice. The Jesuits of Seville were his most intimate associates, and greatly assisted him in writing his work. They were indeed the authors of that part which is devoted to sacred art. His works are seldom seen out of Seville, and he is even very inadequately represented in the splendid gallery of the Prado at Madrid. The altar-piece of the Archangel Michael expelling Satan from Paradise, which was in the church of San Alberto at Seville, was regarded his masterpiece. There are still at Seville an altar-piece of the Conception of San Lorenzo, two pictures of San Fernando in San Clementi, and a picture in San Alberto. See Antonio, Bibliotheca Scriptor. Hispanioe, 3, 456; Ticknor, Hist. Spanish Lit. 3, 19; Spooner, Biog. Dict. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Pachmann, Theodor[[@Headword:Pachmann, Theodor]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Austria, for some time professor of canon law at the university in Vienna, who died February 2, 1881, doctor of theology, is the author of Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechtes (Vienna, 1853, 3 volumes; 3d ed. 1863-66). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:969. (B.P.)

## Pachomius[[@Headword:Pachomius]]

             (Παχώμιος), as Socrates and Talladius write the name, or PACHUMIUS (Παχούμιος) (1), or “THE ELDER,” according to the author of Vita Pachumii, was an Egyptian ascetic of the 4th century, and one of the founders, if not pre-eminently the founder, of the regular cloister life. SEE  MONASTICISM. “The respect which the Church entertains at present,” says Tillemont (Memoires, 7:167), “for the name of St. Pachomius is no new feeling, but a just recognition of the obligations which she. is under to him as the holy founder of a great number of monasteries; or, rather, as the institutor not only of certain convents, but of the conventual life itself, and of the holy communities of men devoted to a religious life.” Pachomius was born in the Thebaid of heathen parents, and was educated in paganism; and while a lad, going with his parents to offer sacrifice in one of the temples of the gods, was hastily expelled by the order of the priest as an enemy of the gods. The incident was afterwards recorded as a prognostic of his subsequent conversion and saintly eminence. At the age of twenty he was drawn for military service under the tyrant Maximin against Constantine and Licinius. The conscripts were embarked in a boat and conveyed down the Nile; and being landed at Thebes were placed in confinement, apparently to prevent desertion. Here they were visited by the Christians of the place, and a grateful curiosity led Pachomius to inquire into the character and opinions of the charitable strangers. Struck with what he had heard of them, he seized the first opportunity of solitude to offer the simple and touching prayer, “God, the creator of heaven and earth, if thou wilt indeed look upon my low estate, notwithstanding my ignorance of thee, the only true God, and wilt deliver me from this affliction, I will obey thy will all the days of my life, and will love and serve all men according to thy commandments.” He was, however, obliged to accompany his fellow-conscripts, and suffered many hardships during this period of enforced service: but when the settlement of the contest released him he hastened back into the Thebaid, and was baptized in the church of Chenoboscia, near the city of Diospolis the Less: and aspiring at pre- eminent holiness, led an ascetic life, under the guidance of Palemon (q.v.), an anchoret of high repute.

After a time he withdrew with Palemon to Tabenna, an island in the Nile, near the common boundary of the Theban and Tenthyrite nomes. Some time after this removal his companion Palemon died, but Pachomius found a substitute for his departed companion in his own elder brother, Joannes or John, who gladly became his disciple. In A.D. 325, directed by what he regarded as a divine intimation, Pachomius invited men to embrace a monastic life; and obtained first three disciples, and then many more, formed them into a community and prescribed rules for their guidance, and as the community grew in number he appointed the needful officers for their regulation and instruction. He built a church as a place of worship and instruction for the  shepherds, to whom, as there was no other reader, he read the Scriptures. So successful were his labors for the propagation of Christianity that the bishop of Tenthyra would have gladly raised him to the rank of presbyter, and even requested Athanasius, patriarch of Alexandria, when visiting the Thebaid, to ordain him; but Pachomius, being aware of the design, hid himself until the patriarch had departed. His refusal of the office of presbyter did not, however, diminish his reputation or influence; new disciples flocked to him, of whom Theodorus or Theodore was the most illustrious. New monasteries sprung up all around his own. Of these several communities he was himself visitor and regulator-general, or archimandrite, each cloister having besides a separate superior and a steward; thus, e.g., his disciple Theodore was superior of the monastery of Tabenna. Pachomius's residence was now at the monastery of Proii, which was made the head of the monasteries of the district. He died there of a pestilential disorder which had broken out among the monks, probably in A.D. 348, a short time before the death or expulsion of the Arian patriarch Gregory and the restoration of Athanasius. Some, however, place the death of Pachomius in A.D. 360.

The monastic communities which he had founded had been so regularly constituted as bodies that the continuity of their existence was not interrupted: by his own death or that of other individuals. Even before Pachomius's death (348) his community numbered eight or nine cloisters in the Thebaid, and 3000 (according to some 7000) members; a century later it counted no less than 50,000. The mode of life was fixed by a strict rule of Pachomius, which, according to a later legend, an angel communicated to him, and which Jerome translated into Latin. The formal reception into the society was preceded by a three-years' probation. Rigid vows were not yet enjoined. With spiritual exercises manual labor was united — agriculture, boat-building, basket-making, mat and coverlet weaving — by which the monks not only earned their own living, but also supported the poor and the sick. They were divided, according to the grade of their ascetic piety, into twenty-four classes, named by the letters of the Greek alphabet. They lived three in a cell. They ate in common, but in strict silence, and with the face covered. They made known their wants by signs. The sick were treated with special care. On Saturday and Sunday the monks partook of the communion. Pachomius also established a cloister of nuns for his sister, whom he never admitted to his presence when she would visit him, sending her word that she should be content to know that  he was still alive. Pachomius, after his conversion, never ate a full meal, and for fifteen years slept sitting on a stone. Tradition ascribes to him all sorts of miracles, even the gift of tongues and perfect dominion over nature, so that he; trod without harm on serpents and scorpions, and crossed the Nile on the backs of crocodiles!

There are various writings extant under the name of Pachomius:

(1.) two Regular Monasticoe.

(a.) The shorter of these, preserved by Palladius, is said to have been given to Pachomius by the angel who conveyed to him the divine command to establish monasteries. This rule is by no means so rigid as the monastic rules of later times. Palladius says that the monasteries at Tabenna and in the neighborhood subject to the rule contained 7000 monks, of whom 1500 were in the parent community first established by Pachomius; but it is doubtful if this is to be understood of the original monastery of Tabenna or that of Proii.

(b.) The longer Regula, said to have been written in the Egyptian (Sahidic?) language, translated into Greek, is extant in a Latin version made from the Greek by Jerome. It is preceded by a Prefatio, in which Jerome gives an account of the monasteries of Tabenna as they were in his time. Cave (Hist Litter. ad ann. 340, in 1, 208 [ed. Oxf. 1740-1743]) disputes the genuineness of the Regula, and questions not only the title of Pachomius to the authorship of it, but also the title of Jerome to be regarded as the translator. He thinks that it may embody the rule of Pachomius as augmented by his successors. It is remarkable that this Regula, which comprehends in all one hundred and ninety-four articles, is divided into several parts, each with separate titles; and Tillemont supposes, therefore, that they are separate pieces collected and arranged by Benedictus Anianus. This Regula was first published at Rome by Achilles Statius, A.D. 115, and then by Petrus Ciacconus, also at Rome, A.D. 1588. It was inserted in the Supplementum Bibliothecae Patrum of Morellus (Paris, 1639), vol. 1; in the Bibliotheca Patrum Ascetica (ibid. 1661), vol. 1; in the Codex Regularum of Holstenius (Rome, 1661); and in successive editions of the fathers.

(2.) Monita, extant in a Latin version, first published by Gerard Vossius with the works of Gregorius Thaumaturgus (Mayence, 1604), and given in the Bibliotheca Patrum (ut supra).

(3.) SS. PP. Pachomii et Theodori Epistole et Verba Mystica. Eleven of these letters are by Pachomius. They abound in incomprehensible allusions to certain mysteries contained in or signified by the letters of the Greek alphabet. They are extant in the Latin version of Jerome (Opera, l.c., and Bibliotheca Patrum, l.c.), who subjoined them as an Appendix to the Regula, but without explaining, probably without understanding, the hidden signification of the alphabetical characters, apparently employed as ciphers, to which the-correspondents of Pachomius had the key (comp. Gennadius, De Viris Illustr. c. vii; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. 3, 14). (4.) Ε᾿κ τῶν ἐντολῶν τοῦ ἁγίου Παχουμίου,Praecepta S. Pachomii s. Pachumnii, first published in the Acta Sanctorum (MIaii, vol. 3), in Latin in the body of the work, p. 346, and in the original Greek in the Appendix, p. 62, and reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland (vol. 4), where all the extant works are given.

There is a prolix life of Pachomius, entitled βίος τοῦ ἁγίου Παχουμίου, Vita S. Pachumim barbarous Greek, the translation perhaps of a Sahidic original, by a monk of the generation immediately succeeding Pachomius; there is also a second memoir, or extract, either by the writer of the life, or by some other writer of the same period, supplementary to the first work, and to this the title Paralipomena de SS. Pachomio et Theodoro has been prefixed; and there is an account of Pachomius in a letter from Ammon, an Egyptian bishop, to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, Ε᾿πιστολὴ Α᾿μμῶνος ἐπισκόπου περὶ πολιτείας καὶ βίου μερικοῦ Παχουμίου καὶ θεοδώρου, Epistola Ammonis Episccpi de Conversatione ac Vitce Parte Pachumii et Theodori. All these pieces are given by the Bollandists, both in the Latin version (p. 295-351) and in the original (Appendix, p. 25- 71), in the Acta Sanctorum (Maii, vol. 3), with the usual introduction by Papebroche.

See Acta Sanctorum, sub Mai. 14; Tillemont, Memoires, 7:167-235; Schaff, Church Hist. 2, 195-198; Neander, Church Hist. vol. 2; Gennadius, De Viris Illustribus, cap. 7; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biogr. and Mythol. vol. 2, s.v.; Ceillier, Hist. Ginerale des Auteurs Sacres et Eccles. 3, 357 sq. Stud. u. Krit. 1864, No. 1; Milman, Hist. of Christianity; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. 1; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy. SEE MONASTERY; SEE MONASTICISM; SEE MONK; and the literature on early MONASTICISM.

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

             distinguished as “THE YOUNGER.” Among the histories published by Herbert Rosweyd (Vitce Patrum [Antw. 1615, fol.], p. 233) is one of a certain Posthumius of Memphis, father (i.e. abbot) of five thousand monks. The MSS. have Pachomius instead of Posthumius. The truth of the whole history is, however, strongly suspected by the editors of the Acta Sanctorum, who have nevertheless printed it in the introduction to the account of Pachomius of Tabenna. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

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

             an Eastern monastic, is supposed to have flourished in the 7th century either in Egypt or Syria, some time after the subjugation of these countries by the Saracens. He is regarded as the author of Pachomii Monachi Setmo contra Mores sui Sceculi et Providentie Divinue Contentum, published by V. E. Loescher in the appendix to his Stromatea, s. Dissertationes Sacri et Litterarii Argumenti (Wittenberg, 1723). See Fabricius, Bibl. Grceca, 9:313.

## Pachymeres, Georgius[[@Headword:Pachymeres, Georgius]]

             (Γεώργιος ὁ Παχυμερής), one of the most important of the later Byzantine writers, was born in or about A.D. 1242 at Nicaea, whither his father, an inhabitant of Constantinople, had fled after its capture by the Latins in 1204. Hence Pachymeres sometimes calls himself a Constantinopolitan. Fitted out with a careful and learned education, he left Nicaea in 1261, and took up his abode in Constantinople, which had then just been retaken by Michael Palaeologus. Here Pachymeres became a priest. It appears that besides divinity, he also, according to the spirit of the time, studied the law, for in after-years he was promoted to the important posts of Πρωτέκτικος, or advocate-general of the Church of Constantinople, and Δικαιοφύλαξ, or chief justice to the imperial court, perhaps in ecclesiastical matters, which, however, were of high political importance in the reigns of Michael Paleeologus and his successor. Andronicus the elder. As early as 1267 he accompanied, perhaps as secretary, three imperial commissioners to the exiled patriarch Arsenius, in order to investigate his alleged participation in a suspected conspiracy against the life of Michael Palaeologus. They succeeded in reconciling  these two chiefs of the state and the Church. The emperor Michael having taken preparatory steps towards effecting a union of the Greek and Latin churches, Pachymeres sided with the patriarch Joseph, who was against the union; and when the emperor wrote in defence of the union, Pachymeres, together with Jasites Job, drew up an answer in favor of .the former state of separation. When the emperor Andronicus repealed the union, Pachymeres persuaded the:patriarch Georgius Cyprius, who was for it, to abdicate.

It seems that Pachymeres also devoted some of his time to teaching, because one of his disciples was Manuel Phile, who wrote aniambic poem on his death. Pachymeres probably died shortly after 1310; but some believe that his death took place as late as 1340. There is a wood-cut portrait of Pachymeres prefixed to Wolf's edition of Nicephorus Gregoras (Basle, 1562).

Pachymeres wrote several important works, the principal of which are: Historia Byzantina, a history of the emperors Michael Paleologus and Andronicus the elder, in thirteen books, six of which are devoted to the life of the former, and seven to that of the latter. This is a most valuable source for the history of the time, written with great dignity and calmness, and with as much impartiality as was possible in those stormy times, when both political and religious questions of vital importance agitated the minds of the Greeks. The style of Pachymeres is remarkably good and pure for his age: — Καθ᾿ ἑαυτόν, a poetical autobiography of Pachymeres, which is lost. Were this work extant, we should know more of so important a man as Pachymeres: — Epitome in universam fere Aristotelis Philosophiam: — Epitome Philosophice Aristotelie: — Περὶ ἀτόμων γραμμῶν, a paraphrase of Aristotle's work on indivisible lines, formerly attributed to Aristotle himself: -Παράφρασις εἰς τὰ τοῦ ἁγίου Διονυσίου τοῦ Α᾿ρεοπαγίτου εὑρισκόμενα: — De Processione Spiritus Sancti, a short treatise: — ῎Εκφρασις τοῦ Αὐγουστεῶνος, a description of the column erected by Justinian the Great, in commemoration of his victories over the Persians, in the church of St. Sophia in Constantinople: — several minor works. See Leo Allatius, Diatriba de Georgus; Haw. kins, Scriptura Byzantia; Fabrietus, Bibl. Graeca, 7. 775.

## Paci, Ranieri[[@Headword:Paci, Ranieri]]

             called del Pace, an Italian painter, was a native of Pisa, and studied under Antonio Domenieo Gabbiani, whose manner he adopted. According to Morrona, he executed some works for the churches of his native city in a reputable manner. Lanzi says that by carelessness and inattention he degenerated into a complete mannerism. He flourished in 1719.

## Pacian[[@Headword:Pacian]]

             SEE PACIANUS.

## Pacianus[[@Headword:Pacianus]]

             a Spanish prelate of the 4th century, who among the Church writers of the West previous to Augustine figures not inconspicuously, is supposed to have become bishop about A.D. 350, and to have died at an advanced age under Theodosius (about 390). For information regarding the personal history of Pacianus we rely mainly on Jerome (in cap. 106 and 132 of his Lib. de Viis illustrisbus — also contr. Ruffin. t. i, c. 24). He describes Pacianus as the descendant of a noble family, and married in early life, for Pacianus had a son, Flavius Dexter, a friend of Jerome, who dedicated to him his work De Viris Illustribus. About the time Ambrose of Milan became an ecclesiastic Pacianus entered the service of the Church, and soon rose to positions of influence. He finally became bishop of Barcelona. Pacianus was especially renowned for his chastity and eloquence. Jerome says also that Pacianus wrote several works, of which he expressly mentions those against the Novatians, and one entitled κέρβος. A work of Pacianus against the Novatians is still extant in the form of three letters addressed to a Novatian of the name of Sympronianus, or Sempronianus as some read it. The work called by Jerome κέρβος, that is cervus, is no longer extant. But Pacianus tells us, in a treatise of his which has come down to us, and which is entitled Parcenesis sive Exhortatorius Libellus ad Panitentiam, that he had written a book called Cervulus. We also possess a sermon by Pacianus on baptism (Sermon de baptismo), intended for the use of catechumens. The style of all these writings, so far as extant, prove Pacianus to have been a master of the Latin language, and Jerome's estimate of Pacianus as “Scriptor eloquens” is not overdrawn. But there is not much evidence of great scholarship or originality, nor anything striking in the writings of Pacianus. What we still possess of them were first  brought out by Tilius (Paris, 1537, 4to). Next came Galland in his Bibliotheca Patrum, 7:257-276; and likewise the Bibl. Patr. maximna Lugdunensis, vol. 4, and Migne, 13:1051 sq. See, besides Jerome's works referred to above, Acta Script. Boll. ad 9 Mart. p. 44; Cave, Scriptor. ecclesiasticorum hist. liter. i, 234; Tillemont, Memoires, 8:539; Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Sacrgs et Eccles. v, 156 sq.; Alzog, Patrologie, § 61; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Paciaudi, Paolo Maria[[@Headword:Paciaudi, Paolo Maria]]

             an Italian ecclesiastic, antiquary, and historian, was born at Turin in 1710. He studied at Bologna, became professor of philosophy at Genoa, and in 1761 settled at Parma as librarian to the. grand-duke, who also -appointed him his. antiquary and director of some public works; besides which he was historiographer of the Order of Malta. He died in 1785. His principal works of interest to us are, De cultu S. Joannis Baptistce antiquitates Christiance (1754, 4to), a masterpiece full of information: — Monumenta Peloponnesiaca (2 vols. 4to): — Memoirs of the Grand Masters of the Order of St. John of Jerusalem (3 vols. 4to). See Fabroni, Vitce Italiorum, vol. 14 s.v.; Leneys, Life of Paciaudi prefixed to his Letters to M. de Caylus; Tipaldo, Biog. degli Italiani illustri, vol. 10, s.v.

## Pacification, Edicts of[[@Headword:Pacification, Edicts of]]

             a name given to certain edicts issued by sovereigns of France, intended, under special circumstances, to afford toleration to the Reformed Church of that country. The first edict of this kind was granted by Charles IX in 1562, tolerating the Reformed religion in the vicinity of all the cities and towns of the realm. March 19, 1563, the same king granted a second edict at Amboise, permitting the free exercise of Protestant worship in the houses of gentlemen and lords high-justiciaries (or those that had the power of life and death) to their families and dependents only, and allowing other Protestants to have their meetings in such towns as they had them in before March 7. Another, called the Edict of Longumeau, sanctioning the execution of that of Amboise, was published March 27,1568. Afraid of an insurrection of the Huguenots, Charles revoked these edicts in September, 1568, forbidding Protestantism, and commanding all its ministers to leave the kingdom in fifteen days. But on Aug. 8, 1570, he retracted, and published an edict on the hallowing the lords high-justiciaries to have sermons in their houses for all who chose to attend. He likewise gave them  four towns, viz. Rochelle, Montauban, Cognac, and La Charite, as places of security for them during the space of two years. Nevertheless in August, 1572, he authorized the St. Bartholomew massacre, and at the same time issued a declaration forbidding the exercise of the Protestant religion, and thereby proved clearly that the successive edicts which he had granted the Protestants, instead of intending their relief, had simply sought to lull them into a false and deceitful security, in order to give time and opportunity to that cruel monarch for his preparation. of the massacre of St. Bartholomew (q.v.).

In April, 1576, Henry III made peace with the Protestants, and the edict of pacification was published in Parliament, May 14, permitting them to build churches. .But the faction of the Guises began the famous league for defence of the Catholic religion, which became so formidable that it obliged the king to assemble the states of the kingdom at Blois in December, 1576; where it was enacted that there, should be but one religion in France, and that the Protestant ministers should all be banished. In 1577 the king. to secure peace, published an edict in Parliament, Oct. 5, granting the same liberty to the Reformed which they had before. However, in July, 1585, the league obliged him to publish another edict, revoking all former grants, and ordering all Protestants to leave the kingdom in six months, or conform.

Henry IV, on his coronation, abolished, July 4, 1591, the edicts against the Protestants. This edict was verified in the Parliament of Chalons, but was never fully acted out. The most famous edict of pacification, however, was the Edict of Nantes, issued by Henry in 1598. It proved the most effectual measure of relief “which the French Protestants had ever enjoyed. By this edict of toleration they were allowed the free exercise of their religion, declared to be eligible to all public offices, and placed in all respects on a footing of equality with their Roman Catholic fellow-subjects. This edict was confirmed by Louis XIII in 1610, and by Louis XIV in 1652. But the latter in 1685. abolished it entirely. SEE HUGUENOTS; SEE NANTES, EDICT OF.

## Pacificators[[@Headword:Pacificators]]

             a name assumed by the imperial party who supported the Henoticon (q.v.) of Zeno in the year 482.

## Pacificus[[@Headword:Pacificus]]

             a noted Itaian mediaeval ecclesiastic, was born at Verona in 776, and after having entered the service of the Church, was made archdeacon of the cathedral in his native town. He had great mechanical skill, and considerably promoted all inventive labors. He died in 844. He left glosses on several books of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, but they have never been collected for publication. His learning and piety in those early mediaeval days were the subject of common remark, and his name deserves to be honorably mentioned in all Christian literary undertakings. See Muratori, Antiquitates Itrali medii oevi, 3, 837; Maffei, Verona Illustrata, s.v.

## Pack, Otto Von[[@Headword:Pack, Otto Von]]

             the noted chancellor of duke George of Saxony, deserves our attention as the discoverer of a plot made in 1527 to eradicate all traces of Protestantism in Germany by a united effort of the Romish princes of the country. A careful investigation failed to reveal the necessary proof of such a plot, and Pack was obliged to leave his native country, and .while seeking an asylum in Belgium is said to have suffered imprisonment and decapitation. At the time Pack was generally believed to have had no evidence. for his revelations, but the subsequent favorable compacts of king Philip with the episcopal princes betray a more intimate alliance than was claimed. Probably the attack on Protestantism had been intended, but the revelation came before the plot was fully matured. See Keim, Schwab. Refornsationsgesch.; Hortleben, Von den Ursachen des ddeutschen Krieges, vol. 1; Neudecker, Urkunden aus derReformationszeit; Ranke, Deutsche Gesch. vol. 3. (J. H.W.) Packard, Prederick Adolphus, LL.D., a prominent American educational writer and philanthropist, was born in Marlborough, Middlesex County, Mass., Sept. 25, 1794. He graduated at Harvard-College in 1814; read law at Northampton, Mass.; then practiced law at Springfield, Mass., from 1817 to 1829, where he also edited the Hampden Federalist for ten years. He was besides a member of the state legislature from 1828 to 1829. He removed to Philadelphia in 1829, and assumed the editorial charge of the publications of the American Sunday- School Union, which position he retained until his death, Nov. 11, 1867.

For nearly forty years he was engaged almost exclusively in Sunday-school work in its various branches. Between 1829 and June, 1867, Dr. Packard edited more than two thousand different works issued by the American  Sunday-School Union in their regular series, more than forty of which he himself wrote or compiled; edited the Sunday-School Magazine, the Sunday-School Journal, and the Youth's Penny Gazette; prepared from 1829 to 1835 inclusive, and from 1838 to 1867, most of the society's annual reports; published tracts and occasional papers on Sunday-school subjects, and pamphlets on educational and other subjects, including a Letter on Christian Union (1850) to bishop Potter, of Pennsylvania. He also published, in 1850, A Reply to an Article in Forbes's Psychological Journal (London) on Diseases of the Mind. He edited eleven of the thirteen volumes of the Philadelphia Journal of Prison Discipline, and contributed to the other two volumes; issued several pamphlets on. the same subject; and wrote for the Princeton Review, the New-Englander, and other periodicals. In July, 1849, he was elected president of Girard College in Philadelphia, but declined the appointment. Packard was a man of untiring zeal and ‘energy, estimable in all the relations of life, and in the highest sense of the phrase a national benefactor. Among the most important of his publications, all of which lack his own name, are, The Union Bible Dictionary (Phila. 1837): — The Teacher Taught (1839), reprinted in London under the title of The Sunday-School Teacher's Handbook: — An Inquiry into the Alleged Tendency of the Separation of Convicts one from the other to Produce Disease and Derangement, by a Citizen of Pennsylvania (1849): — The Teacher Teaching (1861): — The Rock (1861; Lond. 1862): — Life of Robert Owen (Phila. 1866): — The Daily Public School of the United States (1866), a vigorous protest against the inefficiency of the system. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Index to the Princeton Review, vol. 2, s.v.

## Packard, Alpheis Spring, D.D[[@Headword:Packard, Alpheis Spring, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister and educator, was born at Chelmsford, Mass., December 20, 1799, and was the son of Reverend Dr. Hezekiah Packard. He studied at the Phillips Academy of Exeter, and graduated from Bowdoin College in 1816. He was elected tutor of the college in 1819, and, in 1824, professor of languages and classical literature; from 1842 to 1845 filled a vacancy in the chair of rhetoric and oratory; in 1864 was called to the chair of the Collins professorship of natural and revealed religion; and in 1883 and 1884 was acting president. He was chosen a member of the Maine Historical Society in 1828, and was long its secretary and librarian. He died suddenly at Squirrel Island, Boothbay Harbor, Me., July 13, 1884. His sermons, lectures, and contributions of various kinds to the press were numerous. See Boston Advertiser, July 14, 1884. (J.C.S.)

## Packard, Hezekial. D.D.[[@Headword:Packard, Hezekial. D.D.]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at North Bridgewater, Mass., in 1761. He graduated at Harvard College in 1787; was minister at Chelmsford, Mass., from 1793 to 1802; at Wiscasset Me., from 1802 to 1830; and at Middlesex Village, Mass., from 1830 to 1836. He died in 1849. He published single Sermons, etc. (1795-1816). See Sprague, Annals, Unitarian, 8:281; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Packard, Theophilus[[@Headword:Packard, Theophilus]]

             D.D. a Congregational minister, was born March 4, 1769, at North Bridgewater, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1796, and was ordained pastor in. Shelburne, Mass., Feb., 20, 1799, where he remained until his death, which occurred Sept. 17, 1855. He published Sermons in 1806, 1808; 1813, and 1815; and in 1820 the Life and Death of (his son) Isaac T. Packard.; See Sprague, Annals, 2. 408; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Packer, David, M.D.[[@Headword:Packer, David, M.D.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newark, Vt., Feb. 20, 1808; was converted in Burke in 1823; received an exhorter's license in 1832; and began preaching in the Vermont Conference in 1839, where he remained until 1864. His health failing, he attended a course of medical lectures in Philadelphia in 1865, where he graduated as M.D. In 1866 Packer took a superannuated relation in his conference, and entered upon the practice of his newly acquired profession at Lowell, Mass.; but he was prostrated by sickness in 1867, and removed to Chelsea, hoping the change of climate might improve his health. A shock of apoplexy in 1873, however, and another in 1874, left him a physical wreck; and, after a year's residence in Minnesota he died in Chelsea, Mass., Dec. 1, 1875. He was successful both as a minister and a physician.

## Padan[[@Headword:Padan]]

             (Heb. Paddan', פִּדָּן, field; Sept.,.in full, Μεσοποταμία τῆς Συραίς; Viulg. Mesopotamia) occurs in Gen 48:7, for PADAN-ARAMI.

## Padan-Aram[[@Headword:Padan-Aram]]

             (Heb. Paddan ‘Aram', פָּדִּןאּארֲָם, the field [or flat country] of Syria, i.e. Mesopotamiaonly in Genesis; Sept. ἡ Μεσοποταμία Συρίας, Gen 25:20; Gen 28:6-7; Gen 33:18; ἡ M. Gen 28:2; Gen 28:5; Gen 31:18; M. τῆς Συρ. Gen 35:9; Gen 35:26; Gen 46:15; Alex. ἡ M. Gen 25:20; Gen 28:5; Gen 28:7; Gen 31:18; ἡ M. Συρ. Gen 28:2; Gen 33:18, Vulg. Mesopotamia Gen 25:20; Gen 31:18; M. Syrice, Gen 28:2; Gen 28:5-6; Gen 33:18; Gen 35:9; Gen 35:26; Gen 46:15; Syria, Gen 26:15); once called Padan simply (Gen 48:7); the tableland of Aram,'' a name by which the Hebrews designated the tract of country which they otherwise called ARAM-NAHARAIM, “Aram of the two  rivers,” the Greek MESOPOTAMIA (Gen 24:10), and “the field (A.V. country) of Aram” (Hos 12:12). The term was perhaps more especially applied to that portion which bordered on the Euphrates, to distinguish it from the mountainous districts in the north and north-east of Mesopotamia. Rashi's note on Gen 25:20 is curious: “Because there were two Arams, Aram-naharaim and Aram Zobah, he (the writer) calls it Paddan-Aram; the expression ‘yoke of oxen' is in the Targums תּוֹרַין

פִדִּן, paddan torin; and some interpret Paddan-Aram as ‘field of Aram,' because in the language of the Ishmaelites they call a field paddan.” In Syr. pidono is used for a “plain” or “field;” and both this and the Arabic word are probably from the Arab root fadda, “to plough,” which seems akin tofid in fidit, from findere. If this etymology be true, Paddan-Aram is the arable land of Syria: “either an upland vale in the hills, or a fertile district immediately at their feet” (Stanley, Sin. and Pal. p. 129, note). Paddan, the ploughed land, would thus correspond with the Lat. arvum, and is analogous to Eng. field, the felled land, from which the trees have been cleared. SEE ARAM.

Padan-Aram plays an important part in the early history of the Hebrews. The family of their founder had settled there, and were long looked upon as the aristocracy of the race, with whom alone the legitimate descendants of Abraham might intermarry, and. thus preserve the purity of their blood. Thither Abraham sent his faithful steward (Gen 24:10), after the news had reached him in his southern home at Beersheba that children had been born to his brother Nahor. From this family alone, the offspring of Nahor and Micah, Abraham's brother and niece, could a wife be sought, for Isaac, the heir of promise (Gen 25:20), and Jacob the inheritor of his blessing (Genesis 28). SEE MESOPOTAMIA.

## Paddle[[@Headword:Paddle]]

             (יָתֵד, yathed' a pin [as often rendered], especially a tent-pin, Jdg 4:21; Sept. πάσσαλος; Vulg. passillus), the implement required by the Mosaic law to be carried by Jews for the purpose of covering their ordure with earth (Deu 23:13), evidently a common stake or peg of wood, sufficient to scratch the ground with.

## Paddock, Benjamin Green[[@Headword:Paddock, Benjamin Green]]

             a pioneer preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is noted for his valuable Christian labors in the territory now known as the Wyoming Conference, and covering those portions of the great states of Pennsylvania and New York situated near the much celebrated valley of the Woming. He was born in Bennington, Vt., Jan. 24, 1789. His mother is still remembered as a woman of deep piety. For eighty-five years she lived a holy life. An abiding moral influence was thus exerted upon the domestic circle, and Benjamin was one of the first of a numerous household to give his heart to God. At the age of sixteen he was converted under the Rev. Benjamin Bidlack, and joined the Methodist Church. He entered the itinerant ranks in 1810, when his name. first appears upon the Minutes of Conference. He had labored the preceding year on Westmoreland Circuit under the Rev. James Kelsev. Paddock's work was chiefly in the Wyoming valley and its adjacent mountain region. He had a voice of uncommon sweetness and power, and the effect with which he sang for Jesus is still remembered in that section. Later he was stationed at the important charges of Utica, Canandaigua, and Auburn, and also filled the office of presiding elder for many years. In 1843 he was superannuated, and he never after resumed the active work of the ministry. He took up his residence first at Clinton, where he educated his children at college, and later he lived at Rome, New York. His long life of usefulness closed at last at Metuchen, N.J., Oct. 7, 1872, whither he had gone to enjoy the attentions of his children residing there. His dying hour was most tranquil and joyous. His salutation to his brother, the Rev. Z. Paddock, who reached him the evening previous to his death, while it was characteristic, was most exultant. His last words were, “Farewell; Halleluia, all is well!” Like most of the pioneer preachers of Methodism, Mr. Paddock's early educational advantages had been meagre, and he was dependent upon his own industry for the culture he secured. He studied much and wrote some, but he never became pre-eminent among his fellows for commanding intellect, to judge from his productions as published in the Memoir cited below. “He was a man of magnificent heart. He judged things from the emotions, and to him the good was the test of the true” (Dr. Whedon, in Meth. Qu. Rev. April, 1875, p. 348). See the Rev. Z. Paddock, Memoir of the Rev. B. G. Paddock (New York, 1875, 12mo); Min. of Annual Conferences, 1874, p. 52.

## Paddock, James H[[@Headword:Paddock, James H]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Sussex Co., N.J., Aug. 28, 1839. We are unable to gather any authentic information concerning his early life. In 1859 he experienced religion, and joined the Methodist Protestant Church. His conversion was remarkable. He immediately began to exhort sinners to repentance; and success attended his efforts, attracting. the attention of the Church. He was soon licensed to preach, and entered the travelling connection of that Church. He labored on Albany, Canaan, Sterling, and Auburn circuits, serving each charge with acceptability. In 1872 he joined the Wyoming Annual Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was stationed at Stoddardsville, a laborious circuit full of care. But he did his work well. In 1873 he was stationed at Newport, but he did not live to see the end of his conference year. He died March 30, 1874, from the effect of an accidental pistol-shot. J. H. Paddock was a kind, companionable, and good Christian minister. See Minutes of Annual Conferences; 1874.

## Paddock, Zacariah, D.D[[@Headword:Paddock, Zacariah, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Northampton, N.Y., December 20, 1798. He was converted at the age of eighteen, licensed to preach in 1818, and the same year entered the Genesee Conference. His most responsible appointments were: Ridgeway, Clarence, Batavia, French Creek, Westmoreland, Buffalo, Rochester, Auburn, Cazenovia, New York Mills, Sauquoit, Ithica, Binghamton, Oxford, Utica, Wilkesbarre, Honesdale, and Chenango; upon most of which he was eminently successful. He took a superannuated relation in 1870, and died, a member of the Wyoming Conference, at his home in Binghamton, N.Y., July 4, 1879. Dr. Paddock's name in American Methodism in his declining years became a synonym for gentleness, sweetness, and purity. He published several small volumes, and wrote quite extensively for the Church papers and periodicals. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1880, page 86.

## Paderborn[[@Headword:Paderborn]]

             a German city, the seat of several important ecclesiastical councils, and till 1803 ranking as a free imperial bishopric, owes its foundation to Charlemagne, who nominated the first bishop in 795. During the Middle Ages it was one of the most flourishing of the Hanseatic cities, while it was also numbered among the free imperial, cities. In 1604 it was forcibly deprived by the prince-bishop, Theodor of Furstenberg, of many of the special rights and prerogatives which it had enjoyed since its foundation, and was compelled to acknowledge the Roman Catholic as the predominant Church, in the place of Protestantism, which had been established during the time of Luther. The last prince-bishop was Francis Egon, of Furstenberg, 1789-1803. At that time Paderborn was, in accordance with a decree of the imperial commissioners, attached as a hereditary principality to Prussia, which had taken forcible possession of the territory; and, after being for a time incorporated in the kingdom of Westphalia, it was restored to Prussia in 1813, and is now the chief town of a district in the Prussian province of Westphalia. It is situated in 51° 43' N. lat., and 8° 45' E. long., in a pleasant and fruitful district, is built at the source of the Pader, which bursts forth from below the. cathedral with sufficient force to drive mills within twenty paces of its point of exit, and has a population of 11,279. The city has narrow, dark, old-fashioned  streets, presenting no special attractions, although it has some interesting buildings, as, for instance, the fine old cathedral, completed in 1143, with its two magnificent fagades, and containing the silver coffin in which are deposited the remains of St. Liborins. It continues to be the seat of a Roman bishop and chapter. There are as yet but few Protestants in Paderborn. The Gustavus Adolphus Society has established and aids several Protestant societies.

The most important of the councils held at Paderborn was that of A.D. 777, called under the government of Charlemagne to confirm the newly baptized Saxons in the faith. It was ordered by the emperor, who aimed at a centralization of power in his vast possessions, that all should take an oath to abide forever in the Christian faith; and they that refused to do so were punished with the loss of all their property. See Labbe, Concil. 6:1823; Hefele Conciliengesch. iii, 580, 583, 593; Milman, Hist. Latin Christianity, ii, 479; Giefers, Die Anfange des Bisthums Paderborn (1860); Bessen, Gesch. des Bisthums Paderborn (1820, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Padilla, Francesco De[[@Headword:Padilla, Francesco De]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, for some time professor of theology at Seville, who died at Malaga, May 15, 1607, canon and doctor of theology, is the author of Historia Ecclesiastica de Espanna (Malaga, 1605, 2 vols, fol.). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:816; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Padon[[@Headword:Padon]]

             (Heb. Padon', פָּדוֹן, deliverance; Sept. Φαδών), head of one of the families of Nethinim who returned from Babylon (Ezr 2:44; Neh 7:47). B.C. ante 520.

## Padova, (Maestro), Angelo[[@Headword:Padova, (Maestro), Angelo]]

             an Italian painter who flourished at Padua about 1489, and painted in the refectory of the monastery of Santa Giustina a picture of The Crucifixion, which Lanzi says is designed in a grand style, and executed with great spirit. He was a close imitator of the style of Andrea Mantegna.

## Padova, Girolamo da[[@Headword:Padova, Girolamo da]]

             called also Girolamo dal Santo, an Italian painter, was born at Padua in 1480, and died about 1550. He was celebrated in his day for his small pictures of historical subjects, which he decorated with bas-relief sarcophagi and other antique ornaments, with inscriptions copied for the most part from the Paduan marbles. On the death of Bernardo Parentino, in the year 1531, Padova was commissioned to continue the admirable works executed by that master in a cloister in the monastery of Santa Giustina. In these Lanzi says Padova showed himself greatly inferior to Parentino in  design and expression; but Lanzi commends Padova's elegant accessories, designed from the antique.

## Padovanino, Francesco[[@Headword:Padovanino, Francesco]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Padua in the year 1552. It is not known with whom he studied, but he painted history with considerable reputation. He possessed inventive genius, and was a correct and graceful designer. He painted some works for the churches, one of the best of which is a picture in the church of La: Madonna del Carmine at Venice, representing a saint interceding for two criminals condemned to death. He excelled in portraits, which were admired for their truth, dignity, and excellent coloring. He died in 1617.

## Padovano, Antonio And Giovanni[[@Headword:Padovano, Antonio And Giovanni]]

             two old painters, probably brothers, to whom Morelli attributes the works in the church of S. Giovanni Battista (see the next article). In his Notizia, Morelli says that formerly there was the following inscription on one of the gates, “Opus Johannis et Antonii de Padua;” for which reason Morelli conjectures that they were the painters of the whole building.

## Padovano, Giusto[[@Headword:Padovano, Giusto]]

             an old Italian painter who lived at Padua, was a native of Florence. His real name was Giusto Menabuoi; but he was called Padovano from having been eventually a citizen of Padua, where he chiefly resided, and died in 1397 at an advanced age. Vasari says Padovano was a disciple of Giotto, and attributes to him the very extensive works which adorn the church of S. Giovanni Battista in that city. In the picture over the altar are represented various histories of St. John the Baptist; on the walls various scriptural events and mysteries of the Apocalypse; and in the cupola is a choir of angels, where we behold, as in a grand consistory, the Blessed, seated upon the ground, arrayed in various garments. Lanzi says the composition of these works is very simple, but they are executed with a remarkable degree of diligence and felicity.

## Padua[[@Headword:Padua]]

             is the name of an Italian province formerly in Austrian Italy, SEE ITALY, and of the capital of that province. This city is noted in ecclesiastical history as the seat of several Church councils, of which the most important  was held there in the spring of 1350 by cardinal Guy d'Auvergne, legate of pope Clement IV, and which intended to effect the reformation of morals and the general purifying of the Church. Padua, it may be stated here also, is noted as the seat of one of the oldest universities in Europe. It was celebrated as early as 1221. It now supports forty-six professorships, and is attended by about 2000 students. A pretty full account of the ecclesiastical history of Padua the reader will find in Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 12:916-920. For the councils, see Labbe, Conc. 11:1918.

## Pae Atua[[@Headword:Pae Atua]]

             is the name of a general exhibition of the gods among the South Sea Islanders.

## Paean[[@Headword:Paean]]

             (Παιάν) is the name in the Homeric mythology of the physician of the Olympic gods. It was also applied as a surname to Asclepius, the god of healing.

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

             (παιἀν), a hymn anciently sung in honor of Apollo, who is therefore sometimes also called Paean. The hymn was of a mirthful, festive character, sung by several persons under a skilful leader as they marched in procession. It was used either to propitiate the favor of the god or to praise him for a victory or deliverance obtained. It was sung at the Pyacinthia, and in the temple of the Pythian Apollo. Paeans were usually sung among the ancient Greeks, both at the commencement and close of a battle, the first being addressed to Ares, and the last to Apollo. In latter times other gods were also propitiated by the singing of paeans in their honor, and at a still later period even mortals were thus honored. The practice prevailed from a remote antiquity of singing peans at the close of a feast, when it was customary to pour out libations in honor of the gods.

## Paedagogics[[@Headword:Paedagogics]]

             (Gr. παιδαγωγικά, from παῖς, παιδός, a boy, and ἄγειν, to lead, guide; ἀγωγός, leading) is a technical term for the scientific presentation of educational principles, as distinguished from education itself — the latter signifying the application of means by which the mature mind seeks to develop in the immature the formation of an independent character.  Pmedagogics, or as it is generally Anglicized Pedagogics, is therefore related to education as theory is to practice. As a science it is, from its very nature, related to philosophy and theology, and we therefore make room here for a brief consideration of it.

Philosophy must rest upon a scientific apprehension of the nature of social life, with its permanent laws and its ideals, and also of the means to be employed that the laws may be fulfilled and the ideals realized — in other words, philosophy must be based on ethics. It follows from this that the most important prerequisite for philosophy is psychology, the science that is specially concerned with the laws of man's spiritual nature; neither philosophy nor psychology may, however, justly disregard the results obtained by scientific inquiry in the department of man's physical nature. The relation of pedagogics to theology rests on the principle that the highest object to be sought in all training of youth is correct moral or, better, religious guidance; for education is not merely the imparting of knowledge and of facility in its use, but, before and above all else, it is the development of conscience — the moral consciousness — and of the sense of responsibility. Now all morality has its ultimate ground in the relation sustained by man to God. Even philosophers, like the sceptic Lotze (comp. Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 2, 312-321), concede that the moral life will never find a surer platform nor a superior inspiration than is afforded by the principle of love to God. As this is the very cardinal principle of Christianity, pedagogics must be regarded as entering into vital relations with theological ethics; while catechetical instruction in religion, which constitutes an element of popular education among Christian nations generally, brings it into external connection with practical theology also. Pedagogics, however, is not by any means a mere branch of theological instruction, but rather an independent science, which employs those referred to simply as helps, and, in general, derives its matter from the results obtained in every branch of knowledge.

In pedagogical method, all systems of education admit of substantially the same division into a theoretical part, which treats of the principles of intellectual and moral training, and a practical, which discusses the application of such principles to particular objects. If the history of pedagogics be included, Stoy's division into philosophical, historical, and practical pedagogics may be adopted. The science must, at any rate, first present a history of pedagogics, then lay down its own principles of  training, and, finally, show what character the education is to assume in the particular departments of life.

1. The History of Education (see Waitz, Anthropologie der Naturvolker [Leipsic, 1859 ], vol. i). Education, in any proper sense; does not exist among savages. Their life is wholly sensual, and the training they receive accordingly develops only the senses to trustworthiness and keenness, and that merely for the purpose of self-preservation. With nations that have begun to rise above the merely natural state, it consists simply in transmitting what physical skill and intellectual attainments the family or tribe may possess. Among such peoples we may class the negro tribes of Africa, the tribes of South America, and, of the historical peoples, such semi-barbarous nations as the Huns, Mongols, etc. Education in the higher sense is found only among civilized nations, the oldest of which, as is well known, belong to Asia. These manifest in their methods of education the same extraordinary diversities that distinguish the Asiatic nations generally from each other. When our acquaintance with the Chinese begins. their condition is the result of a national development that has progressed through many centuries, and whose internal character is but little known. The absolutism of the state is reflected in the educational system also. Its ideal is the inculcation of reverence for parents and superior authority, and the rod affords the only inducement for application to study for old or young. The Chinese therefore always remain in a state of childhood, despite their continual study and examinations, or, rather, even because of them; and their progress consists merely in their becoming full-grown children (comp. Ed. Biot, Essai sur l'histoire de l'instruction publique, en Chine, etc. [Paris, 1845]; Carriere, Die Affiinge d. Clltur, u. das oriental. Alterthum [Leipsic, 1863]). In India a different system prevails, which is connected with the system of religion, but in a manner quite unlike that which unites education and the wholly external idolatry of the Chinese world. Brahminism and the caste system have a determining influence. The people are educated into submission to the superior or Brahminic caste, as being the highest revelation of the deity unto be lost in which is the religious ideal of Brahminism. The method of instruction is mild; the symbolic language of legends, traditions, and fables affords the means by which a pious abnegation of self towards Brahma and ultimate dissolution in the deity are inculcated. Women are considered incapable of culture, as in China (comp. Lassen, Indische Alterthumskunde [Bonn, 1847-57]; Dursch, Die alteste praktische Padadogoik d. heidnischen Alterthums. etc.  [Tiibingen, 1853]. On the educational ideas of Japan, so very much akin to China, until the reforms of our day by virtue of the American influence on the Japanese, see Johnson's Cyclop. 1, 1485 sq.). In ancient Persia the life of the individual was conditioned by the omnipotence of the state; hence self-assertion and selfdevelopment for the service of the despot, the representative of the state, rather than the annihilation of self and its dissolution in the deity, were the objects sought. Public instruction was therefore in harmony with the pedagogical idea. Women occupied a higher place than in India and China, and received some training in their homes. The Zend-Avesta contains regulations for the training of the priesthood only (comp. Spiegel, Avesta, die heil. Schriften d. Parsen [Leipsic, 1852- 1859]; also Herodotus, i, 132-140; Plato, De Legg. 3, 694; Alcib. 1, 121; Xenophon, Anab. 1, 9, 3; Cyropedia; Strabo, 15:733). Among the later Persians the luxuriousness and weakness of the, nation, as a whole, brought with them a corresponding degeneracy in its education.

We lack definite information with regard to the systems of education among the Shemitic nations of Hither Asia; but the overpowering and almost fiendish influence of their cruel and licentious systems of nature- worship (Baal, Moloch, Astarte, etc.) prevented most of them from ‘attaining' to a superior social culture. Certain departments of learning were taught, however, as drawing, arithmetic, and astrology, among the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Syrians; and an estimate of the culture of the Phoenicians may be formed from their commercial character. In Egypt all learning and culture was in the hands of the priests, who. maintained schools for the sacerdotal class, to which no: others were admitted, with the exception of such persons from the warrior-class as were heirs to the throne. The common people were educated merely to be expert and extremely exact in the arts of which the caste to which they belonged made use in the prosecution of its particular calling. That the moral element was not overlooked, however, appears from the tribunal for the dead, SEE EGYPT, § 12: SEE OSIRIS, and from the belief in a purifying transmigration of souls, SEE METEMPSYCHOSIS, i.e. a belief in an unending individual life in a sensible form. In later times, when the influence of Greece became powerful in Egypt, education was more generally diffused, and more method was applied to its promotion. Musical culture and a preference for exact studies then prevailed.

The earnestness of former times, however, gave way to frivolity (comp. Diod. 1, 80; Herod. 2, 79, 166; Plato, De Legg. 656 sq.; Bunsen, Aegypten's Stelle in d.  Weltgeshichte [Gotha, 1845-56]). In the Hebrew character the religious tendency was especially prominent, and the Hebrew nation was chiefly important as being the people of God. The system of education in vogue aimed, in strict harmony with this idea, to secure the energetic assertion of a nationality whose essence consisted in the principle of faithfulness to the covenant of God. Education was, in short, a corollary of religion, and the teaching was therefore wholly religious, and involved instruction in the law, the customs, and the symbolical observances of the nation, as well as the narration of its history, in illustration of these subjects. This training was committed to the family;' but from the age of twelve years the Jew was admitted to the synagogue, in order to his further advancement, by listening to the reading of the sacred books and their explanation, and by sharing in the religious conversation of the congregation. Women are mentioned as holding public positions among the Jews (Deborah), and as being more respected than was usual among Eastern nations; but the Old Testament contains no trace of special provisions made for the education of females. Of course the Hebrews were a universally educated people, or the parent could not have conducted the intellectual training of his child. Besides, we learn from the sacred Scriptures that they were able to read and write, and had quite a knowledge of astronomy, and consequently of mathematics. Theological schools came into being after the Babylonian captivity (the so called schools of the prophets [q.v.], which flourished in earlier times, are outside of the field covered by the history of general education). Talmudic Judaism provided an organized system of schools for the rabbins. From these were developed real schools of learning, and facilities of a remarkable pedagogical order were afforded by them for the different so-called learned professions, SEE SURA, SEE PUMBUDITA, etc.

During the Middle Ages such Jewish schools flourished prominently in Spain and France, until the general persecutions inaugurated against them made their maintenance any longer an impossibility. In modern times the culture of the Jews partakes more and more of the character of that which prevails among the civilized nations among whom they live (comp. Worman, Hebrews, their Education in Ancient and Modern Times, in Kidder and Schem's Cyclop. of Education; Palmer, Die Paiidagogik des A.T., 2 Schnidt's Encykl. d. gesammt. Erziehungs- u. Untterrichtswesens [Gotha, 1866]; id. Gesch. der Pidcgogikl, vol. i; Weber and Holtzmann, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel [Leips. 1867], 2, 156 sq.). SEE EDUCATION (HEBREW).  The influence of Western nations upon the progress of civilization is of a more recent date, that of the Greeks being first. They held, on the one hand, the conviction that the individual is of no importance in himself, but only as a member of the state; but, on the other hand, they manifested an active spirit that refused to be controlled by nature, seeking rather to subdue it and reduce it to harmony. These characteristics gave shape to education among them, first in the course of practical experiment during many ages, and afterwards as a subject of legislation and philosophy. The political tendency referred to predominated in the systems of the Doric tribes, while the broader recognition of manhood was the leading principle among the lonians. The result was that popular education was more generally diffused among the former; while among the latter (at Athens) it was rather the privilege of the superior class. Slaves, however, were everywhere excluded from the privileges of learning. The Doric system sought to cultivate a manly, independent spirit, that should yet devote itself to the interests of the state. The means employed were gymnastics and music, and, at a later period, reading and writing. Youthful females likewise made use of these, for the cultivation of firmness and love of country. This spirit, ennobled and strengthened by philosophy, appears likewise in the school of Pythagoras, B.C. 569-470. He founded institutions for the purpose of promoting the health and purity of both body and soul. [For his philosophy, SEE PYTHAGORAS.] The Ionian system, which made no provision whatever for the education of females, sought to attain καλοκαγαθία, ‘the beautiful and the good.' The home and public training were complementary of each other; but the influence of the former was not, as a general thing, beneficial, owing to the authority exercised by the nurses and house-slaves (παιδαγωγοί). The public gymnasia taught reading, penmanship, grammar, arithmetic, music, and gymnastics, to which the use of weapons was afterwards added. The scepticism of the Stoics, and the exalted ideals of social culture entertained by Plato and Aristotle, do not seem to have exercised any important influence over the education of the people generally — which is true of all the various systems of philosophy. The influence of Plato's zealous opposition to the godlessness and licentiousness of the popular religion of the Greeks, however. was felt in the gradual undermining of the latter. Down to the time of Plato the real instructor of the Greeks was Homer; from that period his works were subjected to the process of allegorical interpretation (comp. Hochheimer, System d. griech. Erziehung [Gott. 1785-1788]; Gross, Die Erziehungswissensch. nach d. Grundsitzen d. Gr. u. Romer [Ansbach,  1808]; Jacobs, Erz. d. Hellenen zur Sittlichkeit; Jager, Die Gymnastik d. Fellenen, etc. [Esslingen, 1850]; Krause, Gesch. d. Erz. u. d. Unterrichts bei d. Griechen, Etruskern u. Romern [Halle, 1851]; Kirkpatrick, The University [Lond. 1857, 12mol, p. 93-241; Ohler. Lectures on Education [ibid. 1874, 12mo], p. 4-30). Among the ancient Romans the object of religious and social training, if considered apart from the elements introduced by the Sabine and Etruscan influence, was to fit the people for citizenship. Both domestic and public instruction were employed for this end. Seminaries were provided, though not in considerable number before the period when Grecian culture began to assert its claims; while in the family the influential pedagogues came gradually to occupy the place of the parent. Reading, writing, and the memorizing of authors belonged to the course of study. Rhetorical practice was confined to the philosophical schools, and does not date farther back than the empire. Organized elementary schools became very numerous from that period; new facilities for instruction were added to those already in use; and the higher learning was extended, after the Alexandrian model, to embrace the circle of the artes liberales-grammar, dialectics, rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, and music. In time a demand for practical schools, of jurisprudence made itself felt; and subsequently (from A.D. 425) the need of schools of medicine, philosophy, grammar, and rhetoric was recognised, giving rise to universities with faculties. Educational theorists were Portius Cato, M. T. Varro, Cicero, Seneca, Tacitus, Quintilian — the professor eloquentice — Plutarch, and also M. Aurelius (comp. Bernhardy, Grundriss d. Riom. Literatu [Halle, 1850]; Lange, Rom. Alterth. [Berlin, 1863]; Niemeyer, Originalstellen der Griech. u. Rom. Classiker iib. d. Theorie d. Erziehung u. des Unterrichts [Halle and Berlin, 1813]).

Christianity has a different ideal in education. Instead of giving a one-sided attention to the intellectual political, and national relations sustained by man, it seeks to cultivate a complete character, that shall be developed in every direction, and that receives its profoundest moral determination from the conscious relation sustained by man towards that God who is revealed in the New Testament. It must be admitted, however, that this ideal was only gradually apprehended by the Christian world. The family was naturally the only school, at first. The Greek Church was the first to provide catechetical schools, of which that at Alexandria from the middle of the 2d century became the most famous. The object of these schools was simply the preparation of adults for baptism, though philosophical  questions that had a bearing upon Christianity also received consideration. SEE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOLS.

The Greek schools of philosophy, however (first of all that at Athens, then also that at Alexandria and the academies of the Neo-Platonists), continued to be the chief centres of learning in early Christianity, until, in A.D. 529, Justinian closed the school at Athens. The Alexandrian school had succumbed to the fanaticism of the monks and the hierarchy a century before; and the migrations of the nations rendered a renewal impossible. The clergy, who became the sole depositaries of learning in the West, contented themselves. with merely guarding the treasures that had hitherto been acquired. The scientific impulse which took its rise from Mohammedanism led to the advance of culture, especially in Spain, where important contributions to learning were made by the Saracens and the Jews, more particularly in the field of the exact sciences, but also in natural philosophy and the philosophy of religion. (On the school at Cordova, after the 9th century, translations from Aristotle, etc., comp., among others, Erdmann, Gesch. d. Philosophie, 1, 307 sq.; Lewes, Hist. of Philos. vol. 1; Christian Schools and Scholars to the Council of Trent [Lond. 1867, 2 vols. 8vo], vol. 1.) The churches in Germany at the beginning of the Middle Ages, had only schools for the training of the clergy, with a practical and rather narrow aim. The most conspicuous seat of learning in the early Middle Ages was that of Bede and his followers, at York, dating from the 8th century; but it did not go beyond the purely traditional course of studies, whose sources and authorities were found in Augustine, Cassiodorus, Boethius, and Isidore of Seville, From this school came forth Alcuin (q.v.),one of the principal supporters of learning in the Carlovingian age, who deserves, at the same time, the highest credit for the reform of the cathedral and convent school system, which was carried through by Charlemagne. This reform had, of course, no intention of promoting popular education in the modern sense. Charlemagne, incited thereto by Alcuin, sought first of all to train a cultured clergy that should be able to teach every individual the credo, the pater-noster, and similar things, in the vernacular. The diocese of Orleans alone in those times had incipient schools for the people. A century later Raban Maurus (“primus preceptor Germanise”), the founder of the convent-school at Fulda. conceived the idea of educating the people generally, and in England Alfred the Great sought practically to realize the same end. The increased number of universities led, from the 12th century, to a decline of interest in the cathedral and convent schools; and as early as the time of Innocent III (1198-1216) they had become mere representatives  of the illiberal and hierarchical culture of the Church, which the papacy sought, but in vain, to favor at the expense of the more liberal and untrammelled tendencies of the universities. The latter, however, by the opening of the 14th century, experienced the effects of the general decay, which began with the opposition to the papacy of Avignon, and increased as the idea of the state was developed and the cities and commercial interests rose into importance, until, in the 15th century, it produced the overthrow of scholasticism. But a new spirit of inquiry, of independent thought and incipient criticism, that had escaped ecclesiastical control, was already at work, having appeared in connection with the revival of learning that began with Petrarch (1304-1374), and that had, by. the 15th century, aroused a general interest in the study of classical antiquity and of the ancient languages. SEE RENAISSANCE.

The beginnings of popular education in the modern sense are to be credited to the “Brothers of the Common Life,” who established schools in Holland and along the Rhine in the 15th century. They discarded scholasticism, and devoted their attention to the Scriptures, the study of the fathers (Augustine, St. Bernard, etc.), and the languages, not for the purpose of preparing for an office in the Church, but in order to instruct the people. The earliest representatives of exclusively humanistic. learning were trained in these schools, e.g. Agricola, Al. Hegius, and Spiegelberg. These were soon followed by other humanists, whose circles extended over all Germany (Busch, J. Wessel, Wesel, Conrad Celtes, Mutian, Rufus, etc.; compare Voigt, Die Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften [1861]). Reuchlin and Erasmus were influential in promoting the study of languages, the former devoting himself more especially to the Hebrew, the latter to the Greek. Schools for such advanced studies were, however, established only in the larger and more favored towns; and the great majority of towns, as well as the entire open country, was without facilities for education, excepting those afforded by the discouraging labors of strolling scholars (comp. Raumer, Gesch. d. Padagogik, vol. 1. On education generally in the Middle Ages, consult Ruhkopf. Gesch. d. Schul u. Erziehungswesens in Deutschland [Bremen, 1794], vol. 1; Hahn, Das Unterrichtswesen in Frankrseich [Breslau, 1848]; and Christian Schools and Scholars, already referred to).

Luther, with his profound sense of what the people needed, was the first to raise the school for the people to the position of a national institution, and thereby to become the founder of the common-school system of Germany (comp. his excellent address to the German nobility in 1520. Schrift an die  Rathsherren aller Stidte Deutschl., etc. [1524]; and the art. SEE PAROCHIAL SCHOOLS.

He demanded that the people should receive instruction, not only in the family, but also in the school; that the children of citizens should be compelled to attend the schools, and that the town- schools should give special attention to the study of Latin, while music and physical training should not be neglected. Melancthon and the other leading Reformers of the 16th century seconded his efforts. Bugenhagen, Brenz, Zwingli, and Calvin all gave attention to this work (comp. Schenk, Joh. Calvin in seiner padagog. Wirksamkeit [1864]). Many practical difficulties arose, of course, especially in North Germany, and only the mere beginnings of a school system could be realized. The dogmatic disputes of the 16th and the miseries of the 17th century followed, and prevented any further development (Schenkel, Allgem. kirchl. Zeitschr. [1863]). The superior schools were conducted in the humanistic spirit, the most important services in this direction being rendered in Strasburg by Joh. Sturm, who was the leading schoolman of his time. The schools of the Jesuits, which controlled the education of the 17th century, had only the appearance of scientific institutions, whose sole object was to bind thought to an authoritative formalism: by means of the Latin language, and at the same time to strengthen the Romish element (comp. Weicker, D. Schulwesen d. Jesuiten nach d. Ordensgesetzen dar;qestellt [Halle, 1863]). The empiricism which Bacon introduced into philosophy gradually asserted itself in the sphere of pedagogics also. Michael Montaigne (1533-1592) demanded first of all a knowledge of the world; W. Ratich, of Holstein (1571-1635), became a fanatical exponent of the Baconian ideas; and John Amos Comenius (1592-1671), bishop of the Bohemian Brethren, applied them in a more considerate and commendable way, among Roman Catholics, but little was done for education at this time. The only name we can mention is that of Carlo Borromeo (1538-1584), archbishop of Milan. Nor was anything of importance accomplished within that Church during the century that followed the peace of Westphalia. The reformatory efforts in this direction — by the Jansenists, the Port-Royalists, the Fathers of the Oratory, and Fenelon, who wrote, among other subjects of this nature, on the education of females were all directed against the Jesuits.

A renewed interest in Germany for popular education was produced by the pietism of Spener and Aug. Herm. Francke (1663-1727), the latter of whom, especially, aimed. to develop the man into the Christian (comp. reports of the Pedagogium, Latin School, and School for German Citizens in the Orphan House at Halle). The Moravians are especially prominent as  pedagogical missionaries. The revolution in pedagogics, which had resulted in a direct contrast to all former, and especially all churchly, systems of education, is illustrated in the theories of Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712- 1778). His principle of a “return to nature” involved, as the ideal to be sought in education, the complete unfolding of the natural man; and it suggested, as the means to this end, the isolation of the individual, his separation from a world that is ruined by culture (comp. his Contrat Social; Emile: La Nouvelle Heloise; also the biography by Venedey [Berlin, 1850] and by Morley [Lond. and N.Y., 1874, 2 vols. 8vo]). The first of the so-called Realschulen was founded at this time (1739) by Semler (q.v.) at Halle, and others rapidly followed. Their founders had been pupils of Francke, and the influence of these men saved the schools from Rousseau's enthusiasm for the natural man. Basedow (1723-1790), however, was seized by it, and developed it into an external utilitarianism, which he sought to reduce to practice in the Philanthropinum at Dessau (1774). He held that the promotion of the physical well-being and the enlightening of the understanding are infallible means for developing children “into Europeans who shall be harmless, valuable to the community, and contented.” The institutions founded by Bahrdt served merely to caricature the utilitarian tendency; but the writings of Campe, Salzmann, and others show the real service Basedow rendered in: directing attention to the study of the physical sciences (geography; natural philosophy, etc.). The false prevalent cosmopolitanism, the inclination to give attention solely to immediate practical wants and the vapid philosophies, indicate clearly the faults of this realistic theory of pedagogics; but it must be credited with having exerted a vast influence over the education of the world.

The latest aera in the history of pedagogics begins at the opening of our own century with Pestalozzi (q.v.), who advocated the idea that the people should be educated on the method that is implanted in human nature, according to which education must begin with immediate study of the object, and proceed from this starting-point to the development of the various intellectual and physical powers. This is still the determining idea in modern education; but Pestalozzi himself, who, while filled with love for the people, was yet a thoroughly unpractical man, could only seek its realization, but not attain it. It was taken up by others, however, and applied to the work of education in, the most diversified forms. It finds  expression in the form of schools for the indigent, of institutions for the blind and deaf-mutes, of houses of refuge, of orphan asylums, etc.

The prevalent theories of education were, of course, not without influence upon the philosophical and ethical views of the great poets, and especially the philosophers. The influence of Kant, with his “categorical imperative” (the good is to be sought for its own sake), was especially powerful in the field of ethics. Fichte declared that the individual must be trained to become a useful member of society (for his views on public education, comp. his: Reden a. d. deutsche Nation); Schelling maintained (Vorlesungen uber d. akadem. Studium) that the great object sought in teaching should be to bring the individual into right relations to the human race and the divine law, so that the latter may be actualized in him; Hegel held that the moral character of the individual is to be developed by leading him to disregard the particular, and causing him to give attention and effort to the promotion of the general good (comp. Thaulow, Hegels Ansichten iib. Erziehung u. Unterricht [Kiel, 1854]); and Schleiermacher taught that the individuality of each person must be developed, that he may be fitted to fill his proper place, as a member of the whole, in the family, Church, and State (comp. Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, ii, 145 sq.; Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 184 sq.). An attempt to lay a psychological sub-basis for modern education has been made by Johann Friedrich Herbart (each soul a monad and unchangeable; the educator merely changes its conditions), and by Zeller, Waltz, and Stoy, who teach the analogous doctrine that each pupil is to be regarded simply as an individual. Friedr. W. Beneke (Erziehungs u. Unterrichtslehre [Berl. 1835- 36, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1842]), conceiving of psychology as a natural science, seeks to frame a methodology of the physical sensations, upon which to ground a system of education. Niemeyer, and especially Diesterweg, have also rendered meritorious service in this department. The latter has now many adherents, and they regard as the aim (Ziel) of pedagogics, development of man for self-activity in the interests of the true, the good, and the beautiful.

In England there are several prominent thinkers of our century who have earnestly labored to propagate ideas akin to the German. Oftentimes they have risen to a nobler ambition, and have striven for a union of the Church and the School, recognising the impossibility of training the head without the heart, and yet appreciating the unfitness of the secular teacher for the cultivation of man's emotional nature. Lord Brougham and Dr. Matthew  Arnold were especially active in causing the English people to take hold of this idea, and they succeeded so well that it became the common language of all those who deemed that the frame and temper of society needed an extensive renovation, and that this renovation must begin with the young. The presumptuous turn of mind, the reliance on intellectual ability, supposed to result from instruction addressing itself to the intellect alone, were to be corrected by a strong diversion in favor of a more subjective course of study. The student was to be imbued with principles and tastes rather than positive acquirements. The main object of the instructor was to be the formation of moral character by habit, not the imparting of what is commonly called learning. Nay, much was to be unlearned — much rubbish taken down before men could begin afresh on the old foundations — much of the sciolism of recent centuries removed; natural science and literary acquirement were to be brought down from that undue exaltation to which they had been raised in modern times by generations wanting in the habits of reverence and earnestness of feeling Catholic (i.e. Protestant, of course) theology and moral philosophy, “in accordance with catholic doctrine, were to be the main foundation of the improved education of these newer days; science and literature were not, indeed, to be neglected, but to be cultivated in subordination only to these great architectonic sciences, and discarded wherever they could not be forced into subjection. Thus anew generation was to be trained in which inferiority in respect to mere objective knowledge, if such should really ensue, was to be far more than compensated by the higher cultivation of the immortal part, the nobler discipline of piety and obedience. Such aspirations may be traced in most of the many writings on the university system which the crisis near the beginning of the second quarter of this century (about 1833) brought out; while those who are acquainted with the practical details of the subject know full well how deep a picture has been introduced into the actual studies and habits of both universities, but especially of that of Oxford, by the prevalence of views such as these, expressed by energetic men, in language at once startling and attractive.

In the United States, men of intellectual ability have worked for the general diffusion of knowledge through a common-school system, but there has never been any pronounced effort for the training of the young-religiously. Indeed, in our day the cry is for mental development independent of spiritual care; and while in rationalistic Germany there is provision for the religious training of every youth up to the highest class in the gymnasia,  where the pupils are often over twenty years of age, in this country there is no public provision for the moral or religious training of the child. Diesterweg's notion (see above) is gradually coming to prevail. In our higher schools, i.e. the colleges and seminaries, in so far as they are under denominational control, ample provision for religious training now exists; but should the state-college idea continue to grow in favor, the time may come when the Sabbath-school will afford the only opportunity for the religious training of coming American generations. True, chancellor Kent (Commentaries, 2, 187 sq.) has laid down the maxim that under our form of government the parent should be held responsible for the moral training of the child; but the chancellor ignored the fact that we are largely a floating population, constantly amalgamating with different races of different educational grades and various religious notions, and that in a republic which acknowledges the Christian civilization as its guide and base. the state should so educate the coming citizen that he' may rot only be able to interpret the law and have a head to understand, but a heart to cherish and observe it.

2. The second part of pedagogical science relates to the development of a system of education, on the basis of the foregoing history. Its first duty would be, perhaps, to describe the end sought, which must be the cultivation of the ethical principle, after which attention must be given to the subject who is to be trained — the pupil; and, finally, it must indicate the means by which the desired end may be attained. Without entering on the details of modern systems of pedagogics, it may be said, that the result of all recent discussions has been to demonstrate that the general training in schools should not aim at a direct preparation for practical life, but, in its intellectual aspects, should rather seek to lay a broad foundation of general culture upon which may afterwards be based the training required for any particular calling in life; and, further, that the grand object should be the harmonious development of the whole man, particularly in point of character and manly independence, This conclusion demonstrates that the victory of the opponents of all religious instruction in secular school can only be secured at the expense of morality and general culture.

3. The third part of this science has to deal with the relations of education to the constitution of society — in other words, it must treat of the organization of education and its relation to the other organizations of the country, both secular and ecclesiastical. It would lead us beyond the scope of this work to enter into the details of this branch of the subject. The  outline of the discussion, however, is suggested by the above historical review, and many points will be found touched upon in various appropriate articles elsewhere given.

Literature. — On the history of education we mention, besides the works already referred to, Mangelsdorf, Fers. einer Darstell. dessen was seit Jahrhunderten in Betreff d. Erziehunqgswesens gesagt u. gethan worden ist (Leipsic, 1779); Werhof, Polyhistor (Lubeck, 1732); Schwarz,. Gesch. d. Erz. n. ihrenz Zusammenhange unter d. Volkern, von alien Zeiten bis anzf d. neueste (Leips. 1813, 1829). the first attempt at a complete review of the entire subject; Niemeyer, Ueberblick d. all. Gesch. d. Erz. (Halle, 1824, 2d ed.); Pustkuchen-Glanzow, Kurzgefasste Gesch. d. Padagogik (Rinteln, 1830); Cramer, Gesch. d. Erz. u.d. Unterrichts (Elberfeld, 1832, 1838); V. Raumer, Gesch. d. Paddgogik (Stuttgard, 1861, 4 vols.); Anhalt, Gesch. d. Erziehungswesens, etc. (Jena, 1846); Wohlfahrt, Gesch. d. gessammten Erz. u. Unterrichtswesens (Quedlinburg and Leipsic 1853, 1855); Schmidt, Gesch. d. Pidagogik (2d ed. Kothen, 1868-70, 4 vols. 8vo); Palmer, — Evangelische Padagogik (4th ed. Stuttg. 1869, 8vo); Baur, Grundziige d. Erziehunngslehre (2d ed. Giessen, 1849); Stoy, Encykl. Methodologie, u. Literatur d. Padagogik (Leips. 1861); Schmidt, Encykl. d. gesammt. Erziehunsqswesens, etc. (Gotha, 1859, etc., 5 vols. 8vo).

## Paedobaptism[[@Headword:Paedobaptism]]

             (from παῖς, παιδός, a child, and βαπτισμός, baptism) is applied to the baptism of children or infants in the Christian Church, or what is popularly termed infant baptism. Under the general subject of baptism, it is that part which relates especially to the proper subjects of baptism. SEE BAPTISM.

I. Historical View of the Introduction and Prevalence of Infant Baptism. — The early history of this, as of any other Christian rite, involves, naturally and necessarily, two things: — the idea expressed in the rite, and the rite itself. Each of these must be traced in its historical connection, since, a rite or ordinance is the outgrowth of some idea which it is intended to symbolize. In this instance, the rite is the application of water in a certain way to a child; the idea is a certain relation of children to the Church, namely, that the children of Christian parents, by virtue of their parentage, are brought into such a relation to the Church that they are regarded as in a certain sense within its membership, i.e. just as there is a  visible and invisible Church, SEE CHURCH, so there should be recognised a visible and invisible membership; the former being acquired by actual public admission after profession, the latter being acquired by virtue of the descent, and holding good only until the persons enjoying such a membership reach the age of independent action, when it becomes of non- effect unless supplemented by the visible connection. Those entitled to invisible membership are consequently recognised by the Church as fit candidates for baptism, and therefore the rite is administered by the Church when asked for. This historical view of the idea and the rite in the early Church will naturally be taken by two periods — the New Testament or apostolic period, and the period of the fathers.

1. The Idea and the Rite in the New Testament.

(a) The religion of the New Testament is historically, organically, and spiritually connected with the religion of the Old Testament, through the birth, the person, the position, the teaching, and the life and death of Christ. Christ was a Jew, “the son of David, the son of Abraham.” He came “not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil.” Many of the religious ideas which Christ proclaimed and fulfilled have their roots in the Old Testament. The idea which is necessarily involved in infant baptism is plainly a prominent one in the Old Testament, in this form, that the children of Jewish parents were members of the religious organization of the Jewish people. The whole people, as the seed of Abraham, were a divinely constituted religious organization. The nation felt itself to be a religious organization in covenant with God. This caused what we call Church and State to be one, making a theocracy, in which what corresponds to Church and to State with us actually existed, though in union. They were “a Church in the form of a nation.” It is a historical fact that infant children of Jewish parents were regarded as members of this religious, national organization by virtue of their parentage. The conception of the family in the Old Testament brought children within the covenant which God made with Abraham and his family, and which was continued with all the families of his descendants through Isaac and Jacob, when they became a nation. As a sign of this covenant the children were circumcised.

This idea of the family, bearing so plainly in the Old Testament the mark of divine origin and approval, appears also in the New Testament, and, in the transitional fulfilment of the Old Testament in the religion of Christ, it passed into Christianity and the Christian Church also. It appears at first, of  course, because John the Baptist and Christ and his apostles were Jews, and were circumcised in accordance with the old Jewish idea and custom. In the very persons of Christ and his apostles themselves this idea was illustrated in their families, and as they grew up it would naturally become a part of the system of opinions which would be formed by their Jewish education. After the baptism of Jesus, and the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him, and after the day of Pentecost, when the apostles were under the full enlightenment of the Holy Ghost, we do not find this idea rejected explicitly as an unauthorized tradition of the elders, but implied in their actions and utterances, though it had been perverted.

As evidence of this, Paedobaptist writers refer to the following incidents and utterances: In Mat 19:1-15, the evangelist has brought together two incidents touching family relations in the kingdom of heaven, as Christ viewed them. One relates to husband and wife, the other to children. In Christ's blessing little children and saying, “Of such is the kingdom of heaven,” the chief idea present, especially in Mark and Luke, is its illustration of the true Christian disposition. But, at the same time, in .the bringing of the children to him by the mothers, the chief idea on their part is that of some peculiar good coming to their children by persons of saintly character or of high ecclesiastical position putting their hands upon them and blessing them. So thought they of Jesus. In his act and in his words there is a response on his part to this belief of theirs, and in this response there is a recognition, strongly apparent in Matthew, of a peculiar position of children as such in the kingdom of heaven. Calvin well remarks, “Tam parvuli, quam eorum similes.” It is a manifestation, on the part of those bringing them, of the long-prevalent idea of children as a part of the theocracy, and Christ recognises it in his kingdom of heaven. Its bearing upon infant baptism lies chiefly in the fact that in this symbolical action of Christ we have a recognition of a principle that is also the basis of baptism. Says Meyer, in his Commentary upon Matthew, “this blessing is a justification of infant baptism.” The language of Jesus regarding Zaccheeus contains the same conception of the family as a whole participating in salvation through its head: “This day is salvation come to his house (οἴκῳ, “the family of this house,” Meyer), forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham.” Similar also is his language in his directions to his disciples (Mat 10:12-15): “And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it” (comp. Lange, ad loc.). This peculiar theocratic and religious relationship of children, or of posterity in general, if this be assumed as the true sense, suggests doubtless Peter's expression (Act 2:39), For the promise is unto you and to your  children.”

Again he says, in rehearsing the words of the angel to Cornelius (Act 11:14): “Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved.” In the same way Paul and Silas say to the jailer: “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house” (Act 16:31). Later than this, in the time of Paul's epistles, when the Church was more fully organized, most commentators are of opinion that this peculiar relationship of children to Christ and to the Church is contained in Paul's language in his epistles. Thus in Eph 6:1, when he says, “Children, obey your parents in the Lord,” as Alford says, “he regards both parents and children as in the Lord” — that is, as being within the sphere of that peculiar fellowship with Christ which this so frequent phrase signifies. This at least is certainly implied, while most commentators think that the reference here is really to baptized children, and that the apostle regards them as belonging to the Church. So Braune and Riddle in Lange, Hofmann, Stier, Schaff, and others. Meyer rejects any reference to baptism, but considers the passage to contain this peculiar relationship of Christian parents and their children: “The children of Christians, even without baptism, were ἃγιοι (see 1Co 7:14; Act 16:15) through their vital fellowship with their Christian parents” (Com. ib. Eph.). In 1Co 7:14, this idea is very plainly expressed. There Paul says that the children of parents of which only one is a believer are holy and not unclean-that is, they “are not outside of the theocratic fellowship and divine covenant; they do not belong to the unholy κόσμος” (Meyer).

They are ἃγιοι, holy-that is, not subjectively sanctified, but consecrated, standing within the fellowship and covenant of the Christian body, just as children under the old Jewish religion were within the fellowship and covenant of the divinely constituted Jewish body. This results: from the union which exists by birth and in the family life between the children and their Christian parents. They are thus included in the fellowship of the Church in a certain real sense, and that without any personal holiness or faith on their part. The manner in which the apostle uses this in his argument shows that it was the established, universally acknowledged view among them at the time. It is, in fact, the conception and relation which existed under the Jewish economy continued in the New-Testament Church. While touching upon this passage, we may notice its value as evidence of the actual practice of infant baptism at the time. Meyer, Kling, and some other modern German writers find in it evidence more or less strong against such practice in the apostolic Church. It is said by Meyer that “if the baptism of children had been in existence, Paul would  not have argued as he did, because then the ἁγιότης of the children of believers would have had another ground” — that is, baptism itself, instead of their descent and fellowship in the family. But to this it is replied that it reverses the relation between the rite and the ἁγιότης, or holiness. The Jewish child was circumcised because he was holy, not to make him holy; and if children were baptized at the time, it was because they were holy, or consecrated by their birth in the believing family, not to make them holy; so that, even though children were baptized, their baptism would not be the ground of their holiness, and hence would not be used by Paul in his argument. It may, indeed, be justly said, as does Kling in Lange, that “had such a practice existed. it would be fair to presume that the apostle would have alluded to it here. That he did not affords some reason for concluding that the rite did not exist.” But with a true view of the ground and purpose of the argument the reason for such a conclusion becomes much weaker than might otherwise appear. In further proof of the prevalence in the apostolic Church of the idea upon which infant baptism is based, it is evident from Act 21:21, that Jewish Christians in Paul's time circumcised their children, and probably also for some time after him. Paul in all probability did not oppose it; and the charge brought against him of teaching that they ought not to circumcise their children was “certainly false” (Meyer).

It thus appears from the thought and language of the New Testament that the idea of the peculiar covenant relationship of children of believing parents, so prominent in the Old Testament from Abraham to Christ, passed into the conception of Christianity which Christ and the apostles have given us. The family was an organic unity; the family, as a family, through its head came into the religious organization of the Jews as they stood in covenant with God; the children were members of it at birth, and participators, according to their capacity as they grew up, in the blessings of the covenant which God had made with them. The theocracy of the Old Testament corresponds in its religious ideas and life, and in its organization and rites, with the Church of the New Testament. The Church of Christ is essentially the fulfilment and continuation of the theocracy of the Old Testament. They are one and the same Church. This connection, continuation, and fulfilment are expressed in the genealogies of the New Testament, in Christ's language, as in the Sermon on the Mount, and in Paul's writings, especially in the epistles to the Romans and Galatians, in which he insists on the fulfilment and continuance among believers in  Christ of the Abrahamic covenant. Accordingly the family came, as a family could, into that form of the Church which succeeded under Christ, the Messiah. Formerly the children were circumcised as a sign and seal of this fact; subsequently, when baptism became the sign of entrance into the Church, and circumcision fell into disuse, the children would be baptized. This correspondence between circumcision and baptism is mentioned by Paul, Col 2:11-12, in which passage, “buried with him in baptism” (Col 2:12) is explanatory of “ye are circumcised,” and of “the circumcision of Christ” (Col 2:11) (Meyer). SEE CIRCUMCISION, and the citations there made from Justin Martyr, evidently alluding to this passage of Paul, and from Tertullian and others of the fathers, showing that this was their understanding of the New Testament in regard to the relation of the two rites. Whether, therefore, in the instances of baptism recorded in the New Testament, children were actually baptized or not, its language clearly contains the idea and principle from which the practice so soon originated, and upon which it is based in the evangelical churches to-day.

(b) We come now to consider the evidence in the New Testament of the actual baptism of children, of the actual performance of the rite, which is a sign and seal of the idea and fact. Excluding the baptisms by John the Baptist, we have eleven particular instances of baptism mentioned, namely, of two individuals at different times:

[1] the eunuch (Act 8:38); [2] Saul (Act 9:18); then households explicitly mentioned: [3] Lydia “and her household” (Act 16:15); [4] the jailer “and all his” (Act 16:33); [5] “the household of Stephanas” (1Co 1:16); the remaining instances are: [6] Crispus and Gaius (1Co 1:14); [7] “many of the Corinthians” (Act 18:8); [8] Cornelius and those with him (Act 10:48); [9] “they that gladly received his word” (Act 2:41) on the day of Pentecost; [10] “both men and women” by Philip in Samaria (Act 8:12); [11] certain disciples who had been baptized “unto John's baptism” (Act 19:5).

In the first two instances there could have been no children. In the next three the baptism of “a household” is explicitly mentioned, the phrase “all  his” being synonymous with household. In the case of Crispus, Paul says (1Co 1:14) that he baptized him; and in Act 18:8, it is said that “he believed on the Lord with all his house.” We have in this instance the inclusion of the household or family with its head in their belief, at least, and most probably they were baptized as the household of Stephanas was. Of Cornelius it is said (Act 10:2) that he was “one that feared God with all his house.” It is not probable that infant children were among the company gathered together to hear Peter speak, nor can we say it is probable that on the occasion of the immediate baptism of those who “heard the word,” and upon whom “the Holy Ghost fell,” that children were baptized. But this new religious relation of Cornelius would take his house with him, according to the universal conception, as it had done in his devotion to Judaism; and as we have express mention of the baptism of households, as if it were a common custom, it follows with great probability that if there were children in this family, they were baptized, and that it was an instance of “household baptism,” as assumed by Schaff (Apost. Church, p. 571).

Peter's language on the day of Pentecost has already been noticed in its bearing upon the idea connected with the rite. It has some force also as evidence of the actual practice of infant baptism, from the fact of its being part of an exhortation “to repent and be baptized.” In the remaining two instances, of the baptism of “men and women” by Philip, and of the disciples of John the Baptist, there is no implication of the faith or baptism of a family. We have then three instances certainly, and most probably five, out. of eleven instances of baptism in the New Testament, in which households or families were baptized. That οικος and οἰκία and οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες include children in their general meaning there is no question. That there certainly were children in any of these families cannot be asserted it is only a probability, but in the nature of the case a very strong one, amounting almost to certainty. And when “we reflect that the mention of these households, with nothing to intimate that their baptism was strange or exceptional, implies the baptism of other households besides those mentioned, the question of Bengel expresses no more than the real strength of probability: “Who can believe that in so many families not one infant was found, and that the Jews, accustomed to circumcision, and Gentiles to the lustration of infants, should not have also brought them to baptism?” Conybeare and Howson say, “We cannot but think it almost demonstratively proved that infant baptism was the practice of the apostles.” So Lange, Hodge, Schaff, and others.

(c) The presence of the idea or principle upon which infant baptism is grounded, we may say, is an indisputable fact in the New Testament; the evidence of the actual practice of infant baptism can only be said to amount to a very strong probability or a moral certainty. All Baptists assert that there is no ground for this probability. Some eminent historians and critics. also, who are nevertheless paedobaptist in principle, declare that the evidence is against the practice in apostolic times. Thus Neander (Plant. and Training, p. 162) says, “It is in the highest degree probable that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at this period.” Meyer also remarks (Con. uber die Apostelgesch. p. 361) that there is no trace of infant baptism to be found in the New Testament. But it is to be noted that while these eminent scholars do not find sufficient evidence of. the actual practice of the rite in the New Testament history, yet both affirm that the conception of the family there actually present was the idea from which it naturally grew, or which logically and historically justifies it. Neander, for example, in speaking of 1Co 7:14, says, “In the point of view here taken by Paul, we find (although it testifies against the existence at that time of infant baptism) the fundamental idea from which the practice was afterwards developed, and by which it must be justified to agree with Paul's sentiments: an intimation of the pre-eminence belonging to children born in a Christian community; of the consecration for the kingdom of God thereby granted them, and of an immediate sanctifying influence which would communicate itself to their earliest development” (Plant. and Train. p. 164). Similarly Kling in Lange, Com. on Corinthians, and Meyer.

We should observe that certain circumstances of the time would affect the practice itself, and the mention of it in historical records. Christianity being preached as a new faith, or as a renewal or revolution of an old faith, it must begin mainly with adults; the work of spreading it would be missionary work, and baptism of adults would be most important and most numerous. It was characteristic of Christians to insist with emphasis upon a living, personal faith in their converts, in contrast to the formal, perverted faith in Abrahamic descent among the Jews, and a formal, superstitious faith among the Gentiles. This makes it appear in most instances as if this personal adult faith were the indispensable condition of entering into the Church in any way, and of baptism. Again, Jewish Christians, as we have noticed, continued to circumcise their children; and although baptism and circumcision were regarded, as we have. seen, as analogous, and as having the same signification, yet there would naturally be some time before this  would take full possession of the Jewish mind, and it would be some time also before baptism would entirely supersede circumcision. Further, the idea in accordance with which children would be baptized was so thoroughly inwrought into Jewish thought, and passed so naturally into the thought of the New Testament, that we should not expect to find either the idea or the rite spoken of with that prominence and explicitness which would certainly have been the case had they been something new.

2. Historical Testimony in the Post-Apostolic Church. — The first unquestionably explicit reference to infant baptism in Christian literature occurs in Tertullian's De Baptismo, written about A.D. 202. That this at least is such a reference is universally allowed by Baptists themselves in opposing the practice. Earlier fathers, whose writings are quoted as testifying to infant baptism, are Justin Martyr and Irenseus; but it is disputed by opponents of paedobaptism that the passages quoted imply its existence. In the doubtful and scanty remains of other early writers, as the Epistle of Barnabas, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, the epistles of Ignatius and of Clement of Rome, there are no references to the baptism of children. This silence is looked upon by Baptists as evidence that the practice was unknown; by Paedobaptists as evidence that infant baptism was so generally accepted as not to have been disputed at the time. We present in what follows the passages from Justin Martyr, Irenmus, and Tertullian.

Justin Martyr (born about A.D. 100, died A.D. 166), in his First Apology for the Christians, addressed to the emperor Antoninus Pius, written about A.D. 138, says; “Many persons among us of both sexes, some sixty, some' seventy years old, who were discipled to Christ from childhood (οἵ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ), continue uncorrupted.” Ε᾿κ παίδων may mean from very early childhood, or from infancy, as in Mat 2:16, “from two years old and under.” The phrase “were discipled” is the one used by Christ in connection with the word baptizing in the commission in Mat 28:19, the participle βαπτίζοντες expressing the means by which they were made disciples (Meyer, Lange, Alford, Schaff). If, as is most probable, baptism continued to be implied as the means of the μαθητεύειν, then the persons spoken of must have been baptized as παῖδες, perhaps as infants, and that too in the time of some of the apostles. Allusion has already been made to Justin Martyr's association of circumcision and baptism. Writing at so short an interval after the  apostles, his association of the two is strong evidence that they were regarded as corresponding in the apostolic Church, as indicated in Col 2:11-12, and evidence that baptism was performed upon children as circumcision had been. In his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, § 29, he says, “What then is circumcision to me, who have a testimony from God? what is the use of that baptism to one that is baptized with the Holy Ghost?” Also § 43: “We have not received that circumcision which is according to the flesh, but a spiritual circumcision; and we have received it by baptism.” In § 61 of his Apology, he explains to the emperor “the manner in which we have consecrated ourselves to God.” This is an account of baptism, and apparently of adult baptism only. This would lead us to think that infant baptism was not common, but the omission of allusion to it in the account does not give us reason to assert that it was not practiced.

Irenaeus (about A.D. 125-190), a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of the apostle John, in his Adversus Hoereses, lib. 2, 22, 4, says: “Omnnes enim yenit per semet ipsum salvare; omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Denum, infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores” (For he came to save all by himself; all, I say, who through him are born again unto God-infants, and little children, and boys, and old men). The testimony of Irenmeus depends upon the meaning of renascuntur in Deum. Paedobaptist writers affirm that lie includes baptism in the meaning as a part of the means by which they are born again; for not only with Ireneus, but with Justin Martyr and others of the fathers, baptism is connected with regeneration as having some mystical, magical, or spiritual agency in effecting it. It is the beginning of baptismal regeneration, resulting from their interpretation of Joh 3:5, “Except a man be, born of water and of the Spirit,” and Tit 3:5, “the washing of regeneration.” So inseparably associated with regeneration had baptism become; that the word regeneration almost always, included it. Regeneration had come to mean commonly that change which takes place in and through baptism. In proof of baptism being alluded to in the passage quoted, reference is made to another, Adv. Haer. 3, 17, 1: “Et iterum potestatem regenerationis in Deum dans discipulis, dicebat iis, ‘Euntes docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti'“ (Giving them the power of regeneration to God, he said to them, Go and teach all nations, baptizing them, etc.). Again, 3, 18: “Baptismus tribuit regenerationem” (Baptism imparts regeneration). He used also the  phrases “baptism of regeneration,” and “bath of regeneration.” The conclusion seems to be well founded that Irenaeus in the phrase quoted refers to baptism in speaking of the regeneration of infants. Neander admits no trace of infant baptism earlier than this father, and on this passage remarks, “It is difficult to conceive how the term regeneration can be employed in reference to this age (i.e. infancy), to denote anything else than baptism.” The Baptist view of this passage may be seen in the following extract from an article by the Rev. Irah Chase, D.D., in the Bibliotheca Sacra, November, 1849: “According to Irenaeus, Christ, in becoming incarnate, and thus assuming his mediatorial work, brought the human families into a new relation under himself, and placed them in a condition in which they can be saved. In this sense he is the Saviour of all. He became, so to speak, a second Adam, the regenerator of mankind. Through him they are regenerated unto God (‘per eum renascuntur in Deum').” Comp. also the Christian Review, June, 1838. But, though this may have been a view of Irenseus, the preponderance of critical opinion is very decidedly in favor of the view that this term in the passage in question, and generally, includes baptism in its meaning.

Tertullian (A.D. 160-240), in his De Baptismo, has, as we have already mentioned, an unmistakable reference to infant baptism as being practiced, which very few Baptist writers are disposed to dispute. This treatise was written A.D. 202. The reference is as follows, in c. 18: “Itaque pro cujusque personae conditione ac dispositione, etiam'aetate, cunctatio baptismi'utilior est: prsecipue tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est, sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt et proventu malse indolis falli. Ait quidem Dominus: Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire (Mat 19:14), veniant ergo, dum adolescunt, veniant dam discunt, dum, quo veniant, docentur; fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens aetas ad remissionem peccatorum?” (Therefore, according to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more profitable, especially in the case of little children. For what need is there that the godfathers should be brought into danger? because they may either fail of their promises by death, or they may be deceived by a child's proving of a wicked disposition. Our Lord says, indeed, “Do not forbid them to come to me;” therefore let them come when they are grown up; let them come when they understand, when they are instructed whither they are to come. Let them become Christians when they are able to know  Christ. Why should their innocent age make haste to the forgiveness of sin?) Tertullian thus advocates the delay of baptism in general, and in the case of little children especially. But he speaks of their baptism in such a way as to imply that it was a common practice to baptize them as well as others. It is to be noted that he does not oppose the baptism of infants on the ground of its being an innovation, and not of apostolic origin, but on the ground of its not being profitable or expedient. If he could have spoken of it as an innovation, it is quite certain from the nature of the case, and from his frequent use of this argument in other matters, that he would have done so. If it was a frequent practice at that time, it must have been practiced at least some time before, and must have been regarded as legitimately involved in apostolic teaching and tradition.

From the time of Tertullian's De Baptismo, references to the baptism of children are frequent and unequivocal, establishing the fact that it was a recognised rite in the Church at the time, and was a common though not universal practice. Origen (A.D. 185-253) was himself baptized soon after his birth, and in his homily on Luke 14 he makes this statement, “Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins.” He also expressly asserts that “the Church derived from the apostles a tradition to give baptism even to infants.” Tertullian's opposition seems to have had but little influence. Cyprian, a pupil of Tertullian mentions and advocates infant baptism'. The practice of it is also spoken of by Ambrose, Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine; and others. From this time until the rise of a sect called the Petrobrusians in France, about A.D. 1130, it existed in the Church without question. This sect opposed infant baptism because infants, as they said, were incapable of salvation. They maintained themselves, however, only about thirty years; and we hear of no body of men rejecting infant baptism until the rise of the German Antipsedo baptists, A.D. 1522.

The basis of infant baptism, when it appears in the age succeeding the apostles, seems not to have been so much the organic unity of the family, and the participation of children in the covenant relations with their parents, as the belief in the efficacy of baptism to cleanse from sin and to insure the regeneration of the child. SEE REGENERATION.

II. Literature. — Richard Baxter, Plain Scripture Proof of Infants Church Membership and Baptism (1656); Wall, History of Infant Baptism, with Gale's Reflections and Wall's Defence, edited by Cotton (Oxford, 1836 and 1844, 4 vols.); Lange, Die kindertaufe (Jena, 1834); Walch, Historia  Paedobaptismi (ibid. 1739); Williams, Antipaedoboptism Examined (1789, 2 vols.); Dr. Leonard Woods, Works (Boston, 1851), vol. iii; Wardlaw, Dissertation on Infant Baptism (London); J.W. F. Hofling, Das Sakrament der Taufe (Erlangen, 1846, 2 vols.); W. Goode, Efects of Infant Baptism (1851); Edwin Hall, The Law of Baptism (Presb. Pub. Com., Phila.); F. G. Hibbard, Christian Baptism, its Subjects, Mode, and Oblgation (New York, 1845); Rev. Philippe Wolfe, Baptism, the Covenant and the Family (Boston, 1862); Rev. Edward Williams, Practical Reflections on Baptism (Charlottetown, P. E. Island, 1863); Rev. I. Murray, Baptism, its Mode and Subjects (Cavendish, P. E. Island, 1869); S. M. Merrill, Christian Baptism, its Suijects and Mode; H. Martensen, Die christliche Taufe und die baptistische Frage (Hamb. 1843); Dr. H. Bushnell, Christian Nurture (New York, 1868); Rev. N. Doane, Infant Baptism briefly Considered (ibid. 1875); Gray, Authority for Infant Baptism (Halifax, 1837); Rev. H. D. Wickham, Synopsis of the Doctrine of Baptism to the End of the Fourth Century (Lond. 1850). On Origen on infant baptism, see Jour. of Sac. Lit. 1853; Christian Review (Dr. Chase), 1854; Amer. Presb. and Theol. Rev. 1865; Presb. Qu. and Princeton Rev. October, 1873; Southern Presb. Rev. 1873; Amer. Presb. and Theol. Rev. 1867, p. 239, “Irenueus and Infant Baptism.”

Against Paedobaptism: Gale, Reply to Wall (see above); Booth, Paedobaptism Examined (Lond. 1829 3 vols.); Hinton, History of Baptism (Phila. 1849); Carson, Baptism in its Mode and Subjects (Lond. 1844; 5th ed. Phila. 1857); Pengilly, Scripture Guide tb Baptism (Phila. 1849); John Gill, Infant Baptism, a Part and Pillar of Popery (Phila. Amer. Bapt. Pub. Soc.); J. Torrey Smith, The New Testament and Historical Arguments for Infant Baptism Examined (Phila. do.); The Covenant of Circumcision Considered in Relation to Christian Baptism (ibid.); The Baptist Quarterly, Jan. 1869; Difficulties of Infant Baptism.

See also the works cited by Malcom, Theological Index, s.v. Infant Baptism.

## Paedobaptists[[@Headword:Paedobaptists]]

             a name given to most denominations of Christians who baptize children (παῖς and βαριτίζω), in distinction from the self-styled “Baptists,” who baptize only adults. SEE PAEDOBAPTISM.

## Paedothysia[[@Headword:Paedothysia]]

             (Gr. παῖς, παιδός, a child, and θυσία, a sacrifice) is a term used among the ancients to denote the sacrifice of children to the gods. SEE SACRIFICE.

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

             an eminent Belgian painter, was born at Oostacker, near Ghent, in 1781. He first studied under professor Verhaegen at the academy in Ghent. He next went to Paris, and entered the school of David. On his return to Ghent he contended for the prize offered by the academy, which he obtained for his Judgment of Paris, and he was appointed professor of design in that institution. He shortly afterwards resigned his professorship and went to Rome, where he remained eight years, diligently studying the antique and the works of the great masters. He there distinguished himself by painting a large picture representing the embellishments of Rome by Augustus. On his return to his own country he executed many works for the churches and public edifices, as well as for individuals, which justly rank him among the most eminent of the modern Belgian painters. Among his most esteemed works on sacred subjects are, The Finding of the Cross, in the church of St. Michael at, Ghent: — The Adoration of the Shepherds, in the convent of La Trappe near Antwerp: — The Flight into Egypt, at Malines: — The Departure of Tobit, at Opbraekel: — The Retuirn of Tobit, from Maria Oudenhoven: — The Assumption of the Virgin, at Myuysen: — The Disciples at Emmaus, at Everghem: — The Calvary, at Oostacker, etc. These works are designed in a grand and elevated style, and display a profound knowledge of art. He is accused of over-fondness of academic display, but this blemish is more apparent in his profane subjects, although those of a sacred character are not entirely free from it.

## Paenula [[@Headword:Paenula ]]

             SEE PLANETA.

## Paeonia[[@Headword:Paeonia]]

             the healing goddess, a surname of Athene, under which she was worshipped at Athens. SEE MINERVA.

## Paez, Gaspar[[@Headword:Paez, Gaspar]]

             a Spanish missionary, was born at Covilha, Andalusia, in 1582. He early became a member of the Society of Jesus, and was sent as a missionary first to Goa, then to Abyssinia (in 1628). After the death of the king, Melek-Seghed, in 1632, his son Facilidas, annoyed by troubles caused by the alleged unreasonableness of the missionaries, ordered Paez to leave his states. Paez thought he could elude the decree, and concealed himself for sometime, but was discovered and put to death, April 25, 1635. Some of his letters were published in the Litterae Annuoe (1624-1626). See Sotwel, Bibl. Soc. Jesu.; Geddes, Church Hist. of Ethiopia.

## Paez, Pedro[[@Headword:Paez, Pedro]]

             another Spanish missionary, was born at Olmedo, a town in New Castile, in 1564. Having completed his studies at the college of the Jesuitical order, which he had joined while yet a youth; he was appointed to the mission at Goa. He sailed for that port in 1587. At that time the numerous Portuguese who had resided in Abyssinia since the invasion of Christoval de Gama, being without a patriarch or spiritual director of any sort, sent to Goa for some priests, when Paez and another Jesuit, named Antonio Montserrat, were despatched by the governor. The two missionaries sailed from Goa in 1588; they touched at Diu, where they made some stay, disguised as Armenians.

They then sailed for Muscat on April 5, 1588. From thence they made for the port of Zeila in Abyssinia; but on their passage thither they were boarded by an Arab pirate, in sight of Dofar (Feb. 14, 1589), and carried in irons to the capital of the king of Shael (Xaer in the Portuguese writers). They were at first kindly treated by this sovereign but he himself being a tributary to the Turkish pasha of Yemen, and bound by treaty to send him all the Portuguese who might fall into his hands, Paez and his companion were sent to Sanda, the capital of Yemen and the court of the pasha, where they passed seven years in the most dreadful captivity. At last released by the intercession of the viceroy of India, who obtained their liberty upon the payment of a thousand crowns ransom for each, the two missionaries returned to Goa in 1596. The ardor of Paez seems not to have been damped by his past sufferings; on the contrary, after spending several years at Diu and Camboya, he embarked a second time for Abyssinia, and landed at Masawa in April, 1603. His Arst object was to learn one of the most extensively used native dialects, the Gheez, in which he soon acquired such a proficiency as to be enabled to translate into it the compendium of  the Christian doctrine written by Marcos George, and to instruct some native children in the dialogues which that work contains.

In 1604 Za- Denghel, the reigning monarch of Abyssinia, hearing of the attainments of Paez and the proficiency of his pupils, ordered him to appear at his court with two of them, that he might judge for himself. Paez was kindly received by the king, who conferred upon him all sorts of honors and distinctions. On the following day a thesis was maintained in his royal presence, when Paez's pupils answered every point that was put to them by their opponents; the mass was next celebrated in conformity with the Romish ritual; after which Paez preached a sermon in Gheez, which so pleased the king that he gave himself a convert to Christianity, and wrote to the pope and to king Philip III, of Spain, praying them to send more missionaries, that all the people might speedily be brought to accept Christianity. No sooner was this royal wish made public than the Abyssinian priests, dreading the ascendency which Paez and his adherents had gained at court, excited a rebellion. The king was killed in battle October, 1604, but his successor Socinos, otherwise called Melek-Seghed, was even more favorable to the Christian cause. Soon after his accession to the throne he summoned to his presence Paez, who celebrated mass and preached before all his court, assembled for the purpose.

The king was so much pleased with Paez that he gave him, besides a large piece of ground at Georgia, on a rocky peninsula on the south side of the lake Dembea, to build a monastery for his order, land and material to build a palace for himself. Thereupon, without the assistance of any European, but with the mere help of the natives working under his orders, Paez constructed a building which was the astonishment of those who beheld it. A spring-lock which he fixed upon one of the doors saved the king's life when an attempt was afterwards made to assassinate him. Paez lived in great intimacy with Socinos, whom he accompanied in all his military expeditions. It was on one of these occasions that he visited Nagnina, a town three days' march from the sources of the Nile, and surveyed the neighboring country — a fact which Bruce endeavored to discredit, for the purpose of appropriating to himself the glory of being the first European who visited the source of the Abarvi, then reputed to be the main branch of the Nile. Pedro Paez died in the beginning of May, 1612, just as his missionary labors were crowned with success, having persuaded the king to receive the general confession and repudiate all his wives but one. The Roman Catholic faith, thus introduced into Abyssinia, did not long remain the religion of the state. After the death of Socinos (1632), his successor, Facilidas, persecuted the  Jesuits and re-established the old creed, which- was Christianity, though in a corrupt form. Besides the translation of the catechism written by Marcos George, and other tracts, into the native dialect of Abyssinia, Nicolas Antonio (Bib. Nov. 2, 225) attributes to Paez a treatise De Abyssinorum Erroribus, a general history of Ethiopia, which was supposed to exist in manuscript at Rome, and several letters which have been published in the collection entitled Littere Annuoe. See Historia da Ethiopa a altai by Manoel de Almeida, MS., in the British Museum, No. 9861, fol. 195; Ludolf, Historia Ethiopica; Bruce, Travels; Salt, Abyssinia English Cyclop. s.v.

## Paganalia[[@Headword:Paganalia]]

             is the name of an annual Roman festival, celebrated by the inhabitants of each of the pagi or districts into which the country was divided from the time of Numa.

## Paganelli, Niccolo[[@Headword:Paganelli, Niccolo]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Faenza in 1538, and died in 1620. It is not known under whom he studied; but, according to Oretti, he was an excellent artist of the Roman school. Lanzi says that some attribute to him a fine picture of St. Martino in the cathedral, supposed to be the work of Luca Longhi, and that his genuine works are recognised by the initials N. X. P. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, ii, 641.

## Pagani, Gregorio[[@Headword:Pagani, Gregorio]]

             an Italian painter, was the son of Francesco Pagani, and was born at Florence in 1558. He first studied under Santo di Titi, and afterwards with Lodovico Cardi, called Cigoli, whose style he adopted. Lanzi says he was praised by strangers as a second Cigoli, and that he was much employed by them; hence there are only a few of his pictures at Florence. His most celebrated work, the Finding of the Cross, in the Carmine, which .has been engraved, was destroyed with that edifice by fire. He painted a few frescos, all of which have perished, except one in the cloister of Sta. Maria Novella, commended by Lanzi, though injured by time. He died in 1605.

## Pagani, Vincenzio[[@Headword:Pagani, Vincenzio]]

             an Italian painter, was a native of Monte-Rubbiano, in Picenum, of whom there are notices from 1529 to 1553. Colucci, in his Memorie de Monte-  Rubbiane, says he was a scholar of Raphael. He executed many works for the churches in the Roman territory, particularly in his native place, at Fallerone, and at Sarnano. One of his most beautiful works is the Assumption of the Virgin, in the collegiate church at Monte-Rubbiano, designed and executed entirely in the manner of Raphael. The Padre Civalli highly extols two of his works in the church of his order at Sarnano. In 1553 he was, employed to paint the altar-piece of the Capella degli Oddi, in the church of the Conventualists at Perugia, which is highly commended. In consequence probably of his secluded life, little is known of this artist except his works, which are of a high character. Lanzi and others doubt whether he was really a scholar of Raphael, but rather think he formed his style by contemplating his works.

## Paganism[[@Headword:Paganism]]

             a term synonymous with heathenism and polytheism (q.v.), is used to denote the non-Biblical religions of the world-that is to say, all those religious notions not called out by the revealed Scriptures. Hence the whole human race may be said to be divided into Jews, Mohammedans, Christians, and Pagans.

The word paganism comes from the Latin word pagus, a country district, a canton, the adjective from which, paganus, denoted pertaining to such a pagus; then not a soldier; then boorish, or unlearned; and, finally, among the Christian writers, one not a Christian, Jew, or Mohammedan. Its application in the last sense, which it now continues to hold, is thus accounted for: When Christianity gradually became the religion alike of the Romans, empire and of the conquerors who embraced its civilization, those who obstinately clung to the old idolatry were called, both in Latin and in the Teutonic speech, by names which in themselves expressed, not error in religion, but inferiority of social state: the worshipper of Jupiter or of Woden was called in Latin mouths a pagan, in Teutonic mouths a heathen. The two names well set forth the two distinct standards of civilization which were held by those who spoke the two languages. The paganus was the man of the country, as opposed to the man of the city. The Gospel was first preached in the towns, and the towns became Christian, while the open country around them still adhered to the old gods. Hence the name of the pagan, the rustic, the man who stood outside the higher social life of the city, came to mean the men who stood outside the pale of the purer faith of the Church. In the England of the 6th century, and in the Eastern  Germany of the 8th, no such distinction, however, could be drawn. If all who dwelt within the walls of a city had remained without the pale of the Church, the Church would have had few votaries indeed among the independent Teutons.

In their ideas the opposition between the higher and the lower stage was not the opposition between the man of the city and the man of the country; it was the opposition between the man of the occupied and cultivated land and the wild man of the wilderness. The cities, where there were any, and the villages and settled land generally, became Christian, while the rude men of the heath still served Woden and Thunder. The worshippers of Woden and Thunder were therefore called heathens. Pagan and heathen, then, alike mark the misbeliever as belonging to a lower social stage than the Christian, But the standard of social superiority which is assumed differs in the two cases. The one is the standard of a people with whom the city is the centre of the whole social life; and the .other is the standard of a people among whom the city, if it was to be found at all, was simply the incidental dwelling-place of a part of the nation which was in no way privileged over those who dwelt beyond its bounds (comp. Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 21; Freeman, Hist. of the Norman Conquest, 4:415).

The relation of the Christian Church to the various forms of paganism, or, better, polytheism, which it has sought to supplant, and continues seeking to supplant, is a subject of great importance to the student of ecclesiastical history. But we have not sufficient room to enter here into a detailed account of paganism. We must content ourselves with saying that the principal pagan religions of the world are briefly defined as follows: Those of Japan, Buddhism and Sintoism; of China, Buddhism and Confucianism; of Tartany, Lamaism; of India, Brahminism. Buddismsm, Thuggism, and the'religion of thb Parsees; of Persia, Mohammedanism and the Zoroastrian religion; of Africa, Feticlism; of Polynesia, image-worship and hero- worship; of the ancient aborigines of Lapland, Greenland, and North America, a peculiar combination of spirit and fetich worship, described under the article INDIANS. For an account of these various forms of paganism, see the articles treating of the different countries mentioned, and of the various religious systems mentioned in that connection.

The entire pagan population of the world is estimated in Johnson's Family Atlas at 766,342,000, distributed as follows:

America3,899,000Asia666,251,000Africa94,972,000Australasia and Polynesia1,220,000766,342,000Against this there is an estimated Christian population, including Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Greek communions, of 369,969,000; a Mohammedan population of 160,823,000; and a Jewish population of 6,000,000.

In this place we confine ourselves to that form of paganism with which Christianity came in contact immediately after its organization and propagation, i.e. the paganism of the Roman empire, and those powers organized and controlled by institutions of a like standard of civilization. For the paganism of the remaining world, in its relation to Christianity, SEE FETICHISM; SEE POLYTHEISM.

I. Pagan Theology. — The theology of these pagans, according to their own writers, e.g. Scaevola and Varro was of three forms. The first of these may well be called fabulous, as treating of the theology and genealogy of their deities, in which they say such things as are unworthy of deity; ascribing to them thefts, murders, adulteries, and all manner of crimes; and therefore this kind of theology is condemned by the wiser sort of heathens as nugatory and scandalous. The writers of this sort of theology were Sanchoniatho, the Phoenician; and among the Greeks, Orpheus, Hesiod, Pherecydes, etc. The second sort, called physic, or natural, was studied and taught by the philosophers, who, rejecting the multiplicity of gods introduced by the poets, brought their theology to a more natural and rational form, and supposed that there was but one supreme god, which they commonly made to be the sun — at least this was an emblem of him — but at too great a distance to mind the affairs of the world: they therefore devised certain daemons, which they considered as mediators between the supreme god and man; and the doctrine of these daemons, to which the apostle is thought to allude in 1Ti 4:1, was what the philosophers had a concern with. They treated of their nature, office, and regard to men; as did Thales, Pythagoras, Plato, and the Stoics. The third form, called politic, or civil, was instituted by legislators, statesmen, and politicians — such as, first among the Romans, Numa Pompilius: it chiefly  respected their gods, temples, altars, sacrifices, and rites of worship, and was properly' an idolatry, the care of which belonged to the priests, and this was enjoined upon the common people, to keep them in obedience to the civil state. Thus things continued in the Gentile world until the light of the Gospel was sent among them. The times before were times of ignorance, as the apostle calls them: men were ignorant of the true God, and of the worship of him; and of the Messiah, and salvation by him. Their state is truly described (Eph 2:12) that they were then “without Christ; aliens from the commonwealth of Israel; strangers from the covenants of promise; having no hope, and without God in the world.;” and, consequently, their theology was insufficient for their salvation.

II. Paganism combated by Christianity. — The contest between Christianity and paganism. so far as the circumstances of it are known, was almost as much a contest between the civil authorities of the Roman empire and the religion, as between Christianity and the old religions of the civilized world. Of all that took place with respect to conflicts between the new and old religions in countries adjoining the Roman empire, such as the Parthian empire in the West and the Germanic nations in the North, we know next to nothing. But within the bounds of the Roman empire itself Christianity was a standing, enemy of many existing institutions ill every country, and these institutions being upheld by the state, Christians came to be looked upon, in respect to their religion, as national enemies wherever they existed. It was part of the policy of the Roman empire, as is well known, to tolerate all national religions within the boundaries of the nations which professed them, but this toleration was, suspended when these religions began to exercise a proselyting influence beyond their national boundaries. Now it was an essential characteristic of Christianity that it was a proselyting religion. Its teachers acted under the especial commission, “Go ye into all the world, and make disciples of every creature,” and no other religion ever showed such an aggressive nature. Thus Christianity was, in limine, a foe to the existing religious institutions of the world, as they were looked at from a statesman's point of view;. But, more than this, Christianity refused to become a peaceable member of any eclectic system. The scepticism of the academies was superseded during the early spread of Christianity by an eclecticism originating with Ammonius Saccas and his disciples, the NeoPlatonists.

This system ‘became extremely fashionable among the intellectual classes in the more learned regions of the Roman empire. It was an attempt, a last attempt, of  heathenism to work itself into an alliance with a foe of whom an inner conviction seemed to say that he would in the end prove too strong for it. But Christianity would not come to terms. It would not even consent to the drawing up of preliminaries for a treaty of peace. The words of its Master were continually illustrated by all Christian missionaries, “I came not to send peace, but a sword.” Christianity sought not toleration, not compromise, but universal supremacy. Thus, theoretically at least, the contest between Christianity and paganism was a war which could only end by the extermination of one or the other, and the process of resistance to extermination on the part of paganism was that which constituted the substance of the struggle between it and Christianity. But, apart from this general antagonism between the two religious systems, there was a special institution of the empire, its official religion, with which Christians came into fatal conflict almost by accident. This official religion had more of the rising eclecticism in it than of the old decaying polytheism, but it was little concerned with moral or theological principles, its one prominent requirement being the recognition of the emperor as an object of worship. The sacrifice of a few grains of incense to him was the test of religious obedience. To frequent the temples, to offer sacrifices to the gods, to take part in the mysteries, might be parts of religious practice, and every one was at liberty to adopt them as he pleased. But public piety, that which established a citizen as, qua religion, a good citizen, was the religious veneration of the emperor. neither more nor less. Thus the religion of Christians when tried by this test. was necessarily open to misconstruction. To burn incense to the emperor was idolatry; not to burn it seemed to be disloyalty and rebellion.

They who would gladly have taken an oath of allegiance, if it had been offered to them simply as such, refused with an unyielding firmness to do so when it was presented to them under the form of an idolatrous rite. It seems strange that the astute statesmanship of the empire did not devise some means by which men so really loyal to it as were the early Christians might be permitted to live in peace; but perhaps the explanation is to be found in the fact that the kingship and kingdom of Christ were ideas which entered largely into their religious teaching, and formed a prominent idea in the popular theory of the multitude. Such an idea would look like rebellious rivalry to the mind of a Roman statesman- one who would never be able to appreciate the force of such words as “My kingdom is not of this world”-and thus his only antidote to that worship of Christ which recognised him as the king of the Christians, though an invisible one, would be a repudiation of him by adoption of the visible  emperor as their numen. If the novel custom of deifying the living emperor had not been invented, the Christians could have declared their allegiance to him without any hesitation, as is shown by the Apologies; and in such a case it is not improbable that they might, so far as public authority was concerned, have been tolerated in their religion, provided its proselyting principles had not caused any disturbance of public order.

III. Popular Paganism and Christianity. — At the same time that Christianity was thus opposed to the state religion of the empire, it was also in a position of strongly aggressive opposition to the popular religion of every country within its boundaries, that of the Jews alone being, and that only for a short time, an exception. Whether the popular religion was polytheism or some of the many varieties of fetichism, it was certain to be denounced as false by Christian teachers, and as so entirely false that nothing would satisfy Christianity except the entire abolition of what was denounced. Thus Christians arrayed against themselves a large class in those whose personal interest it was that the old religion should be maintained, and in the bulk of the ignorant among the people at large, whom stolid habits and unreasoning prejudice would enlist against innovators to whom no religion seemed sacred. Such a position of antagonism to the old religions was as essential to Christianity as uncompromising opposition to Baal was essential to Elijah; and even when Christians were not aggressive by positive opposition, their negative opposition was necessarily conspicuous. For the rites of polytheism were not confined to the temples; they pervaded all the customs of social and public life. Christians were prevented from attending the public games by the association of idolatrous rites with them; “the many images, the long line of statues, the chariots of all sorts, the thrones, the crowns, the dresses” by the preceding sacrifices and the procession. “It may be grand or mean,” says Tertullian; “no matter, any circus performance is offensive to God. Though there be few images to grace it, there is idolatry in one; though there be no more than a single sacred car, it is a chariot of Jupiter; and anything whatever of idolatry, whether meanly arrayed or modestly rich and gorgeous, taints it in its origin” (De Spectac. c. 7).

The theatres were equally. forbidden, for “its services of voice and song and lute and pipe belong to Apollos and. Muses, and Minervas and Mercuries, . . . and the arts are consecrated to the honor of the beings who dwell in the names of their founders” (ibid. c.x). Even in the intercourse of private life, the Lares and Penates of the hall, the libations. of the dinner-table, the very  phraseology with which ordinary conversation was largely decorated, all partook of the nature of idolatry (Tertullian, De Idol.c. 15 ,17, 21, 22), and the necessities of their anti-idolatrous principles thus secluded Christians from the social assemblies of their heathen acquaintance, and made them in many respects a separate community. Above all, Christianity was the deadly foe of a widespread immorality, the extent of which is almost inconceivable. Polytheism was always a religion of mere ceremony, unassociated, as a religion, with any moral law. Hence the most religious man in the sense of polytheism might be a shameless profligate, emulating the gods to whom he sacrificed in their reputed licentiousness, and guilty (as was Socrates) of crimes against which even nature revolts (id. Apol.c. 46). Vices of this class were terribly common among the Romans of early imperial times, and are exposed with scornful indignation by Tertullian in his Apology. Something of the extent to which profligacy was carried may also be seen by his denunciation of infanticide, in one bold sentence of which he says: “How many, think you, of those crowding around and gaping for Christian blood; how many even of your rulers, notable for their justice to you and for their severe measures against us, may I charge in their own consciences with the sin of putting their offspring to death?” (ibid. c. ix). Against the class of crimes thus indicated, Christianity protested by word and example, Tertullian fearlessly declaring in respect to the latter that Christians were conspicuous for “a persevering and steadfast chastity.” Popular habits and customs being thus so contrary to the spirit of Christianity, it could not fail that a very strong opposition must have been offered to its progress; and although vast multitudes were quickly gathered to the standard of the Cross, there was still a large and influential mass of the population in every country of the empire who looked upon it as the sign of an institution which sought the abolition of their cherished customs and habits, which made its disciples bad citizens and bad neighbors, and which was therefore to be hated and, if possible, extinguished.

IV. Pagan Philosophy and Christianity. — Apart from the ruling powers of the empire, and from those classes which formed the bulk of the nations composing it, there was also a considerable class of highly educated men, especially in Rome and Alexandria, on whom old fashioned polytheism had no hold, but who yet set themselves against Christianity. Among such were the Epicurean Celsus, who wrote a comprehensive work, The Word of Truth (now known only by Origen's refutation of it), against the new faith; the cynic Crescens --φιλοψόφος καὶ φιλοκόμπος — the boasting  braggadocio of Justin Martyr's Apology (Just., Mart. Apol. ii, 3; Euseb. 4:5); Trypho the Jew, against whom the same apologist wrote an important work, his Dialogue with Trypho; and Lucian the satirist, who opposed Christianity as a superstition unworthy of intellectual men (Lucian, De Morte Peregrin. c. 11-16). Indeed, the contemptuous manner in which grave writers like Pliny, Tacitus, and Suetonius mention the new faith seems to show that the literary class in general was opposed to it, and did not even think it worth while to make any effective inquiry in regard to its principles. That they gradually learned to feel more respect for it is shown by the rise of the eclectic school of the Neo-Platonists; but even among these there were bitter opponents of Christianity, though there are indeed others who theoretically adopted a large portion of its principles. SEE ECLECTICISM; SEE NEO-PLATONISM.

V. Persecutions of Christians by Pagans. — The broadest and most evident form of .the struggle for life and supremacy between paganism and Christianity was that of the continuous attempt of the former to suppress the latter by force. In this the state and. the populace co-operated, and there is no reason to think that the intellectual classes and philosophers held aloof. The first approach to a general persecution was that begun at Rome under Nero (Tertull. Apol. c.v). St. Paul's account of his own sufferings (2 Corinthians 6:23-27), his reference to the amphitheatre at Ephesus (1Co 15:32), to actual persecution of Christians (1Co 4:9, and perhaps in Heb 11:35-38), to the position of the apostles as the “off scouring of the earth,” to the “much tribulation” through which the faithful entered into rest, to his deliverance “out of the mouth of the lion,” all seem to shows that the struggle between paganism and Christianity had begun even in apostolic times. But it is probable that persecution then was of a local kind, arising out of charges made by Jews against Christians, for whom they entertained a deadly hatred. Suetonius mentions, indeed, that the Jews were driven out of Rome by Claudius on account of an insurrection raised by one “Chrestus,” probably one of the many false Christs that rose up at this period, and Christians who were not Jews may have been expelled with them, though anything like a Christian insurrection (as the historian's words are sometimes interpreted) was so alien to the spirit of the early Christians as to be beyond probability. After the great fire of Rome in the year 64, Nero, however (who is said by Dion and Suetonius to have been himself the incendiary), accused the Christians of causing it, and brought upon them a terrible stream of indignation from  the excited Romans. Tacitus wrote his annals about thirty years after that, and he describes their sufferings in a few graphic words. Nero, invited the citizens to a festival in the imperial gardens (now the Vatican), and the chief spectacle which he then offered them was the martyrdom of their hated neighbors. Some were sewn in the skins of wild beasts, and torn to pieces by dogs; some crucified: some burned to death; some smeared over with inflammable substances, and used as torches or bonfires to light up the gardens after dark. This persecution lasted for four years, and there can be no doubt that it was carried on in other cities as well as at Rome. During the course of it the apostle Peter was one of those who were crucified in the gardens of Nero, and Paul was beheaded a short distance out of Rome. How many others went to make up the grand vanguard of the army of martyrs it is impossible to say, but the words of the heathen historian point to a great multitude rather than to a merely considerable number. It is usual to reckon ten periods of persecution, at intervals, spreading over the latter half of the 1st the 2d, the 3d, and the 4th centuries. But this enumeration is arbitrary, and cannot be supported by historical evidence. During the whole of that time there was persecution going on in some part of the empire, although emperors like Hadrian, Vespasian, Titus, Nerva, and Trajan (Tertull. Apol. c.v) were unlikely to give it: any encouragement. Yet Pliny's famous letter to Trajan (Pliny Epp. 10:96) shows that it was difficult to save Christians from the popular cry for their extermination; and the martyrdom of St. Cyprian is another illustration of the same fact. The last and most terrible of the general persecutions was that which immediately preceded the accession of Constantine, when it seemed as if Diocletian had nearly accomplished his object of destroying the very name of Christian. It is not the purpose of this article, however, to go into any details respecting these periods of persecution, and the subject may be dismissed with the following table, which represents the conclusions that may be arrived at from the examination of historical-data:

A. CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF PAGAN PERSECUTIONS.

64-65 Under Nero: ‘Martyrdom of St. Peter and St. Paul (Tertull. Apol. v; Euseb. Hist. Eccl. ii, 25).

95-96 Under Domitian: Banishment of St. John (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii, 17- 18).

104-117 Under Trajan: Martyrdom of St. Ignatius (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. iii,  36).

161-180 Under Marcus Aurelius: Martyrdom of St. Polycarp and the martyrs of Lyons (Euseb. Hist. Ecc 4:15 v, 1).

200-211 Under Severns: Martyrdom of St. Perpetua and others in Africa (Euseb. Hist. Ecc 6:1; Ecc 6:4-5).

250-253 Under Decius: Martyrdom of St. Fabian (Euseb. Hist Eccl. 6:41- 42).

257-260 Under Valerian: Martyrdom of St. Cyprian (Eu seb. Hist. Ecc 7:10-12).

303-313 Under Diocletian, Galerius, and Maximian: Martyrdom of St. Alban (Euseb. Hist. Ecc 8:1-17; Ecc 9:1-11; Bede, Hist. Eccl. i, 6, 7).

VI. The Decline of Paganism. — The long and bitter struggle between the paganism and the Christianity of the Roman empire came to a close with Constantine's victory over Maxentius. As early as A.D. 311 Galerius had been terrified by a shocking and mortal disease to issue a decree, in which he, with the emperors Constantine and Licinius, directed that persecution should cease, that churches should be rebuilt, and that the Christians should be allowed to worship in peace (Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 8:17). But the execution of this decree was much hindered by Maximin and Maxentius, and it was only on their defeat by Licinius and Constantine that a real toleration began. After that event (A.D. 313). the emperors immediately published the famous Edict of Milan (Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 10:5; Lactantius, De Mort. Persecut. 48), in which the previous decree was rigidly enforced and all persecutions entirely suppressed. In the year 321 a severe blow was given to expiring paganism by an edict in which the emperor established the Lord's-day as a public festival. and a day of abstinence from labor. When Constantine became sole emperor, in A.D. 324, he issued one in a still more decided tone, in which he exhorted all his subjects throughout the empire to forsake paganism and worship Christ only; and from that time he and his successors ruled the empire as Christian emperors. Before the end of the 4th century paganism had become so much weakened and the Christian population so decidedly predominant that the emperors were able to take measures towards its final suppression. Theodosius (A.D. 381) forbade apostasy to paganism and suppressed its sacrifices, though still tolerating its minor rites (Cod. Theodos. 16:7), the Western emperors, Gratian and Valentinian, following his example. When  Theodosins became sole emperor (A.D. 392), he forbade all kinds of idolatry under severe penalties (ibid. 10, 12). The last traces of paganism died out in the Eastern empire in the first quarter of the 5th century (ibid. 10, 22), and its final extinction in the West was at the same time effected by the supremacy of the Northern invaders. If since that age Christianity has lost its ground, it has not been to the old paganism, but to its Eastern successor, Mohammedanism. The former never revived after the time of its last great effort to gain supremacy in the Diocletian persecution, and for nearly three centuries the empire was wholly Christian.

See Kortholt, De Religione Ethnica; Rudiger, De Statu Paganorum; Tzschirner, Fall des Heidenthums; Dollinger, Judaism and Paganism Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, vol. 1; Hardwick, Church Hist. of the Middle Ages (see Index); Maclear, Hist. of Christian Missions, p. 5 sq.; Merivale, Conversion of the Northern Nations; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2, 67-71; Pritchard, Egyptian Mythology (designed to illustrate the origin of paganism).

## Pagasaeus[[@Headword:Pagasaeus]]

             is a surname of Apollo, derived from Pagasus, a town of Thessaly, where he had a temple.

## Page, David Cook, D.D[[@Headword:Page, David Cook, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was, in 1853, rector of a church in Memphis, Tennessee; about 1858 removed to Allegheny, Penn., as rector of Christ Church, and there remained during the greater part of the rest of his life. A short time previous to his death he became rector of Trinity Church, Natchez, Miss. He died in Allegheny City, Pennsylvania, May 7, 1878, aged seventy-six years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1879, page 170.

## Page, Durand[[@Headword:Page, Durand]]

             one of the French Illuminati (q.v.), was born at Aubais, in Languedoc, in 1681. After the suppression of the Camisards in 1705, he submitted to the Church authorities, and was taken across the frontier to Germany, whence he passed to Holland, and in 1706 went to London. He died, probably, in England about the middle of the 18th century, leaving a work entitled Theatre Sacrs des Cevennes (Lond. 1707, 12mo); reprinted under the title Les Prophetes Protestants (Paris, 1847, 8vo).

## Page, Edward[[@Headword:Page, Edward]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Burlington County, N. J., April 19, 1787; was converted in 1807; licensed to preach in 1811; and, called of God to the ministry, joined in April, 1817, the Philadelphia Conference which then occupied the entire ground now covered by the Philadelphia, New Jersey, and Newark conferences. From the year 1817 to the year 1852, a period of thirty-five years, Mr. Page travelled as follows: Essex and Staten Island, 1817; Salem Circuit, 1818- 19; Lewiston, Del., 1820-21; Trenton Circuit, 1822; Cumberland Circuit, 1823-24; New Castle, Del., 1825; Cecil Md., 1826; Gloucester Circuit, 1827-28; Chester Circuit, Pa., 1829-30; Bristol, Pa., 1831-32; Camder Circuit, 1833; Moorestown, 1834; Freehold, 1835; New Egypt, 1836; Bargaintown, 1837-38; Freehold, 183940; Columbus, 1841-42; Flemington, 1843; Clinton, 1844; Asbury, 1845-46; Columbus, 1847; Tom's River, 1848-49; Moorestown, 1850-51; then as supernumerary or superannuated he resided at Trenton, N. J. until his death in March, 1867. He was a truly devoted Christian minister, laboring early and late for the  flock under his care, and thousands revere his memory as blessed. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1867. Page; Harlan, a devoted American Christian layman, noted for his philanthropic labors, was born at Coventry, Conn., July 28, 1791. He was the only son of pious parents; received a good education, and was taught by his father the trade of a house-joiner. He was converted in 1813, and united with the Church in 1834. After a further residence of five years in his native town, he removed to Boston, where he remained a short time. He then returned to Coventry, but, after spending three years, he took up his abode in Jewett City; later he engaged in the business of engraving at Andover. In 1825 he was appointed agent of the General Depository of the American Tract Society in New York, which was formed in that year and he held this position till his death in 1834. Harlan Page embraced every opportunity of doing good to his fellow-men, and made use of many instrumentalities. The means which he employed were writing letters, distributing tracts, teaching in or superintending Sabbath-schools, holding prayer-meetings, and personal conversation with those around him. The numerous letters which he wrote to unconverted persons are models of personal exhortation and appeal. Plain, but courteous; pointed, but kind and gentle, they seldom failed to produce lasting impressions and convictions. It is said that he was instrumental in the conversion of more than one hundred persons. See Memoir of arlan Page (published by the American Tract Society).

## Page, Joseph Rusling, D.D[[@Headword:Page, Joseph Rusling, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in New Brunswick, N.J., August 1, 1817. He united with the Methodists at sixteen years of age, studied in Auburn Theological Seminary two years (1841-43); was preacher at Plymouth, N.Y., in 1838, pastor at Perry, from 1839 to 1841, from 1843 to 1857, and from 1859 to 1868; in the interim at Stratford, Connecticut (1857-59), thereafter financial agent of Ingham University; resident at East Avon, N.Y., five years, and pastor at Brightoni from 1875 until his death at Rochester, December 17, 1884. See Genesis Cat. of Auburn Theol. Sem. 1883, page 75.

## Page, Samuel[[@Headword:Page, Samuel]]

             an English divine who flourished in the first half of the 17th century as vicar of Deptford, and died in 1630, is noted as the author of a number of sermons which are read to this day for their elegance of style. He also wrote several theological treatises.(Lond. 1609-39). See Athen. Oxon. (see Index).

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

             an English divine of note, was born at Harrow-on-the-Hill, in Middlesex, and was educated at Baliol College, Oxford, whence he was elected a fellow of All-Souls. In 1629 he was appointed master of the Free School at Reading, which preferment he retained for almost ten years, when he was deprived of it by the Dissenters and the Revolutionists. He was appointed by his college to the living of East Leaking, Berkshire, and held it until his death in 1663. He wrote A Treatise in Justification of Bowing at the Name  of Jesus, by way of answer to an Appendix against that custom (Oxford, 1631, 4to); and also an Examination of such considerable Reasons as are made by Mr. Prynne in a Reply to Mr. Widdowes concerning the same Argument, printed with the former. He was also the author of Certain Animadversions upon some Passages in a Tract concerning Schism and Schismatics, by Mr. Hales of Eton (Oxon. 1642, 4to); and the Peacemaker, or a Brief Motive to Unity and Charity in Religion. He likewise published a translation of Thomas a Kempis 1639, 12mo), with a large epistle to the reader. See book, Eccles. Biog. 7:490,491.

## Pagendarm, Johann Gerhard[[@Headword:Pagendarm, Johann Gerhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Lubeck, December 2, 1681. He studied at Wittenberg, and acted for some time as preacher at different places. In 1730 he commenced his academical career at. Jena, and died May 23,1754. He wrote, De Codice Judeorum Olsnensiun Ebraeo (Jena, 1730): — De Hebdomatibus Danielis (1745): — דּךֵ אבי מלכהךֵת אבי יסכהGen 11:29, in the Bibliotheca Lubecensis, 6, No. 5. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:62; Jocher, Allemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Paget[[@Headword:Paget]]

             SEE PAGIT.

## Paggi, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Paggi, Giovanni Battista]]

             a noted Italian painter, was born of an ancient and noble family at Genoa in 1554. He was the pupil of Luca Cambiaso, and was distinguished chiefly as a painter, though he attained to distinction also as a sculptor and architect. About 1580 he was obliged to flee from Genoa in consequence of an unfortunate homicide which the absurd conduct of a friend brought upon him. Paggi went to Florence, and, under the protection of the grand-dukes Francesco I and Ferdinando, lived there in peace and with reputation. He was recalled through archbishop Sinnasio, afterwards cardinal, to Genoa about 1600, where he executed several excellent works, and gave a great impulse, especially in coloring, to the Genoese school of painting, of which he was the best master in his time. Paggi died in 1627. His masterpieces are two pictures in San Bartolomeo, and the Slaughter of the Innocents, belonging to the Doria family, painted in 1606. In 1607 he published a. short treatise on the theory of painting.

## Pagi, Anthony[[@Headword:Pagi, Anthony]]

             a noted French ecclesiastical writer, was born at Rogua, a small town in Provence, in 1624. He took the monk's habit in the convent of the Cordeliers at Arles in 1641. After he had finished the usual course of studies in philosophy and divinity, he preached a while, and was at length made four successive times provincial of his order. These occupations did not hinder him from devoting time to the study of chronology and ecclesiastical history, branches of learning in which he excelled., His most considerable work is entitled, Critica historico-chronologica in Annales  ecclesiasticos Baronii, in which, following that learned cardinal year by year, he has rectified a great number of mistakes, both in chronology and in facts. Pagi published the first volume of this work, containing the four first centuries, at Paris in 1689, with a dedication to the clergy of Francs, who allowed him a pension. The whole work was printed after his death in four volumes folio, at Anvers, or rather at Geneva, in 1705, by the care of his nephew, Francis Pagi, of the same order. It is carried to the year 1198, where Baronius ends. Pagi was greatly assisted in it by the abbe Longuerue, who also wrote the eulogy of our author which is prefixed to the Geneva edition. This Critique is of great utility; but the author, too fond of striking out something new, has given a chronology of the popes of the first three centuries which is not approved by the critics, and more or less impeaches his reliability as a historian. His style is simple, but his matter evinces study and care. Pagi was in correspondence with the learned of his time in France and in England. Among his friends were Stillingfleet, Spanheim, Dodwell, cardinal Noris, etc. He died in 1699. See Niceron, Memoires, vol. 1 and 17; Ersch u. Guber, Encyklo. s.v. (J. H.W.)

## Pagi, Francois[[@Headword:Pagi, Francois]]

             nephew of the preceding, also a distinguished French ecclesiastic, was born at Lapbesc, in Provence, in 1654. He was educated first by ‘the priests of the Oratory at Toulon, and then by his uncle, who inspired the. boy with a desire to serve the Church. Francois entered the Order of the Cordeliers, and, after teaching philosophy for some time, sought further mental development under the guidance of his uncle, and thus became that learned man's assistant in his Critique on Baronius's Annals. Franois then laid the plan of a work of his own, which he afterwards published under the title Breviarium Histor. chronol. crit., illustr. pontif. Roman. gesta, concilior. general. acta, nec non comnplura tunm sacror. rituum, turn antiquce eccles. disciplince, capita complectens (1717-1747). In it Pagi manifests great zeal for ultramontane theology and the exaltation of the papacy. He died at Orange Jan. 21, 1721. See Niceron, Memoires, vol. 7. s.v.

## Pagiel[[@Headword:Pagiel]]

             (Heb. Pagiel', פִּגְעַיאֵל, chance or event of God; Sept. Φαγιήλ, Num 1:13; elsewhere Φαγεήλ), son of Ocran, and chief man of the tribe of Asher at the time of the Exode, appointed with others to command in war (Num 1:13; Num 2:27; Num 7:72; Num 7:77; Num 10:26). B.C. 1658.

## Pagit (Or Paget), Ephraim[[@Headword:Pagit (Or Paget), Ephraim]]

             an English divine, son of Eusebius, was born in London in 1585, and was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He obtained the living of St. Edmund the King, in Lombard Street, London, of which he was deprived at the Rebellion. He retired to Deptford, where he died in 1647. Pagit was noted as a linguist. He wrote Christianographia, or a Description of the Sundrie Sorts of Christians in the World not subject to the Pope, etc. (London, 1635): — Hearesiographia, or a Description of the Heresies of Later Times (1645): — Sermon on St. Mat 7:15 (1645). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

## Pagit (Or Paget), Eusebius[[@Headword:Pagit (Or Paget), Eusebius]]

             an English Puritan minister and writer, was born at Crawford, in Northamptonshire, about 1542. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. After taking holy orders in the Church Establishment he became successively vicar of Orundle and rector of Langton, in his native county; afterwards he removed to the living of Kilhampton, in Cornwall; and lastly to St. Anne and St. Agnes, London, in 1604. He died in 1617. He published some sermons and theological works, of which the following are the best known: A Harmonie upon the Three Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke (London, 1584), translated from Calvin: The History of the Bible, briefly collected by way of Question and Answer, printed at the end of several old editions of the Bible. See Athen. Oxon.; Brook's Puritans; Fuller's Worthies; Lloyd's Worthies; Strype's Whitgift; Allibone, Dict. of Briit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Thomas, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

## Paglia, Francesco[[@Headword:Paglia, Francesco]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Brescia in 1636. He was a scholar of Guercino, whose manner he Imitated. Lanzi says he was excellent in laying on his colors, admirable in his chiaroscuro, but he displayed little spirit, and his proportions were frequently too long and slender. His best work is an altar-piece in the church of La Carita. He excelled in portraits, which are distinguished for truth of character, great purity of color, and uncommon relief. Orlandi Says he was living in 1700; others, that he died about 1700; and Zani, that he died in 1713.

## Pagni, Benedetto[[@Headword:Pagni, Benedetto]]

             an Italian painter, was a native of Pescia, and studied in the school of Giulio Romano at Rome. He accompanied that master to Mantua, where he assisted him in his works. He acquired considerable distinction as a historical painter, and executed some works for the churches. Lanzi says his picture of the Martyrdom of St. Lorenzo, in the church of St. Andrea, at Mantua, is worthy of the school of his master. Many pictures are claimed to have been executed by him in his native city, but Lanzi thinks that the Marriage at Cana, in the collegiate church, and the facade of the house of the Pagni family, are the only genuine ones. Zani says he painted from 1525 to 1570.

## Pagninus, Sanctes[[@Headword:Pagninus, Sanctes]]

             an Italian monk, noted as a Hebraist and exegete, by Buxtorf called “Vir linguarum Orientalium peritissimus,” was born at Lucca in 1466. He became a Dominican in 1486, and was the pupil of Savonarola and others famous in theology and Oriental learning at Fiesoli, where his rapid progress won the esteem of cardinal de Medici, afterwards Leo X. Having received holy orders, Pagninus devoted himself to the duties of the pulpit, and the persuasive earnestness of his preaching made many celebrated converts under Leo X he was professor of a school of Oriental literature, founded by that pontiff at Rome: but after Leo's decease he accompanied the cardinal-legate to Avignon, and subsequently removed to Lyons, where he became a zealous opponent of the Reformed religion, and was the means of founding a hospital for the plague. He died there in 1541, honored and regretted by rich and poor.

The learned works of Pagninus have been highly esteemed by some, severely criticised by others.

(1.) He published at Lyons, in 1528, Veteris et novi Testamenti nova translatio, which had been the labor of thirty years, and was to have been published at the expense of Leo X had he lived to see it finished. In the preface he details the care which he had taken to make the work perfect. It is the first Latin Bible in which the verses of each chapter are distinguished and numbered as in the original, and is remarkable for the extreme closeness with which the Latin is made to follow and take the shape of the Hebrew idiom. Richard Simon charges him with this as a fault, saying that it not only makes his language obscure and barbarous', but sometimes  changes the sense of the original. Servetus published a folio edition of this work, which he infected with his own errors, at Lyons in 1642. That of Arias Montanus, in the Antwerp Polyglot, exaggerates the peculiarities of his Latin style. Still the editions of 1599 and 1610-13, in 8vo, which give an inter-linear and word-for-word translation of the Hebrew with the vowel-points, is to this day the most convenient Hebrew Bible for beginners.

(2.) His Thesaurus Linguoe Sanctoe (Lyons, 1529, in folio) is much esteemed. The folio edition of Geneva, 1614, by J. Mercier and A. Cavalleri, is very inferior, and in many places corrupt. There is also a Paris edition, in 4to, of 1548.

(3.) An abridgment of the Thesaurus in 8vo, with the title Thesauri Pagnini Epitome, was printed at Antwerp in 1616, and often reprinted. He also published

(4.) Isagoges seu introductionis ad sacras litteras liber unus (Lyons, 1528, 4to; ibid. 1536, fol.).

(5.) Hebraicarum institutionum libri quatuor ex Rabbi David Kinchi priore parte fere transcripti (ibid. 1526; Paris, 1549), both 4tos.

(6.) An abridgment of this grammar, also in 4to, was published at Paris in 1546 and 1556. —

(7.) Catena Argentea in Pentatetuchum (Lyons, 1536, folio), in six volumes. This is a collection of the comments of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin writers on the five books of Moses. He also produced several other learned works See Histoire des honmmnes illustres de l'ordre de St. Domique, by Touron; Bibliotheca Sancta, by Sixtus of Siena.

## Pagoda[[@Headword:Pagoda]]

             (according to some, a corruption of the Sanscrit word bhagavata, from bhagavat, sacred; but according to others a corruption of put-gada, from the Persian put, idol, and gada, house) is the name of certain Hindu temples, which are among the. most remarkable monuments of Hindi architecture. Though the word itself designates but the temple where the deity — especially Siva, and his consort Durga or Parvati — was  worshipped, a pagoda is in reality an aggregate of various monuments, which in their totality constitute the holy place sacred to the god. Sanctuaries, porches, colonnades, gateways, walls, tanks, etc., are generally combined for this purpose, according to a plan which is more or less uniform. Several series of walls form an enclosure; between them are alleys, habitations for the priests, etc., and the interior is occupied by the temple itself, with buildings for the pilgrims tanks, porticos, and open colonnades. The walls have at their openings gopuras, or large pyramidal gateways, higher than themselves, and so constructed that the gopura of the outer wall is always higher than that of the succeeding inner wall, the pagoda itself being smaller than the smallest gopura. The extent of the enclosing walls is generally considerable; in most instances they consist of hewn stones of colossal dimensions. placed upon one another without mortar or cement, but with such admirable accuracy that: their joints are scarcely visible. The gateways are pyramidal buildings of the most elaborate workmanship; they consist of several, sometimes as many as fifteen stories. The pagodas themselves, too, are of a pyramidal shape, various layers of stones having been piled upon one another iii successive recession; in some pagodas, however, the pyramidal form begins only with the higher stories, the broad basis extending to about a third of the height of the whole building. The sides of the different terraces are vertical; but the transition from one to the other is effected by a vault surmounted by a series of small cupolas, which hide the vault itself. A single cupola, hewn out of the stone, and surmounted by a globe, generally crowns the whole structure; but sometimes the latter also ends in fantastical spires of a fan- like shape or in concave roofs. The pagodas are covered all over with the richest ornamentation. The pilasters and columns, which take a prominent rank in the ornamental portion of these temples, show the greatest variety of forms; some pagodas are also overlaid with strips of copper, having the appearance of gold. There are pagodas of all sizes in India. Some of them have been erected by wealthy Hindus for the purpose of performing their private devotions in them, and correspond in character to the Western chapels. In the case of the large pagodas, vast endowments in many instances are expended in their support, as well as for the idols they contain and the Brahmins that attend them.  “The most celebrated pagodas on the mainland of India are those of Mathura, Trichinopoli, Chalambron, Konjeveram, Jaggernaut, and Deogur, near Ellora. That of Mathura consists of four stories, and is about 63 feet high; its base comprises about 40 square feet, Its first story is made of hewn stones, heavily adorned with copper and gilt; the others are of brick. A great number of figures, especially representing deities, tigers, and elephants, cover the building. The pagoda of Tanjore is the most beautiful monument of this kind in the south of India; its height is 200 feet, and the width of its basis is equal to two thirds of its height. The pagoda of Trichinopoli is erected on a hill elevated about 300 feet over the plain; it differs in style from other pagodas dedicated to Brahminical worship, and exhibits great similarity with the Buddhistic monuments of Tibet. The great pagoda of Chalambron, in Tanjore, is one of the most celebrated and one of the most sacred of India. It is dedicated to Siva and Parvati, and is filled with representations belonging to the mythical history of these gods. The buildings of which this pagoda is composed cover an oblong square 360 feet long and 210 feet wide. At Konjeveram there are two pagodas —the one dedicated to Siva, and the other to Parvati. The pagodas of Jaggernaut, on the north end of the coast of Coromandel, are three; they are erected likewise in honor of Siva; and surrounded by a wall of black stones — whence they are called by Europeans the Black Pagodas — measuring 1122 feet in length, 696 feet in width, and 24 feet in height. The height of the principal of these three pagodas is said to be 344 feet; according to some, however, it does not exceed 120 to 123 feet. The pagoda of Deogur, near Ellora, consists also of three pagodas, sacred to Siva; they have no sculptures, however, except a trident, the weapon of Siva,' which is visible on the top of one of these temples. The monuments of Mavalipura, on the coast of Coromandel, are generally called the Seven Pagodas; but as these monuments — which are rather a whole city than merely temples — are buildings cut out of the living rock, they belong more properly to the cut-rock monuments of India than to the special class of Indian, architecture comprised under the term pagoda.”

“The pagodas in Burmah,” says Mr. Boardman, “are the most prominent and expensive of all the sacred buildings. They are solid structures, built of brick, and plastered. Some of them are gilt throughout, whence they are called golden pagodas. The largest pagoda in Tavoy is about fifty feet in  diameter, and perhaps one hundred and fifty feet high. That which is most frequented is not so large. It stands on a base somewhat elevated above the adjacent surface, and is surrounded by a row of more than forty small pagodas, about six feet high, standing on the same elevated base. In various niches round the central image are small alabaster images. Both the central and the surrounding pagodas are gilt from the summit to the base, and each one is surrounded with an umbrella of iron, which is also gilt. Attached to the umbrella of the central pagoda is a row of small bells or jingles, which, when there is even a slight breeze, keep a continual chiming. A low wall surrounds the small pagodas, outside of which are temples, pagodas of various sizes, and other appendages of pagoda worship, sacred trees or thrones, sacred bells to be rung by worshippers, and various figures of fabulous things, creatures, and persons mentioned in the Burman sacred books. Around these is a high wall, within which no devout worshipper presumes to tread without putting off his shoes. It is considered holy ground. Outside this wall are perhaps twenty Zayats, and a kyung. The whole occupies about an acre of ground. The total number of pagodas in Tavoy is immense. Large and small, they probably exceed a thousand. Before leaving America, I used to pray that pagodas might be converted into Christian churches. But I did not know that they were solid monuments of brick or stone, without any cavity or internal apartments. They can become Christian churches only by being demolished and built anew.” The Dagong pagoda at Rangoon is the most magnificent in Burmah. A description of it is given by Mrs. Judson. See her Memoir and the Christian Offering

The mode of worship in these heathen temples is as follows: When a Hindui comes to a pagoda to worship, he walks round the building as often as he pleases, keeping the right hand towards it; he then enters the vestibule, and if there be a bell in it, as is usually the case, he strikes upon it two or three times. He then advances to the threshold of the shrine, presents his offering to the Brahmin in attendance, mutters inaudibly a short prayer, accompanied with prostration of the body, or simply with the act of lifting his hands to his forehead, and straightway retires. The ceremonies observed by the Hindus in building a pagoda are curious. They first enclose the ground on which the pagoda is to be built, and allow the grass to grow on it. When the grass has grown considerably, they turn an  ash-colored cow into the enclosure to roam at pleasure. Next day they examine carefully where the cow, which they reckon a sacred animal, has condescended to rest its body, and having dug a deep pit on that consecrated spot, they place there a marble pillar, so that it may rise a considerable distance. above the ground. On this pillar they place the image of the god to whom the pagoda is to be consecrated. The pagoda is then built quite around the pit in which the pillar is placed. The place in which the image stands is dark, but lights are kept burning in front of the idol.

“The term pagoda is, in a loose way, also applied to those Chinese buildings of a tower form which consist of several stories, each story containing a single room, and being surrounded by a gallery covered with a protruding roof. These buildings, however, differ materially from the Hindi pagodas, not only so far as their style and exterior appearance are concerned, but inasmuch as they are buildings intended for other than religious purposes. The Chinese call them Ta, and they are generally erected in commemoration of a celebrated personage or some remarkable event; and for this reason, too, they are placed on some elevated spot, where they may be conspicuous, and add to the charms of the scenery. Some of these buildings have a height of 160 feet; the finest known specimen of them is the famous Porcelain Tower of Nankin. The application of the name pagoda to a Chinese temple should be discountenanced, for, as a rule, a Chinese temple is an insignificant building, seldom more than two stories high, and built of wood; the exceptions are rare, and where they occur, as at Pekin, such temples, however magnificent, havre no architectural affinity with a Hindu pagoda.” See Williams, Middle Kingdom, 1, 82, 101, 132; 2, 17; Huc, Chinese Empire, 2, 166 sq.; Bohn's India; Trevor, India, p. 89-92.

## Pah-kwa[[@Headword:Pah-kwa]]

             a Chinese charm, consisting of eight diagrams arranged in a circular form; it is in most common use in China. The figure is thus formed. The eight diagrams are described by Mr. Cuthbertson, an American missionary to the Chinese, as follows: “They are triplets of lines, whole and broken, the various combinations of which produce eight sets of triplets, each having its peculiar properties. These. by further combinations, produce sixty-four figures, which also possess their peculiar powers. The first set are representative respectively of heaven, vapor, fire, thunder, winds, water, mountains, earth. These mysterious figures embody in some inscrutable manner the elements of all change, the destinies of all ages, the first principles of all morals, the foundation of all actions. They, of course, furnish important elements for the subtle calculations of the diviner. From such a system of calculation the results obtained must depend wholly upon the ingenuity of the practitioner. The figure of the eight diagrams is seen everywhere. It is often worn on the person. It is seen, too, posted in conspicuous positions about houses, chiefly over the door, to prevent the ingress of evil influences.” See Doolittle, China and the Chinese (N. Y. 1866, 2: vols. 12mo); Nevins, China and the Chinese (N. Y. 1869 12mo).

## Pahari Version Of The Scripture[[@Headword:Pahari Version Of The Scripture]]

             The Pahari is spoken by the Paharis, a hill tribe in the Rajmahal district, Bengal, who are supposed to be among the earliest settlers in the country. The Reverend E. Droese, of Bhangalpore, who has spent nearly a quarter of a century among the Paharis, and who is the only European that knows much of their language, has translated the gospel of Luke, which was published by the Calcutta Auxiliary Bible Society in 1881. The same scholar also prepared a translation of the gospel of John, which was published in 1883. These are the only parts of the Scripture which are yet printed. (B.P.)

## Pahath-Moab[[@Headword:Pahath-Moab]]

             (Heb. Pach'ath Modib', מוֹאָב פִּחִת, governor [lit. pasha] of Moab; Sept. Φαὰθ [v.r. Φαλάθ, etc.] Μωάβ; Vulg. Phahath-Moab, “governor of Moab”)on the head of one of the chief houses of the tribe of Judah, who signed his.name to the sacred covenant of Nehemiah (Neh 10:14). B.C. 410. “As we read in 1Ch 4:22, of a family of Shilonites, of the tribe of Judah, who in very early times ‘had dominion in Moab,' it may be conjectured that this was the origin of the name. It is perhaps a slight corroboration of this conjecture that we find in Ezr 2:6 that the sons of Pahath-Moab had among their number ‘children of Joab;' so also in 1  Chronicles 4 we find these families who had dominion in Moab very much mixed with the sons of Caleb, among whom, in 1Ch 2:54; 1Ch 4:14, we find the house of Joab. It may further be conjectured that this dominion of the sons of Shelah in Moab had some connection with the migration of Elimelech and his sons into the country of Moab, as mentioned in the book of Ruth; nor should the close resemblance of the names עָפְרָה(Ophrah), 1Ch 4:14, and , עָרְפָּה(O.)pah), Rth 1:4, be overlooked. Jerome, indeed, following doubtless his Hebrew master, gives a mystical interpretation to the names in 1Ch 4:22, and translates the strange word Jashubi-leem ‘they returned to Leem' (Bethlehem). The author of Quaest. Heb. in Lib. Paraleip. (printed in Jerome's works) follows up this opening, and makes Jokim (qui starefecit solemn) to mean Eliakim, and the men of Chozeba (viri mendacii), Joash and Saraph (securus et incendeons), to mean Mahlon and Chilion, who took wives (בָּעֲלוּ) in Moab, and returned (i.e. Ruth and Naomi did) to the plentiful bread of Bethlehem (house of bread); interpretations which are so far worth noticing, as they point to ancient traditions connecting the migration of Elimelech and his sons with the Jewish dominion in Moab mentioned in 1Ch 4:21. However, as regards the name Pahath Moab, this early and obscure connection of the families of Shelah, the son of Judah. with Moab seems to supply a not improbable origin for the name itself, and to throw some glimmering upon the association of the children of Joshua and Joab with the sons of Pahath-Moab.

That this family was of high rank in the tribe of Judah we learn from their appearing fourth in order in the two lists (Ezr 2:6; Neh 7:1), and from their chief having signed second among the lay princes (Neh 10:14). It was also the most numerous (2818 [2812]) of all the families specified, except the Benjamite house of Senaah (Neh 7:38). The name of the chief of the house of Pahath-Moab:in Nehemiah's time was Hashub; and, in exact accordance with the numbers of his family, we find him repairing two portions of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh 3:11; Neh 3:23). It may also be noticed, as slightly confirming the view of Pahath-Moab being. a Shilonite family, that whereas in 1Ch 9:5-7 and Neh 11:5-7, we find the Benjamite families in close juxtaposition with the-Shilonites, so in the building of the wall, where each family built the portion over against their own habitation, we find Benjamin and Hashub the Pahath-Moabite coupled together (Neh 3:23)., The only other notices of the family are found in Ezr 8:4, where two hundred of its males are said to have  accompanied Elihoenai, the son of Zerahiah, when he came up with Ezra from Babylon; and in Ezr 10:30 where eight of the sons of Pahath- Moab are named a; having taken strange wives in the time of Ezra's government.” SEE PASHA.

## Pai[[@Headword:Pai]]

             (1Ch 1:50). SEE PAU.

## Paigeoline[[@Headword:Paigeoline]]

             an Italian engraver, of whom scarcely anything is known, has left a light but spirited etching, bearing his name, after the picture by Paul Veronese, representing The Mother of Moses brought to Pharaoh's Daughter as a Nurse for her Son, Zani spells his name Paigeloine.

## Paila[[@Headword:Paila]]

             is, according to the Puranas (q.v.), one of the disciples of Vyasa (q.v.), the reputed arranger of the Vedas (q.v.); he was taught by the latter the Rig- Veda, and, on his part, communicated this knowledge to Bashkali and Indrapramati. This tradition, therefore, implies that Paila was one of the earliest compilers of the Rig-Veda.

## Pain[[@Headword:Pain]]

             (MYSTICAL), a certain indescribable agony which has been believed by mystics to be necessary to prepare them for a state of rapture. “This mysterious pain,” says Mr. Vaughan (Hours with the Mystics), “is no new thing in the history of mysticism. It is one of the trials of mystical initiation. It is the death essential to the superhuman height. With St. Theresa the physical nature contributes it much more largely than usual; and in her map of the mystic's progress it is located at a more advanced period of the journey. St. Francis of Assisi lay sick for two years under preparatory miseries. Catharine of Siena bore five years of privation, and was tormented by devils besides. For five years, and yet again for more than three times five, Magdalena de Pazzi endured such aridity that she believed herself forsaken of God. Balthazzar Alvarez suffered for sixteen years before he earned his extraordinary illumination. Theresa, there can be little doubt, regarded her fainting-spells, hysteria, cramps, and nervous, seizures as divine visitations. In their action and reaction body and soul were continually injuring each other. The excitement of hallucination would produce an attack of her disorder, and the disease again foster the hallucination. Servitude, whether of mind or of body, introduces maladies unknown to freedom.” “These sufferings,” adds the same writer, “are attributed by the mystics to the surpassing nature of the truths manifested to our finite faculties (as the sun-glare pains the eye); to the anguish involved in the surrender of every ordinary support or enjoyment, when the soul, suspended (as Theresa describes it) between heaven and earth, can derive solace from neither; to the intensity of the aspirations awakened, rendering those limitations of our condition here, which detain us from God, an intolerable oppression; and to despair, by which the soul is tried, being left to believe herself forsaken by the God she loves.” SEE MYSTICISM.

## Paine, James[[@Headword:Paine, James]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Londonderry, Ireland, Dec. 25, 1801. He received that early training in spiritual things for which the Presbyterians of the mother country are proverbial. During the year 1820 his parents emigrated to the United States, and became members of Dr. Baxter's congregation in Lexington, Va., where he professed religion, and soon after turned his thoughts to the ministry. He graduated with honor at Washington College, Lexington, Va.; studied theology in the seminary at Princeton, N. J.; was licensed by Lexington Presbytery in 1829, ordained in 1830, and labored as a missionary for several years at Warm Springs and New Monmouth churches, Va. He afterwards took charge of Fairfield and Timber Ridge Churches, Va. It was here that the best years of his life were spent; ever ready to preach, he went in and out before his people, leading them like a true shepherd for twenty-three years. From thence he was called to the Church at Somerville, Tenn., where he continued to labor until his death, April 7, 1860. Mr. Paine, though not an author, often wrote for the press. His preaching was clear and expository; his style free from all affectation or vagueness; his all-conquering desire was a single burning zeal to glorify God in the salvation of souls. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 104. (J. L. S.)

## Paine, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Paine, Robert, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Person County; N.C., November 12, 1799, of Baptist parents. In early life. he removed to Tennessee; was converted November 9, 1817; licensed to preach the same year; the next year was admitted into the Tennessee Conference, and after laboring on several circuits and in important stations, was elected president of La Grange College, Alabama, in 1830, a position which he retained until his elevation. to the episcopacy in 1846. He had been a member of every General Conference from 1824, and was active in, the discussion that led to the division of the Methodist Church in 1844. His extensive labors as a bishops closed with his death, October 20, 1882. He was a very able preacher, a ready speaker, and a devoted Christian. He wrote Life and Times of Bishop McKendree. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1882, page 147; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

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

             a noted American speculative writer, and prominent political character in the colonial history of this country, whose influence upon his day and generation was unfavorable to Christianity, though. not altogether to civilization, deserves a place here for his repeated attempts to modify the religious thought of this country.

Life. — Paine was an Englishman by birth, and saw the light of this world Jan. 29,1737, at Thetford, in the county of Norfolk. His father, who was a Quaker, brought him up to his own business, that of a staymaker. At the age of twenty Thomas removed to London, where he worked some time at his business. He then went to Sandwich, in Kent, where, in 1760, he married the daughter of an exciseman, and obtained a place in the excise, but retained it only about a year, and then became an assistant at a school in the neighborhood of London. After leaving this situation he was again employed in the excise, and was situated at Lewes, in Sussex. Here he had gained some reputation by various pieces of poetry, and had been selected  by the excisemen of the neighborhood. to draw up The Case of the Officers of Excise, with Remarks on the Qualifications of Officers, and on the numerous Evils arrising to the Revenue from the Insufficiency of the present Salaries (1772).

The ability displayed in this his first prose composition induced one of the commissioners of excise to give him a letter of introduction to Benjamin Franklin, then in London as a deputy from the colonies of North America to the British government. Franklin was favorably impressed with Paine, and, hoping that his services might prove beneficial to the colonies, advised him to go to America. Paine took the advice, settled at Philadelphia in 1774, and devoted himself to literary works. He became a contributor to various periodical works, and in January, 1775, editor of the Philadelphia Magazine. In 1776, at the outbreak of our colonial conflict, he embraced the cause of the colonies, and enlisted as a volunteer in the army. He had previously influenced public opinion in favor of independence from the British throne by an article which he published in the Pennsylvania Journal (October, 1775), entitled “Serious Thoughts.” In it he declared for political equality, and gave expression to the hope of the ultimate abolition of slavery. He now further encouraged the radical movers for separation by another publication of his, entitled Common Sense (Phila. 1776, 8vo). These writings made a profound impression, especially the latter, and contributed in an eminent degree to make the people of this country of one mind. The masses, who had reasoned but little on the subject, were stirred to activity, and thus thousands who would otherwise have been passive, if not opponents to the independence scheme, were brought to the aid of the Revolutionary movement.

True, some of his political teachings could not have the endorsement of the moral and religious element; yet the truth cannot be withheld that Thomas Paine was one of the most powerful. actors in the Revolutionary drama, and that, whatever his failings, errors, or vices, his service to his adopted country should not be forgotten. Some writers have denied his political services, and have declared it impossible that, a stranger at the outbreak of the colonial struggle, he could have influenced public opinion in America; but such should remember that the contemporaries of Paine and worthy men many of them certainly were who associated with Paine-judged differently, and not only freely circulated his writings, but gave expression to their worth for political purposes by voting him £500 through their legislators, besides conferring on him the degree of M.A. (Pennsylvania University), and membership in their choicest literary association, the American Philosophical Society. Though in the army,  Paine continued to employ his pen. In December, 1776, he published his first Crisis, which opened with the phrase, “These are the times that try men's souls.” So well was it believed to meet the emergency of those times that it was, by order, read at the head of every regiment, and is pronounced to have done much to rouse the drooping ardor of the people. He continued such publications until the attainment of peace in 1783. In 1777 he was made secretary to the Congressional Committee on Foreign Affairs, but in 1779 he was obliged to resign this post, because he had in an excited encounter divulged the secrets of his office. In 1781 Paine Wyas sent to France with colonel Lawrence to negotiate a loan, in which he was more than successful; for the French government granted a subsidy of six millions of livres to the Americans, and also became guarantee for a loan of ten millions advanced by Holland. On his return to America he was rewarded for his services by being appointed, in 1785, clerk to the Assembly of Pennsylvania; he received from Congress a donation of $3000; and the state of New York bestowed on him the confiscated estate of Frederick Davoe, a royalist, near New Rochelle, in the state of New York, consisting of 500 acres of well-cultivated land, with a good stone house. After the peace between Great Britain and America, Paine employed himself chiefly in mechanical speculations. In 1787 he embarked for France, and, after visiting Paris, went to England, with a view to the prosecution of a project relative to the construction of an iron bridge, of his own invention, at Rotherham, in Yorkshire.

This scheme involved him in considerable difficulties; but his writings; in which he foretold, or rather recommended, the change that was approaching in France, brought him a supply of money. On the appearance of Burke's Reflections on the French Revolution, Paine wrote the first part of his celebrated Rights of A Man, in answer to that work, the most famous of all the replies to Burke, and circulated in innumerable editions, not only in English, but also in foreign versions. The second part was published early in 1792; and on May 21 in that year a proclamation issued against wicked and seditious publications evidently alluded to, though it did not name, the Rights of Man. On the same day the attorney-general commenced a prosecution against Paine as the author of that work, because of his outcry against the English. aristocracy, and severe assaults on the British constitution. While the trial was pending he succeeded in making his escape. He set off for France, arriving there in September, 1792. The garrison of Calais were under arms to receive this “friend of liberty,” the tricolored cockade was presented to him by the mayor, and the handsomest woman in the town was selected to  place it in his hat. Meantime Paine had been declared in Paris worthy of the honors of citizenship, and being chosen member of the National Convention for the department of Calais, he proceeded to Paris, where he was received with every demonstration of extravagant joy. On the trial of Louis XVI he voted with the Girondists against the sentence of death, proposing his imprisonment during the war, and his banishment afterwards. This conduct offended the Jacobins, and towards the close of 1793 he was excluded from the convention on the ground of being a foreigner (though naturalized), and immediately after he was arrested and committed to the Luxembourg. Just before his confinement Paine had finished the first part of his work entitled the Age of Reason, and having confided it to the care of his friend Joel Barlow, it was published (see below). On the fall of Robespierre he was released. In 1795 he published the second part of his Age of Reason; and in May, 1796, he addressed to the Council of Five Hundred a work entitled Decline and Fall of the System of Finance in England, and also published his pamphlet entitled Agrarian Justice, being a plan for meliorating the condition of man. Fearful of being captured by English cruisers, he remained in France some years longer. He had, however, written to Mr. Jefferson, who had then but recently been elected president of the United States, and expressed a wish to be brought back to America in a government ship. Jefferson at last replied, offering Paine a passage in the Maryland sloop of war, which he had sent to France for a special purpose'.

In his letter, dated March, 1801, Jefferson expresses his high estimate of Paine's services in the cause of American independence in the following words: “I am in hopes you will find us returned generally to sentiments worthy of former times. In these it will be your glory to have steadily labored, and with as much effect as any man living. That you may long live to continue your useful labors, and to reap their reward in the thankfulness of nations, is my sincere prayer.” Paine did not embark for America, however, till August, 1802: he reached Baltimore in the following October. His first wife had died about a year after their marriage; he lived about three years with his second, whom he married soon after the death of his first, when they separated by mutual consent, it is said, on account of her physical disability. During his last residence in France he led a dissolute life, and one of the women he supported followed him to this country. He died in the city of New York, June 8, 1809, and, being refused burial by the Quakers, was interred in a field on his own estate near New Rochelle. Cobbett, some eight or nine years afterwards, disinterred Paine's bones and carried them to England, but instead of arousing, as he expected, the  enthusiasm of the republican party in that country, Cobbett only drew upon himself universal contempt. Paine's political and religious admirers in America erected in 1839 a showy monument, with a medallion portrait, over his empty grave. There is now a hall in Boston, supported by freethinkers, which is called after him.

Works. — As a writer Paine has sometimes been compared with Gibbon (q.v.). Both wrote on religion, philosophy, and politics. But these two authors are so very unlike each other that they should be compared only as extremes of the same general school. The freethinker Paine is a character of a very different kind from the freethinker Gibbon. The latter is the polished scholar, the polite man of letters; the former an active man of the world, educated by men rather than books, of low tastes and vulgar tone. Gibbon's religious scepticism is that of high life, Paine's of low. In the treatment of religious topics, the one writer sneers, the other hates. The one is a philosopher, the other a politician. Schooled in the politico- philosophical doctrines of Rousseau, Paine became the exponent of this Frenchman among the lower orders of the Anglo-Saxon family, by combining in his teachings the doctrines of Rousseau with those of the English deists. The language in which he clothes his thoughts betrays, besides, great familiarity with the bitterness of Voltaire. An edition of Paine's Political Writings was published at Boston in 1856 (2 vols. 8vo), and at New York (1860, 12mo); and in the same year his so-called Theological Writings were issued. In London a complete edition of his works was published in 1861. The two great works of Thomas Paine are, as we have seen above, The Rights of Man and The Age of Reason. Of the former we have not place to treat here, as the religious views espoused therein reappear, only in a more objectionable form, in the second work. The Age of Reason was a pamphlet admitting of quick perusal. It was afterwards followed by a second part, in which a defence was offered against the replies made to the former part. The object of the two is to state reasons for rejecting the Bible (pt. 1, p. 319; pt. 2, p. 8, 83), and to explain the nature of the religion of deism (pt. 1, p. 3, 4, 21-50; pt. 2, p. 83-93), which was proposed as a substitute.

A portion is devoted to an attack on the external evidence of revelation, or, as the author blasphemously calls it, “the three principal means of imposture” (p. 44), prophecy, miracles, and mystery; the latter of which he asserts may exist in the physical, but not by the nature of things in the moral world. A larger portion is devoted to a collection of the various internal difficulties of the  books of the Old and New Testament, and of the schemes of religion, Jewish and Christian (pt. 2, p. 10-83). The great mass of these objections are those which had been suggested by English or French deists, but are stated with extreme bitterness. The most novel part of this work is the use which Paine makes of the discoveries of astronomy, in revealing the vastness of the universe and a plurality of globes, to discredit the idea of interference on behalf of this insignificant planet — an argument which he wields especially against the doctrine of incarnation (pt. 1, p. 37-44). But no part of his work manifests such bitterness, and at the same time such a specious mode of argument, as his attack on the doctrine of redemption and substitutional atonement (p. 20). The religion which Paine proposed to substitute for Christianity was the belief in one God as revealed by science; in immortality as the continuance of conscious existence; in the natural equality of man; and in the obligation of justice and mercy to one's neighbor (pt. 2, p. 3, 4, 50).

As a writer, Paine must be granted to possess a vigorous and clear style; though somewhat coarse and simple, it is enlivened with comparisons and illustrations which render it very popular and attractive. He saw clearly the weak points of any object against which he directed his attack, and accordingly he was a vigorous assailant; but he was unqualified, either by competent knowledge or by habits of patient investigation, for the examination of the diversified subjects he attempted; certainly not in all their bearings. He was truly a bold and original thinker, but he lacked the amount of knowledge necessary for inquiry and criticism; hence he proved but a feeble and ignorant foe of Christianity. He assailed it without understanding it, and condemned without careful examination. His own testimony must forever settle his incompetency. He declared his belief in the existence of a God and a future life, but decried the sacred Scriptures as contradictory, though he had not a copy of the Bible at his command while criticising. Thus while he stated some of the common difficulties which really exist in the Gospel history acutely, he frequently exposed himself for want of sound knowledge, when he thought that he was exposing the sacred writers. But, besides all this, the grossness and scurrility of his language-in his satire and blasphemous ribaldry he is a fit parallel to Voltaire-reasonably shock the religious feeling of all Christians. Yet all his failings may easily be accounted for, and his attacks on Christianity forgiven him, or should at least be covered with the mantle of charity, when we consider that Paine was soured by the incongruities of the  English Establishment in which he had been reared; and then, influenced by the shallow infidelity of the French Revolutionists, quarreller with the Bible, when it was only a quarrel with bishops. Of what Christianity really is, in its highest and broadest catholic sense, we do not believe that he had the remotest idea; and so far has the world advanced in Bible knowledge that the Tribune (N. Y., March 25, 1876) says truly: “His best arguments, if they may be so called, would not, if first published today, attract the slightest attention, nor would anybody think them worthy of serious refutation. The opponents of Christianity are now men of larger calibre, greater knowledge, and more respectable method. They perhaps do less mischief than he did, because fewer people understand them. He was an infidel without science, erudition, or philosophy. He was simply a sharp debater, a caviller, and a technical disputant. As such he was immensely admired by minds of the same class, but it is a class for which we cannot entertain the highest respect, and to whose guidance methodical thinkers in these days will not resign themselves.”

A book so easily confuted as Paine's Age of Reason did not, of course, remain long unanswered. Bishop Watson's and Thomas Scott's responses are now the best known; but we may add to these names those of J. Achincloss, Elias Boudinot, John Disney, Samuel Drew, J. P. Estlin, David Levi, W. McNeil, Thomas Meek, Michael Nash, Uzal Ogden, John Padman, William Patten, J. Priestly, T. Shame, David Simpson, Thomas O. Summers, Robert Thompson, John Tytler, W. Wait, G. Wakefield, E. Wallace, and T. Williams, and still leave the list unexhausted. When Robert Hall was asked his opinion of the Age of Reason, he replied, “My opinion of it, sir? Why, sir, it is a mouse nibbling at the wing of an archangel.” See, on Paine and his literary productions, Salmagunda (Lond. ed.), 1, 134; Dibdin, Sunday Library, 6:335; Lowndes, British Libr. p. 1761; Lond. Month. Rev. (1794), p. 96; Brit. Rev. June, 1811; Edinb. Month. Rev. 3, 434; Blackw. May. 10:701; 13:49; 17:198; 26:816, 866; 29:764; 30:637; 34:501; 35:406; 38:361, 366; Niles, Register, 30:397; Carey, Museum, 1, 20; 9:179; Spirit of the Pilgrims, 4:338; Living Age, 16:169; Hist. Mag. (N.Y.), July, 1857, p. 206; Lond. Quar. Rev. July, 1858; Atlantic Monthly, July, 1859: Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.; Watson, Men and Times; Randall, Jefferson; Memoirs of S. Grellet; Address on Paine, by W. A. Stokes (1859, 8vo). The principal biographies of Paine are: Francis Oldys's (George Chalmers) (Lond. 1791, 8vo); James Cheetham's (N. Y. 1809, 8vo); Sherwin's (1819, 8vo); G.Valse's (N. Y.  1841, 8vo); by the editor of the National (Lond. 1850, 12mo); by the editor of Paine's Political Writings (Bost. 1850, 2 vols. 8vo); by the author of The Religion of Science (N. Y. 1860,12mo). We hardly know whether to name in this connection the recent publication entitled Light from the Spirit World: the Pilgrimage of Thomas Paine and Others to the Seventh Circle in the Spirit World,. by Rev. C. Hammond (Medina, N. Y., 1852, post 8vo).

## Paine, William Pomeroy, D.D[[@Headword:Paine, William Pomeroy, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Ashfield, Massachusetts, August 1, 1802. He studied at Ashfield Academy; in 1827 graduated from Amherst College, and in 1832 from Andover Theological Seminary; from 1829 to 1831 he was tutor in Amherst College. His only pastorate was of the Church at Holden, Mass., where he was regularly ordained and installed, October 24, 1833. He resigned this charge in February 1875, but remained pastor emeritus until his death, November 28, 1876. See Cong. Quarterly, 1877, page 421.

## Paint[[@Headword:Paint]]

             is the rendering of the A.V. in Jer 22:14 of the Heb. מָשִׁח, mashach', properly to anoint, as in Gen 31:13; Dan 9:24. In Eze 23:40 the original is כָּחִל, kachal', to smear. In 2Ki 9:20, and Jer 4:30, the Heb. word is פּוּךְ, puek, of uncertain etymology; but, according to First, akin to Sanscrit pig, Latin pingo, fingo. It denoted a mixture of burned or pulverized antimony and zinc, which was softened with oil, and applied to the eyes by a pencil or short, smooth style of ivory, silver, or wood, which was drawn between the closed eyelids. By this process a black ring was formed around the eyelids (see Hartmann, Aufklarungen iiber Asien, ii, 446 sq.; id. Hebruerin, ii, 149 sq.; 3, 198 sq.; S. Grand in the Museum Hagan. 3, 175 sq.). The allusion in Wisdom of Solomon 13:14 is to the custom, which prevailed especially among the Romans, of painting with red colors the cheeks of idols on holidays. A similar custom to that of the Hebrew women, mentioned above, still prevails in the East, where the women paint not only their cheeks, but their eyebrows, and the inner surface of the eyelids (comp. Shaw, Travels, p. 294; Niebuhr, Bedouin, p. 65; Travels, 1, 292; Joliffe, Travels, p. 187; Rosenmuller, Morgenl. 4:269 sq.; Hartmann, Ideal weibl. Schinh. p. 65 sq., 307 sq.; Ruppell, Arab. 36:65) (Winer). The use of cosmetic dyes has prevailed in all ages in Eastern countries. We have abundant evidence of the practice of painting the eyes both in ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, 2, 342) and in Assyria (Layard, Nineveh, 2, 328); and in modern times no usage is more general. It does not appear, however, to have been by any means universal among the Hebrews. The notices of it are few; and in each  instance it seems to have been used as a meretricious art, unworthy of a woman of high character. Thus Jezebel “put her eyes in painting” (2Ki 9:30, margin); Jeremiah says of the harlot city, “Though thou rentest thy eyes with painting” (Jer 4:30); and Ezekiel again makes it a characteristic of a harlot (Eze 23:40; comp. Joseph. War, 4:9, 10). The expressions used in these passages-are worthy of observation, as referring to the mode in which the process was effected. It is thus described by Chandler (Travels, 2, 140): “A girl, closing one of her eyes, took the two lashes between the forefinger and thumb of the left hand, pulled them forward, and then thrusting in at the external corner a bodkin which had been immersed in the soot, and extracting it again, the particles before adhering to it remained within, and were presently ranged around the organ.”

The eyes were thus literally “put in paint,” and were “rent” open in the process. A broad line was also drawn around the eye, as represented in the accompanying cut. The effect was an apparent enlargement of the eye; and the expression in Jer 4:30 has been by some understood in this sense (Gesen. Thes. p. 1239), which is without doubt admissible, and would harmonize with the observations of other writers (Juv 2, 94, “Obliqua producit acu;” Pliny, Eph 6:2). The term used for the. application of the dye was, as above noted, kachdl, “to smear;” and Rabbinical writers described the paint itself under a cognate term (Mish'na, Sabb. 8:3). These words still survive in kohl, the modern Oriental name for the powder used. The Bible gives no indication of the substance out of which the dye was formed. If any conclusion were deducible from the evident affinity between the Hebrew pik, the Greek φῦκος, and the Latin fucus, it would be to the effect that the dye was of a vegetable kind. Such a dye is at the present day produced from the henna plant (Lawsonia inermis), and is extensively applied to the hands and the hair (Russell, Aleppo, 1, 109, 110). But the old versions (the Sept., Chaldee, Syriac, etc.), agree in pronouncing the dye to have been produced from antimony; the very name of which (στίβι, stibium) probably owed its currency in the ancient world to this circumstance, the name itself and the application of the substance having both emanated from Egypt.

This mineral was imported into Egypt for the purpose. One of the pictures at Beni Hassan represents the arrival of a party of traders in stibium. The powder made from antimony has always been supposed to have a beneficial effect on the eyesight (Pliny, 33:34). Antimony is still used for the purpose in Arabia (Burckhardt, Travels, 1, 376) and in Persia (Morier, Second Journey, p. 61), though lead is also used in the latter country (Russell, 1, 366); but in  Egypt the kohl is a soot produced by burning either a kind of frankincense or the shells of almonds (Lane, 1, 61). The dye-stuff was moistened with oil, and kept in a small jar, which we may infer to have been made of horn, from the proper name Keren-happuch, “horn for paint” (Job 43:14). The probe with which it was applied was made either of wood, silver, or ivory, and had a blunted point. Both the probe and the jar have frequency been discovered in Egyptian tombs (Wilkinson, 2, 344). In addition to the passages referring to eye-paint already quoted from the Bible, we may notice probable allusions to the practice in Pro 6:25, and Isa 3:16, the term rendered “wanton” in the last passage bearing the radical sense of painted. The contrast between the black paint and the white of the eye led to the transfer of the term puk to describe the variegated stones used in the string courses of a handsome building (1Ch 29:2; A.V. “glistering stones,” lit. stones of eye-paint); and, again, the dark cement in which marble or other bright stones were imbedded (Isa 54:11; A.V. “I will lay thy stones with fair colors”). Whether the custom of staining the hands and feet, particularly the nails, now so prevalent in the East, was known to the Hebrews, is doubtful. The plant, henna, which is used for that purpose was certainly known (Son 1:14; A.V. “camphire”), and the expressions in Son 5:14 may probably refer to the custom (Smith). With reference to this custom of “painting the eyes” in the East, Thomson remarks: “The ladies blacken the eyelids and brows with kohl, and prolong the application in a decreasing pencil, so as to lengthen and reduce the eye in appearance to what is called almond shape. It imparts a peculiar brilliancy to the eye, and a languishing, amorous cast to the whole countenance. Brides are thus painted, and many heighten the effect by application to the cheeks of colored cosmetics. The powder from which the kohl is made is collected from burning almond- shells or frankincense, and is intensely black. Antimony and various ores of lead are also employed. The powder is kept in vials or pots, which are often disposed in a handsome cover or case; and it is applied to the eye by a small probe of wood or ivory, or silver, called meel, while the whole apparatus is called mukhuly” (Land and Book, 2, 184, 185); SEE EYE.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Shenandoah Co., Va., Feb. 14, 1795; graduated at Greenville College, Tenn.; studied divinity at the South- Western Theological Seminary, Maryville, Tenn.; was licensed by Marion  Presbytery Sept. 24, 1823, and ordained April 16, 1824. In addition to his labors as a minister, he taught school till 1832 in Wythe Co., Va. About that time he took charge of the congregation of Anchor and Hope and Draper Valley, and afterwards New Dublin, Va., and remained with these three churches till his death, Feb. 20,1863. Mr. Painter was a man of sterling worth and great personal influence. He was one of the pioneers of Presbyterianism in that part of Virginia. As such he practiced great self- denial in the work of the Master — his labors being constant and devoted in teaching and preaching. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 448. (J. L.S.)

## Painting[[@Headword:Painting]]

             We have no means of knowing what progress the art of painting made among the ancient Hebrews, as it is generally supposed that all pictures and images were forbidden by the Mosaic law (Lev 26:1; Num 33:52). In later times their principal houses were beautifully painted with vermilion (Jer 22:14). Among the ancient Assyrians this art appears to have been cultivated, as mention is made in Eze 23:14-15, of “men portrayed upon the wall, the images of the Chaldaeans portrayed with vermilion, girded with girdles upon their loins, exceeding in dyed attire upon their heads, all of them princes to look to.” This description of the interior of the Assyrian palaces completely corresponds with and illustrates tie monuments of Nimruid and Khorsabad, as brought to light by Mr. Layard. “The walls were of sun-dried bricks, and where they rose above the sculptured slabs they were covered with paintings.” SEE ASSYRIA. Among the Egyptians, from the employment of hieroglyphics, it is supposed that the art of the painter was generally associated with that of the scribe. The painter held his brush in one hand, and his palette or saucer of color in the other. From the representation given of two artists engaged on a painting, it will be observed that though the easel stands upright, they had no contrivance to support or steady the hand; hence the Egyptian painters appear to have been very careful in tracing their outlines with chalk, which they effaced if any imperfection were discovered. It is evident that the manufacture of images and painted toys was carried to a remarkable extent, as well as the decoration. of mummy-cases. Wilkinson gives the following account of the ancient art:  “Mention is made of an Egyptian painting by Herodotus, who tells us that Amasis sent a portrait of himself to Cyrene, probably on wood, and in profile; for the full face is rarely represented either in their paintings or bas- reliefs. The faces of the kings in the tombs and temples of Egypt are unquestionably portraits, but they are always in profile; and the only ones in full face are on wood, and of late time. Two of these are preserved in the British Museum, but they are evidently Greek, and date, perhaps, even after the conquest of Egypt by the Romans. It is therefore vain to speculate on the nature of their painting, or their skill in this branch of art; and though some of the portraits taken from the mummies may prove that encaustic painting with wax and naphtha was adopted in Egypt, the time when it was first known there is uncertain, nor can we conclude, from a specimen of Greek time, that the same was practiced in a Pharaonic age.

“Fresco painting was entirely unknown in Egypt; and the figures on, walls were always drawn and painted after the stucco was quite dry. But they sometimes coated the colors with. a transparent varnish, which was also done by the Greeks; and the wax said by the younger Pliny to have been used for this purpose on the painted exterior of a house at Stabia may have been a substitute for the usual varnish, which last would have been far more durable under a hot Italian sun.

“Pliny states, in his chapter on inventions, that Gyges, a Lydian, was the earliest painter in Egypt; and Eluchir, a cousin of Daedalus according to Aristotle, the first in Greece; or, as Theoprastus thinks, Polygnotus the Athenian. But the painting represented in Beni Hassan evidently dates before any of those artists. Pliny, in another place says, ‘The origin of painting is uncertain: the Egyptians pretend that it was invented by them 6000 years before it passed into Greece — a vain boast, as every one will allow. It must, however, be admitted that all the arts (however imperfect) were cultivated in Egypt long before Greece existed as a nation; and the remark he afterwards makes, that painting was unknown at the period of the Trojan war, call only be applied to the Greeks, as is shown by the same unquestionable authority at Beni Hassan, dating about 900 years before the time usually assigned to the taking of Troy.

“It is probable that the artists in Egypt who painted on wood were in higher estimation than mere decorators, as was the case in Greece, where ‘no artists, were in, repute but those who executed pictures on wood, for neither Ludius nor any other wall painter was of any renown.' The Greeks  preferred movable pictures, which could be taken away in case of fire, or sold if necessary; and, as Pliny says, ‘there was no painting on the walls of Apelles's house (or no painting by Apelles on the walls of a house). The painting and decoration of buildings was another and an inferior branch of art. The pictures were put up in temples, as the works of great masters in later times in churches; but they were not dedications, nor solely connected with sacred subjects and the temple was selected as the place of security, as it often was as a repository of treasure. They had also picture galleries in some secure place, as in the Acropolis of Athens.

“Outline figures on walls were in all countries the earliest style of painting; they were in the oldest temples of Latium; and in Egypt they preceded the more elaborate style, that was afterwards followed by bas-relief and intaglio. In Greece, during the middle period, which was that of the best art, pictures were painted on wood by the first artists, and Raoul-Rochette thinks that if any of them painted on walls, this was accidental; and the finest pictures, being on wood, were in after-times carried off to Rome. This removal was lamented by the Greeks as ‘a spoliation,' which having left the walls bare, accounts for Pausanias saying so little about pictures in Greece. Historical compositions were of course the highest branch of art, though many of the greatest Greek artists, who seem to have excelled in all styles, often treated inferior subjects, and some (as in later times) combined the two highest arts of sculpture and painting.

“In the infancy of art, figures were represented in profile; but afterwards they were rare in Greece; and art could not reach any degree of excellence until figures in a composition had ceased to be in profile; and it was only in order to conceal the loss of an eye that Apelles gave one side of the face in his portrait of Antigollus.

The oldest paintings were also, as Pliny admits, monochrome, or painted of one uniform color, like those of Egypt; and, indeed, statues in Greece were at first of one color, doubtless red like those of the Egyptians, Romans, and Etruscans. For not only bas-reliefs were painted, which, as parts of a colored building, was a necessity, but statues also; and as art advanced they were made to resemble real life. For that statue by Scopas, of a Bacchante, with a disemboweled fawn, whose cadaverous hue contrasted with the rest, at once shows that it was painted, and not of a monochrome color; and the statues of Praxiteles, painted for him by Nicias, would not have been preferred by that sculptor to his other works if they had merely been  stained red. The blue eyes of Minerva's statue; the inside of her shield painted by Pannaeus, and the outside by Phidias (originally a painter himself), could only have been parts of the whole colored figure; Pannaeus assisted in painting the statue of Olympian Jupiter: and ivory statues were said to have been prevented turning yellow by the application of color.

“If the artists of Greece did not paint on walls, it was not from any mistaken pride, since even the greatest of them would paint statues not of their own work; and those in modern days who study decorative art will do well to remember that to employ superior taste in ornamental composition is no degradation, and that the finest specimens of decorative work in the Middle Ages were executed by the most celebrated artists.” Anc. Egyptians, 2, 277 sq. For a detailed account of Greek and Roman painting, as an art, see Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. SEE COLOR; SEE PICTURE.

## Painting The Eyes[[@Headword:Painting The Eyes]]

             or rather the eyelids, is more than once alluded to in Scripture, although this scarcely appears in the Authorized Version, as our translators, unaware of the custone, usually render "eye" by "face," although eye is still preserved in the margin. So Jezebel "painted her eyes," literally "put her eyes in paint," before she showed herself publicly (2Ki 9:30). This action is forcibly expressed by Jeremiah (Jer 4:30), "Though thou rentest thine eyes with painting." Ezekiel (Eze 23:40) also represents this as a part of high dress: "For whom thou didst wash thyself, paintedst thy eyes, and deckedst thyself with ornaments." The custom is also, very possibly, alluded to in Pro 6:25 : "Lust not after her beauty in thine heart, neither let her take thee with her eyelids." It certainly is the impression in Western Asia that this embellishment adds much to the languishing expression and seducement of the eyes, although Europeans find some difficulty in appreciating the beauty which the Orientals find in this adornment. (See Hartmann's Hebraerim, 2:149 sq.)

The following description of the process is from Lane's Modern Egyptians (1:41-43): "The eyes, with very few exceptions, are black, large, and of a long almond form, with long and beautiful lashes, and an exquisitely soft, bewitching expression: eyes more beautiful can hardly be conceived: their charming effect is much heightened by the concealment of the other features (however pleasing the latter may be), and is rendered still more striking by a practice universal among the females of the higher and middle classes, and very common among those of the lower orders, which is that of blackening the edge of the eyelids, both above and below the eyes, with a black powder called kohl. This is a collyrium, commonly composed of the smoke-black which is produced by burning a kind of libam — an aromatic resin — a species of frankincense, used, I am told, in preference to the better kind of frankincense, as being cheaper and equally good for the purpose. Kohl is also prepared of the smokeblack produced from burning the shells of almonds. These two kinds, though believed to be beneficial to the eyes, are used merely for ornament; but there are several kinds used for  their real or supposed medical properties, particularly the powder of several kinds of lead ore, to which are often added sarcocolla, long pepper, sugar-candy, fine dust of a Venetian sequin, and sometimes powdered pearls. Antimony, it is said, was formerly used for painting the edges of the eyelids. The kohl is applied with a small probe of wood, ivory, or silver, tapering towards the end, bit blunt: this is moistened, sometimes with rose- water, then dipped in the powder and drawn along the edges of the eyelids: it is called mirwed; and the glass vessel in which the kohl is kept, mulholah. The custom of thus ornamenting the eyes prevailed among both sexes in Egypt in very ancient times: this is shown by the sculptures and paintings in the temples and tombs of this country; and kohl-vessels, with the probes, and even with the remains of the black powder, have often been found in the ancient tombs. I have two in my possession. But, in many cases, the ancient mode of ornamenting with the kohl was a little different from the modern. I have, however, seen this ancient mode practiced in the present day in the neighborhood of Cairo, though I only remember to have noticed it in two instances. The same custom existed among the Greek ladies, and among the Jewish women in early times."

Sir J.G.Wilkinson alludes to this passage in Mr. Lane's book, and admits that the lengthened form of the ancient Egyptian eye, represented in the paintings, was'probably produced by this means. "Such," he adds, "is the effect described by Juvenal (Sat. 2:93), Pliny (Eph 6:2), and other writers who notice the custom among the Romans. At Rome it was considered disgraceful for men to adopt it, as at present in [most parts of] the East, except medicinally; but, if we may judge from the similarity of the eyes of men and women in the paintings at Thebes, it appears to have been used by both sexes among the ancient Egyptians. Many of the kohl-bottles have been found in the tombs, together with the bodkin used for applying the moistened powder. They are of various materials, usually of stone, wood, or pottery; sometimes composed of two, sometimes of three or four separate cells, apparently containing each a mixture, differing slightly in its quality and hue from the other three. Many were simple round tubes, vases, or small boxes; some were ornamented with the figure of an ape or monster, supposed to assist in holding the bottle between his arms, while the lady dipped into it the pin with which she painted her eyes; and others were in imitation of a column made of stone, or rich porcelain of the choicest manufacture" (Ancient Egyptians, 3:382). SEE PAINT.

## Painting, Christian[[@Headword:Painting, Christian]]

             The first law which governed the early Christian sculptors and painters was to present Christ as the source and center of their life, and so to depict him that other figures in their compositions should appear like rays emanating from him. With respect to the contents and spirit of representation, it may be said that, during the entire period of early Christian art, both sculpture and painting were, for the most part, limited to symbolical expression. In the beginning, symbolical representations were alone permitted. Soon, however, the art impulse partially broke away from these fetters; yet art still remained a sort of biblia pauperum, and served chiefly as a mere reminder of the themes of sacred history. Even at a later period, when works of art were employed in multitudes for church decorations, Biblical  scenes, especially from the Apocalypse, were still preferred. As early as the 4th century we find a portrait-like representation of sacred personages accompanying these forms of artistic symbolism. It was even believed that veritable portraits of Christ, the Madonna, and the Apostles, existed in paintings from the hand of St. Luke, and in. sculpture from that of Nicodemus, in the napkin of St. Veronica, yea, even in the so-called ἀχειροποιήτοις ("likenesses of celestial origin").

In the first third of the early Christian period, from, the 3d century to the second half of the 5th century, of which numerous works of art in the so- called cemeteries (catacombs of Rome, Naples, Syracuse, etc.) have been preserved, painting still maintained the ancient plastic method of representation (as may be seen also in the paintings in the cemeteries, in the mosaics of Santa Costanza and Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome, San Giovanni in Fonte, and San Nazario e Celso at Ravenna). In the second third, till the 8th century, painting sought more and more to adapt the antique forms to the idealistic, transcendental spirit of Christianity, as may be seen from the mosaics of Santa Pudentiana and Santi Cosma e Damiano at Rome, of San Appollinare Nuovo, San Appollinare in Classe, and San Vitale at Ravenna, and some miniatures. After the 8th century, painting, and in fact, the entire art of early Christianity, lapsed into a continually deepening decline, till the 11th century, as may be seen in the mosaics of San Prassede, San Marco, and others in Rome, and miniatures of various manuscripts, and the Iconostasis (q.v.) of Greek and Russian churches.

With the new life which the 11th century ushered in in Western Christendom, architecture reached not only the climax of its own development, but also asserted a decided preponderance over sculpture and painting. One spirit and one life prevailed in all three of the sister-arts. The newly awakened art impulse developed itself in the North, especially in Germany, much later in Italy. Here the earliest movement took place in the 12th century, and the following century had been ushered in before the first endeavors were made by single artists of lesser rank to blend the Byzantine style with the ancient Italian, and thus to infuse new life into the old Christian types. The "Romanesque" style of painting first reached completeness in Giovanni Cimabue and in Duccio di Boninsegna of Sienna (fl. about 1282). On this wise there grew up two schools of painting — that of Florence and that of Sienna; the Florentine of a severer type, approaching nearer to the early Christian (Byzantine), the Siennese characterized more by tenderness and sentiment, more independent, and  likewise more graceful in the rendering of form. These two masters were followed by Giotto di Bondone of Florence (1276-1336), known under the title of "the father of Italian painting," but in fact only the founder of the Gothic style of painting. He was a bold reformer, and broke through the traditions of art and servile adherence to the early Christian types. The best pupils of Giotto were Taddeo Gaddi, and his son, Angelo Gaddi, Giottino, Orcagna, Spinello, Aretino, Antonio Veneziano, and others.

In Germany, the beginnings of the Romanesque style may be traced back to the 11th century. An improvement is manifest in the 12th century, especially in the famous altar of Verdun (of the year 1180, now in the monastery of Neuburg, near Vienna), in the mural paintings of the grand hall of the monastery of Brauweiler, near Cologne, and the ceiling of the central aisle of St. Michael, at Hildesheim. Far more numerous and important are the works still preserved from the period of the Gothic style, in which the peculiar spirit of mediaevalism first attained to complete artistic expression. The development of glass-painting must especially be noted — probably a German invention, dating at the end of the 10th century — examples of which are seen in the windows of St. Cunibert, at Cologne, in the choir of Cologne Cathedral, in the Church of St. Catharine, at Oppenheim, and in Strasburg Cathedral. In easel pictures, which previously appear to have been very little painted, there is manifest no higher artistic endeavor until the middle of the 14th century. After this three separate schools may be distinguished:

1. The Bohemian, or school of Prague, founded by Charles IV;

2. The Nuremberg school, the chief representative monuments of which are several altar-shrines in the Frauenkirche, in St. Laurence, and St. Sebald, at Nuremberg;

3. The school of Cologne, by far the most important, whose chief representatives were master Wilhelm (about 1360) and master Stephan Lochner (about 1430).

With the beginning of the 15th century broke forth, in opposition to the spirit of mediaevalism, a decided endeavor after greater truth of expression in art an endeavor in light, color, drawing, and composition, to bring the spiritual import of representation into harmony with the laws and principles of nature. This naturalistic development first manifested itself in Italy in the Florentine school. Fra Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole (1387-1455), although  in other respects wholly dominated by the spirit of mediaevalism, was, nevertheless, the first who sought to penetrate into the psychological meaning of the human countenance. Over against him, already decidedly emancipated from mediaevalism, stands Tommaso di San Giovanni da Castel, called Masaccio (1401-28), one of the greatest masters of the 15th century. With Fra Angelico are associated the names of Benozzo Gozzoli and Gentile da Fabriano; with Masaccio those of Fra Filippo Lippi, his son Filippino, Domenico Ghirlandajo, and Bastiano Mainardi. Other Florentine artists, as Antonio Pallajuolo and Andrea del Verocchio, who were also sculptors, strove by anatomical studies to transfer plastic forms to painting in a more vigorous modelling of the human figure; while Luca Signorelli of Cortona (1440-1521), by the nobleness and artistic truth of his compositions, presents a strong contrast with the deeper sentiment of the Umbrian school, which, with its chief theatre in the vicinity of Assisi, is an antithesis of the Florentine. Celebrated masters of the Umbrian school were Pietro Perugino (1446-1526), the teacher of Raphael, and the latter's father, Giovanni Santi (died 1494), as well as Raphael's friend, Francesco Francia (died 1517). The remaining schools of Italy, as the Venetian, with its Giovanni Bellini (about 1430-1516), the school of Padua and Mantua, with masters like Francesco Squarcione and Andrea Mantegna (1431- 1506), follow the Florentine.

Italian painting reached its climax in the 16th century. The most celebrated masters of that period were Leonardo da Vinci, Cesare da Sesto, Andrea Salaino, Francesco Melzi, and especially Luini. The Venetian school of the 16th century sought to realize by means of color the noble results to which Leonardo had attained. In the quality of color this school achieved a supremacy over all others. Its chief master was Titian. With him labored the distinguished pupils of Giorgione-Fra Sebastiano del Piombo, Giacopo Palma, called Il Vecchio, and Pordenone. Among Titian's own pupils the most distinguished was Jacopo Robusti, called Tintoretto. In the renowned Paul Veronese, we have a master of color of the highest rank. The principal seat of the Lombard school in the 16th century was Parma. Its chief master was Correggio. The Florentine school, and, later, almost the entire painting of Italy after the beginning of the 16th century, were ruled by Michael Angelo, and by such lesser lights as Ricciarelli, Venusti, Sarto, and others. The greatest of the five great masters is Raphael. His best pupils were Giulio Romano (1492-1546), Gaudenzio Ferrari, and Giovanni da Udine.  In the Netherlands a new impulse was given to Christian painting by Hubert van Eyck (died 1426), the inventor, or, rather, the improver, of oil painting, and his younger brother and pupil, John van Eyck (died 1441). Their principal pupils were Pieter Christus, Rogier van der Weyden, and particularly Hans Memling. The influence thus begun made itself felt ill Holland, where a similar school was founded, whose chief masters were Lucas van Leyden, and his contemporary Jan Mostaert. At the beginning of the 16th century a number of artists followed the style of the Van Eycks. The most distinguished of these was Quintin Massys, the smith of Antwerp (died 1529).

Similar was the career of German art during this period. The Gothic style had a long supremacy; but about the middle of the 15th century all the German schools followed the Italian. The chief masters of this period were, in the school of Cologne, Johann von Mehlem, the painter of the Death of the Virgin.; in the school of Westphalia, the master of Liesborn monastery; in the school of Ulm and Augsburg, Martin Schin (about 1480), the somewhat younger: Bartholomatus Zeitblom, and his successor, Martin Schaffner, of Ulm, and Hans Holbein, father of the renowned Holbein the younger, of Augsburg; in the school of Nuremberg, Michael Wohlgemuth (1434-1519), and more especially his pupil Albrecht Durer. Mention must also be made of the Saxon school, whose head was the well known Lucas Cranach (1472-1553), the friend of Luther, whose best pupils were his sons, John and Lucas Cranach the younger. The only artist who can be compared with the great master of Nuremberg is Hans Holbein the younger (1497-1554). His most characteristic works are the Darmstadt MadoInna, a copy of which is at Dresden, and his well-known Dance of Death. In the second half of the 16th century the painting of Germany and the Netherlands lost its independence by servile imitation of Italian masters. But in Italy, too, we find a sudden decline, which clearly evidences that art had passed its zenith. A second race of pupils became mere imitators, even exaggerating the onesidedness of Titian, Correggio, and Michael Angelo.

The best examples of these so-called "mannerists" were Fr. Salviati, and Giorgio Vasari. In opposition to this confusion, at the end of the century arose the Bolognese school of the Caraccis, whose advent marks for Italy the commencement of the fourth period of modern painting. Ludovico Caracci, and his nephews and pupils, Agostino and Annibale Caracci, established a sort of eclectic system, whose purpose it was to imitate the chief distinguishing qualities of the five great masters of painting. Their  best pupils were Domenichino (15811641), Guercino (1590-1666), Franc. Albani (1578-1660), and especially Guido Reni (1575-1642), the, most distinguished of all. A second school of Italian, painting arraying itself in opposition to the idealism of the great masters, and developing a one-sided realism and naturalism, was founded in the beginning of the 17th century. Its principal representative was Mic. Angelo.Amerighi da Caravaggio, whose pupils, the two Frenchmen, Moyse Valentin :and Simon Vonet, and the eminent Spanish master, Gius. Ribero, called Spagnoletto, transplanted their influence to France and Spain. Notwithstanding the eminent talents exercised to uphold the fame of Italian painting, yet in the 18th century it reached its lowest level of decadence. It was in Spain that the new revival of catholicism in art found, in the 17th century, its strongest support. The five great masters who represent the completest development of painting in Spain were almost all from the school of Seville. They were: 1. Jose Ribera; 2. Francesco Zurhbaran (1598-1662); 3. Diego Velasquez da Silva (15991660), one of the most eminent of portrait-painters; 4. Alonzo Cano; 5. Bartolome Murillo. The flourishing period of Spanish painting was of short duration; and in the last quarter of the 17th century the schools of Spain degenerated into mere factories of art, such as Luca Giordano of Italy introduced.

In the Netherlands, painting maintained a certain elevation of rank for a somewhat longer period. Here two distinct schools, that of Brabant (Belgium) and that of Holland, developed themselves out of national divisions. The former had its masters in Peter Paul Rubens, and in his pupils, viz. Jac. Jordaens, Caspar de Crayer, and, above all, Aniton van Dyck (1599-1641). The latter was represented by Theodor de Keyser, Franz Hals, Barth, Van der Helst, and others, who. were almost exclusively portrait-painters. A far higher development was, however, reached in the famous Rembrandt, whose most distinguished pupils and successors were Gerbrandt van der Eeckhout, Solomon Koning, and Ferdinand Bol.

France and Germany can claim no position of importance during this period in a brief review of Christian painting. In Germany, the Thirty Years' Wai had nearly uprooted all elements of culture, and when, in the 18th century, the country began to recover from these devastations, masters of only subordinate rank, as Balth, Denner, Dietrich; and Raphael Mengs (172879), appeared upon the stage. In France, the older and better masters, like Nic. Poussin, Eustache Lesueur, and others, strove in vain to make head against the theatrical style represented by Charles Lebrun, the  fat vorite of Louis XIV. Since the diffusion over, Europe of. that immoral and irreligious spirit which preceded and. followed the French Revolution, Christian painting has liaturally experienced a marked decline. But in Germany, France, and Belgium individual schools. have again grown up, the excellences of which, in the appreciation of the grand and the beautiful, cannot be denied. In Germany, Munich, Disseldorf, Berlin, and of late Vienna, must be mentioned as the principal seats of revived painting, in which sacred themes occupy a most significant place, and these treated both in a Catholic and a Protestant spirit, the former by Cornelius, Overbeck, Fiirich, H. Hess, Schraudolp, and others; the latter by Lessing, Hiibner, Bendemann, Deger, Von Gebhardt, and others. On the whole, however, modern, religious painting, corresponding to the religious condition of the present time, seems partly a mere endeavor to revive a greatness and power which has perished, and partly a blind effort to reach a new goal, which is still enshrouded in darkness.

The best modern works on the history of Christiait painting are, Kugler, Handbuch der. Geschichte der Malerei seit Constantin. dem Grossen (2d ed. Berlin, 1847; 4th ed. by Liibke, 1872); Ch. Blanc, Histoire des Pein- tres de Toutes les Ecales depvlis la Renaissance jusque nos Jours (Paris, 1851 sq.); W. Lubke, Geschichte deritalienischen Malerei voum 4. bis 16. Jahrhundert (8th ed. Stuttgart, 1880); A. Woltmann, Geschichte der Malerei (Leipsic, 1878; Engl. transl. Lond. and N.Y. 1881); Ruskin, Modern. Painters (Lond. 1843-60, 5 volumes); Crowe and Cavalcaselle, Storia della Pittura in Italia dal Secole II al Secolo X VI (Florence, 1875); the art. Malerei in Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop.; and Peinture in Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Paisiello, Giovanni[[@Headword:Paisiello, Giovanni]]

             an eminent Italian composer, who wrote both secular and Church music, was born at Taranto in 1741. He received his musical education in the Conservatorio St. Onofrio at Naples, under the guidance of the celebrated musician Durante. Of Paisiello's earlier works none are of special interest to us, as they were principally of a secular character. Some of his best works, among which is II Barbiere de Seviglia, were written during an eight years' residence at St. Petersburg. At Vienna he composed twelve symphonies for a large orchestra, and the opera buffa II Re Teodoro. Between 1785 and 1799 he produced a number of operas for the Neapolitan theatre, and was appointed by Ferdinand IV his Maestro di Capella. In consequence of having accepted under the revolutionary government the office of national director of music, he was suspended from his functions for two years after the restoration of royalty, but eventually restored to them. In 1802 he went to Paris to direct the music of the consular chapel, and while in that position wrote a Te Deum for Napoleon's coronation. The indifferent reception shortly after given to his opera of Prosepine led him to return to Naples, where he died in 1816. His compositions are characterized by sweetness and gracefulness of melody and simplicity of structure. Besides no fewer than ninety operas, instrumental quartets, harpsichord sonatas, and concertos, he composed masses, requiems, cantatas, an oratorio, and a highly praised funeral march in honor of General Hoche. See Dhoron et Fayolle, Dictionnaire  Historique des Musiciens, s.v.; Quatremere de Quincy, Notices sur Paisiello; Fetis, Biogiraphie Universelle des Musiciens,

## Pajon, Claude[[@Headword:Pajon, Claude]]

             a noted French Protestant divine, celebrated as an apologist of the new doctrines, but also distinguished as somewhat alien to orthodox teachings was born at Remorantin, in Low Blesois, in 1626. Belonging to a family which had early and fervently embraced the Reformed theology, Claude Pajon was educated with great care in order that he might prove faithful to the good cause, and when he decided to enter the work of the ministry he was sent to the theological school at Saumur, where, under Amyraut, Placaeus, and Capellus, he prepared for his life-work. In 1650 he was made pastor at Marchenoir, and he held that place until 1666, when he was called to a professorship in divinity at his alma mater, as successor of the much- distinguished Amyraut (q.v.). That good man held heterodox views on the Caivinistic doctrines of predestination and grace. Pajon in like manner stirred up considerable agitation by his peculiar views on these subjects. He denied the immediate concursus in providence, and the direct influence of the Holy Spirit in conversion. The gracious influence of the Holy Spirit he held to be so intimately united with the efficacy of the Word that there was no possibility of an immediate influence of the Spirit upon the heart; that its influence was principally upon the understanding, through the medium of the Scriptures and the whole course of a man's life. These views, which were proclaimed against by the extreme Calvinists as Pelagianism, brought him into disrepute, and he felt compelled to resign his professorship. In 1668 he accepted a call as pastor to the Protestant Church at Orleans; but, as he continued to advocate his heterodox teachings, he encountered the combined opposition of the leading theologians of the French Protestant Church, and was subjected to much annoyance and severe treatment. By the influence of Jurieu and others, several synods were held to consider his heretical dogmas, and, in spite of many friends who rallied to his defence and support, he was condemned by the synods, first in 1677, and at several synods following. The Academy of Sedan also condemned his doctrines, and that without a hearing; and when he desired to defend himself, the privilege was denied him on the ground that he only wished an opportunity to propagate is heresy. Pajon died Sept. 27, 1695, at Carre, near Orleans. His views found advocates, and Pajonism is not an extinct heresy in our day. The origin of the heresy, we think, is easily accounted for. The French  Church had originally adopted the unmodified Calvinistic predestination dogma. Many of the thinking minds of the French Protestant Church sought for a milder doctrine more in harmony with a commonsense interpretation of the Scriptures. Consequently there arose contentions and divisions in the French Church as far back as the opening of the 17th century. John Cameron, the Scotch professor of divinity at Sedan, and later at Saumur, advocated a moderated scheme of election, and it is therefore not particularly wonderful that the French theologians Amyraut, Placaeus, and Pajon should have tried their skilful hand in the pruning of a tree whose fruit the masses would not relish as it first came to them. SEE PREDESTINATION. Among the ablest advocates of Pajonism were Isaac Papin (q.v.), Lenfant, Alix, Du Vidal, and many others. Of the fifty works which Pajon composed, he published only three: Sermon on 2Co 3:17 (Saumur, 1666), the doctrines of which were more clearly set forth by Isaac Papin under the name of Pajonism. — An Examination of the Legal Precedents (of P. Nicole) (q.v.) (Orleans, 1673, 2 vols.); an excellent defence of the Protestant faith against the Romanists: — Remarks on the Pastoral Call (Amsterdam, 1685). The doctrinal views of Pajon were especially answered with ability from the Reformed side by Claude and Jurieu, Traite de Ta Nature et de la Grace, ou de Concours general de la Providence, et du Concours particulier de Grace effcace, contre les nouvelles hypotheses de M. P. [ajon] et de ses Disciples (Utrecht, 1687); also by Leydecker and Spanhelm: from the Lutheran side by Val. Ernest: Lischer (Exercitatio Theol. de Claudii Pajonii ejusque Sectator bus quos Pajonistas: vocant Doctrina et Fatis [Lips. 1692]). On the relation between his individual opinion and the general dogmatic system of the Reformed Church, and on its significance in the Reformed theology, see Zeller's Theol. Jahrb. 1852, 1853; Schweizer, Centraldogmen, ii, 564 sq.; Ebrard, Dognatik, vol. i, § 43; Gass, Dogmengesch. ii, 359 sq.; Dorner, Gesch. d. prot. Theol. p. 448 sq.; Frank, Gesch. d. prot. Theol. ii, 49 sq. See also Schriickh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref 7:722 sq.; De Chaufepie, Dictionnaire historigue, s.v.; Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 10:775-778. Pajon, Louis-Esaie, a member of the same family, was born May 21,1725, at Paris, and died July 24, 1796,. at Berlin. He served the French churches of Leipsic and of Berlin, and became a counsellor of the consistory. He edited Beausobre's Hist. of the Reformation, and translated the Moral Lessons of Gellert (Leips. 1772, 2 vols.). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Pajonism[[@Headword:Pajonism]]

             SEE PAJON, CLAUDE.

## Pakington, Dorothy[[@Headword:Pakington, Dorothy]]

             a learned English authoress, who wrote much on practical religious topics, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. She was the daughter of lord Coventry and wife of Sir John Pakington. She died in 1679. She was highly esteemed by her contemporaries for her piety and virtues. She wrote, The Gentleman's Calling: — The Lady's Calling (Oxf. 1675, 8vo): — The Government of the Tongue:— The Christian's Birthright: — The Causes of the Decay of Christian Piety: — The Art of Contentment (edited by Pridden, 1841, fcp. 8vo). At the time of her death she was employed on a work entitled The Government of the Thoughts. This lady is one of the many to whom has been ascribed also the authorship of The Whole Duty of Man. Dr. Hicks, in the dedication of his Anglo Saxon Grammar to Sir John Pakington, favors this impression, and Sir James Mackintosh (Edinb. Revelation 14, 4, n.) adopts this theory. The subject is treated at some length in the article “Hawkins, W. B.” in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2, 803.

## Pakkuoth[[@Headword:Pakkuoth]]

             SEE GOURD.

## Pakuda, Bachja Ben-Joseph, Ibn[[@Headword:Pakuda, Bachja Ben-Joseph, Ibn]]

             a noted Jewish moralist, lived between A.D. 1050 and 1100. Nothing is known of his personal history, not even when and where he was born, nor how and where he was educated. But he is distinguished as the author of a work in Arabic, known in Hebrew under the name of הִלְּבָבות חוֹבוֹת, The Duties of the Heart, an ethical treatise, written in a kind of poetical prose, but considered as a poem more on account of its sublimity of style and language than for its actual versification. This work, in which “more stress is laid on internal morality than on mere legality,” was translated twice into Hebrew, by Joseph Kimchi (q.v.) and by rabbi Jehuda ben- Samuel ibn-Tibbon (q.v.), and afterwards into several other languages, and has found its way into almost every Jewish library. In Bachja's system there is no poetry, no idealism, no theosophy.

He is the lawyer and judge, the practical jurist, to whom man and his happiness, here and hereafter, are the  objects of philosophical speculation. He is orthodox without an exception, in theology as well as in the acknowledgment of the Jewish sources, viz. the Bible and tradition, neither of which he subjects to any criticism. But he adds to these two sources of information a third, viz. reason, which he places at the head, and thus, by means of reason, Scripture, and tradition, he seeks to demonstrate “that the performance of spiritual duties is not a mere supererogatory addition to that piety which is manifested in obedience to law, but is the foundation of all laws.” As a poet, Bachja is especially famed for a poem on “Self-examination,” בִּקָּשָׁה, or שַׁיר תּוֹכָחָה; also called from its initial בָּרְכַי נִפְשַׁי, generally appended to the editions of the Choboth ha-Lebaboth, and written in the style of the Arabic Malkazimi , or rhymes without metre. This poem has been translated into Italian by Ascaralli and Alatrini, into German by Sachs and M. E. Stern, and into English by the Rev. M. Jastrow in the Jewish Index (Phila. 1872, Oct. and Nov.). Whether Bachja lived before, after, or at the same time with Ibn-Gebirol (q.v.) is not fully ascertained; but he never mentions Gebirol or any of his books, which some take as a proof that he lived before Gebirol. See Gratz, Geschichte d. Juden, 6:43 sq.; Braunschweiger, Geschichte d. Juden in den roman. Staaten, p. 51 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, ii, 412 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Judaica, i, 76 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei (German transl. by Hamburger), p. 54 sq.; Jellinek, Introduction to the Chobot ha-Lebaboth (Leipsic, 1849); Stern, Germ. Transl. of the Chobot ha-Lebaboth, with exeg. annotations (Vienna, 1866); Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, 1, 418, 420, 426; Munk, Esquisse historique de la Philosophie chez les Juifs; Sachs, b Religiose Poesie der ,uden in Spanien, p. 63 sq., 273 sq.; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebr. Literature, p. 247 sq.; Finn, Sephardim, p. 177; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, p. 61; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 290; Wise, Lecture on Bachja (in The Israelite [Cincinnati], Dec. 1872); Zunz, Literaturgeschichte der synagogalen Poesie, p. 201; the same, Additamenta ad Catal. codd. Hebr. Bibl. Sen. civ. (Lips.), p. 318; Eisler, Vorlesungen fiber die jidischen Philosophen des oMittelalters (Vienna, 1876), 1, 43 sq.; but especially Kaufmann, Die Theologie des Bachja ibn- Pakudah (ibid. 1874). (B. P.)

## Pal, Krishnu[[@Headword:Pal, Krishnu]]

             the first Christian convert at Serampore, in India, forsook the faith of his fathers late in the last century, and became a native Christian minister. He  made many converts, lived a devoted Christian life, and died peacefully and triumphantly in Christ. He is principally known to the Christian world as the author of the beautiful hymn beginning “O thou, my soul, forget no more;” translated by Joshua Marshman in 1801. (S. S.)

## Palace[[@Headword:Palace]]

             (the rendering in the A.V. usually of אִרְמוֹן, armon [הִרְמוֹן, ha.rmn, Amo 4:3], a castle, as rendered only in Pro 18:19; and uniformly of בַּירָה, birah, a citadel, 1Ch 29:1; 1Ch 29:19; so in Nehemiah, Ezra, Esther, and Daniel; but prop. of הֵיכָל, heykal, 1Ki 21:1; 2Ki 20:18; Psa 45:8; Psa 45:15; Psa 144:12; Pro 30:28; Isa 13:22; Isa 39:7; Dan 1:4; Nah 2:6; the Chald. הֵיכִל, heykdl, Ezr 4:14; Dan 4:4; Dan 4:29; Dan 6:18, a regal edifice, esp. the temple of Jehovah, as elsewhere rendered; less prop. of אִפֶּדֶן, appeden, a fortress, Daniel 1:45; טַירָה, tirah, Son 8:9; Eze 25:4; a castle, as elsewhere chiefly; also בַּיתָן, bithadn, a large house, Est 1:5; Est 7:7-8; and בֵּית, beth, a house, in certain combinations; in the N.T. αὐλή, Mat 26:3; Mat 26:58; Mat 26:69; Mar 14:54; Mar 14:64; Luk 11:21; Joh 18:15, a court or hall, as elsewhere sometimes rendered; πραιτώριον, Php 1:13. the prcetorium [q.v.], as rendered in Mar 15:16), in Scripture, denotes what is contained within the outer enclosure of the royal residence, including all the buildings, courts, and gardens (2Ch 36:19; comp. Psa 48:4; Psa 122:7; Pro 9:3; Pro 18:19; Isa 23:13; Isa 25:2; Jer 22:14; Amo 1:7; Amo 1:12; Amo 1:14; Nah 2:6). In the N; T. the term palace (αὐλή) is applied to the residence of a man' of rank (Mat 26:3; Mar 14:66; Luk 11:21; Joh 18:15). The specific allusions are to the palace built by Herod, which was afterwards occupied by the Roman governors, and was the praetorium, or hall, which formed the abode of Pilate when Christ was brought before him (Mar 15:16): the other passages above cited, except Luk 11:21, refer to the residence of the high-priest.

The particulars which have been given under the head HOUSE SEE HOUSE (q.v.) require only to be aggrandized to convey a suitable idea of a palace; for the general arrangements and distribution of parts are the same in the palace as in the house, save that the courts are more numerous. and  with more distinct appropriations, the buildings more extensive, and the materials more costly. The palace of the kings of Judah in Jerusalem was that built by Solomon, thought by most interpreters to be the same with that called “the house of the forest of Lebanon,” of which some particulars are given in 1Ki 7:1-12; and if that passage be read along with the description which Josephus gives of the same pile (Ant. v, 5), a faint idea may be formed of it, as a magnificent collection of buildings in adjoining courts, connected with and surrounded by galleries and colonnades. To the same Jewish historian we are also indebted for an account of Herodis palace, doubtless drawn from personal knowledge (War, v, 4:4). The two buildings apparently occupied the same site, namely, the eminence of Zion, doubtless immediately adjoining and including the castle of David, or the present citadel of the metropolis. SEE JERUSALEM.

“There are few tasks, more difficult or puzzling than the attempt to restore an ancient building of which we possess nothing but two verbal descriptions; and these difficulties are very much enhanced when one account is written in a language like Hebrew, the scientific terms in which are, from our ignorance, capable of the widest latitude of interpretation; while the other, though written in a language of which we have a more definite knowledge, was composed by a person who never could have seen the buildings he was describing. Notwithstanding this, the palace which Solomon occupied himself in erecting during the thirteen years after he had finished the Temple is a building of such world-wide notoriety that it cannot be without interest to the Biblical student, and that those who have made a special study of the subject, and who are familiar with the arrangements of Eastern palaces, should submit their ideas on the subject; and it is also important that our knowledge on this, as on all other matters connected with the Bible, should be brought down to the latest date. Almost all the restorations of this celebrated edifice which are found in earlier editions of the Bible are what may be called Vitruvian, viz. based on the principles of classical architecture, which Were the only ones known to their authors. During the earlier part of this century attempts were made to introduce the principles of Egyptian design into these restorations, but with even less success. The Jews hated Egypt and all that it contained, and everything they did, or even thought, was antagonistic to the arts and feelings of that land of bondage. [Nevertheless it is certain that the Temple  (q.v.) was in a large measure a copy of many of the Egyptian structures which remain to this day.] On the other hand, the exhumation of the palaces of Nineveh (q.v.), and the more careful examination of those at Persepolis, have thrown a flood of light on the subject. Many expressions which before were entirely unintelligible are now clear and easily understood, and, if we cannot yet explain everything, we know at least where to look for analogies, and what was the character, even if we cannot predicate the exact form, of the buildings in question.” “Although incidental mention is made of other palaces at Jerusalem and elsewhere, they are all of subsequent ages, and built under the influence of Roman art, and therefore not so interesting to the Biblical student as this. Besides, none of them are anywhere so described as to enable their disposition or details to be made out with the same degree of clearness, and no instruction would be conveyed by merely reiterating the rhetorical flourishes in which Josephus indulges when describing them; and no other place is described in the Bible itself so as to render its elucidation indispensable in such an article as the present.” SEE ARCHITECTURE.

1. The following is substantially the reconstruction of Solomon's famous palace as proposed by Fergusson in his Handbook of Architecture, p. 202. It is impossible, of course, to be at all certain what was either the form or the exact disposition of such a palace, but, as we, have the dimensions of the three principal buildings given in the book of Kings, and confirmed by Josephus, we may, by taking these as a scale, ascertain pretty nearly that the building covered somewhere about 150,000 or 160,000 square feet. Less would not suffice for the accommodation specified, and more would not be justified, either from the accounts we have, or the dimensions of the citys in which it was situated. Whether it was a square of 400 feet each way, or an oblong of about 550 feet by 300, as represented in the annexed diagram (fig. 1), must always be more or less a matter of conjecture. The form here adopted seems to suit better not only the exigencies of the site, but the known disposition of the parts.

(a.) The principal building situated within the palace was, as in all Eastern palaces, the great hall of state and audience; here called the “House of the Forest of Lebanon.” Its dimensions were 100 cubits, or  150 feet long, by half that, or 75 feet in width. According to the Bible (1Ki 7:2) it had “four rows of cedar pillars, with cedar beams upon the pillars;” but it is added in the next verse that “it was covered with cedar above the beams that lay on 45 pillars, 15 in a row.” This would be easily explicable if the description stopped there, and so Josephus took it. He evidently considered the hall, as he afterwards described the Stoa basilica of the Temple, as consisting, of four rows of columns, three standing free, but the fourth built into the outer wall (Ant. 11:5); and his expression that the ceiling of the palace hall was in the Corinthian manner (Ant. 7:5, 2) does not mean that it was of that order, which was not then invented, but after the fashion of what was called in his day a Corinthian cecus, viz. a hall with a clerestory. If we, like Josephus, are contented with these indications, the section of the hall was certainly as shown in fig. 2, A. But the Bible goes on to say (1Ki 7:4) that “‘there were windows in three rows, and light was against light in three ranks,” and in the next verse it repeats, “and light was against light in three ranks.” Josephus escapes the difficulty by saying it was lighted by θυρώμασι τριγλύφοις, or by windows in three divisions, which might be taken as an extremely probable description if the Bible were not so very specific regarding it; and we may therefore adopt some such arrangement as that shown in fig. 2 B. In short, Fergusson suggests a clerestory, to which he thinks Josephus refers, and shows the three rows of columns which the Bible description requires. Besides the clerestory, there was on this theory a range of openings under the cornice of the walls, and then a range of open doorways, which would thus make the three openings required by the Bible description. In a hotter climate the first arrangement (fig. 2, A) would be the more probable; but on a site so exposed and occasionally so cold as Jerusalem, it is scarcely likely that the great hall of the palace was permanently open even on one side.

Another difficulty in attempting to restore this hall arises from the number of pillars being unequal (“15 in a row”), and if we adopt the last theory (fig. 2, B), we have a row of columns in the centre both ways. Fergusson holds that it was closed, as shown in the plan, by a wall at one end, which would give 15 spaces to the 15 pillars, and so provide a central space in the longer dimension of the hall in which the throne might have been placed. If  the first theory be adopted, the throne may have stood either at the end, or in the centre of the longer side, but, judging from. what we know of the arrangement of Eastern palaces, we may be almost certain that the latter is the correct position.

(b.) Next in importance to the building just described is the hall or porch of judgment (1Ki 7:7), which Josephus distinctly tells us (Ant. 8:5, 2). was situated opposite the centre of the longer side of the great hall an indication that may be admitted with less hesitation,, as such a position is identical with that of a similar hall at Persepolis, and with the probable position of one at Khorsabad. Its dimensions were 50 cubits long and 30 wide (Josephus says 30 in one direction at least), and its disposition can easily be understood by comparing the descriptions which we have with' the remains of the Assyrian and Persian examples. It is thought by Fergusson to have been supported by four pillars in the centre, and to have had three entrances; the principal one opening from the street and facing the judgment-seat, a second from the court-yard of the palace, by which the councillors and officers of state might come in (fig. 1, in the direction M), and a third from the palace, reserved for the king and his household, as shown above (fig. 1, in the direction N).

(c.) The third edifice is merely called “the Porch.” Its dimensions are not all given in the sacred text. Josephus does not describe its architecture; and we are unable to understand the description contained in the Bible, owing apparently to our ignorance of the synonyms of the Hebrew architectural terms. Its use, however, cannot be considered as doubtful, as it was an indispensable adjunct to an Eastern palace. It was the ordinary place of business of the palace, and the receptionroom — the Guesten-Hall — where the king received ordinary visitors, and sat, except on great. state occasions, to transact the business of the kingdom.

(d.) Behind this, we are told, was the inner court, adorned with gardens and fountains, and surrounded by cloisters for shade; and besides this were other courts for the residence of the attendants and guards, and, in Solomon's case, for the three hundred women of his harem: all of which are shown in the plan (fig. 1) with more clearness than can be conveyed by a verbal description.

(e.) Apart from this palace, but attached, as Josephus tells us, to the Hall of Judgment, was the palace of Pharaoh's daughter — too proud and important a personage to be grouped with the ladies of the harem, and requiring a residence of her own.

(f.) There is still another building mentioned by Josephus, as a naos or temple, supported by, massive columns, and situated opposite the Hall of Judgment. It may thus have been outside, in front of the palace in the city; but more probably was, as shown in the plan, in the centre of the great court. Fergusson thinks it could not have been a temple, in the ordinary acceptation of the term, as the Jews had only one temple, and that was situated on the other side of the valley; but it may have been an altar covered by a baldachino. This would equally meet the exigencies of the description as well as the probabilities of the case; and so it has been represented in the plan above (fig. 1 “altar”).

If the site and disposition of the palace were as above indicated, it would require two great portals: one leading from the city to the great court, shown at N; the other to the Temple and the king's garden, at N. This last, Fergusson supposes, was situated where the stairs then were which led up to the City of David, and where the bridge afterwards joined the Temple to the city and palace.

The recent discoveries at Nineveh have enabled us to understand many of the architectural details of this palace, which before they were made were almost wholly inexplicable. (See the Jour. of Sac. Lit. Jan. 1852, p. 422.) We are told for instance, that the walls of the halls of the palace were wainscoted with three tiers of stone, apparently versicolored marbles, hewn and polished, and surmounted by a fourth course, elaborately carved with representations of leafage and flowers. Above this the walls were plastered and ornamented with colored arabesques. At Nineveh the walls were, like these, wainscoted to a height of about eight feet but with alabaster, a peculiar product of the country, and these were separated from the painted space above by an architectural band; the real difference being that the Assyrians revelled in sculptural representations of men, and animals, as we now know from the sculptures brought home, as well as from the passage in Ezekiel (23:14), where he describes “men portrayed on the wall, the images of the Chaldaeans portrayed with vermilion,” etc. These modes of  decoration were forbidden to the Jews by the second commandment, given to them in consequence of their residence in Egypt and their consequent tendency to that multiform idolatry. Some difference may also be due to the fact that the soft alabaster, though admirably suited to bass-relief, was not suited for sharp, deeply cut foliage sculpture, like that described by Josephus, while, at the same time, the hard material used by the Jews might induce them to limit their ornamentation to one band only. It is probable, however, that a considerable amount of color was used in the decoration of these palaces, not only from the constant reference to gold and gilding in Solomon's buildings, and because that as a color could hardly be used alone, but also from such passages as the following: “Build me a wide house and large” — or through-aired — “chambers, and cutteth out windows; and it is ceiled with cedar, and painted with vermilion” (Jer 22:14). It may also be added that in the East all buildings, with scarcely an exception, are adorned with color internally, generally the three primitive colors used in all their intensity, but so balanced as to produce the most harmonious results. SEE ASSYRIA.

2. Quite different is the scheme proposed by Thenius in the Exeg. Handb. zum. A. T., of which the following is substantially a reproduction:

(a.) On this plan, proceeding from without, the first part was “the House of the Forest of Lebanon,” so called, probably, because it was constructed of cedarwood from Lebanon. This served as an audience chamber or hall of state (Joseph. l.c.), and was hung around with costly armor (1Ki 10:16-17). The Targum calls it “the house of the cooling of the king,” probably because of the refreshing air which its size, its elevated site, and its open construction secured for it. Some have thought it was a sort of winter-garden or conservatory; but this is less probable. Its proportions, 100 cubits of length, 50 of breadth, and 30 of height, must be understood of the inner measurement; so that the area of this hall was larger than that of the temple, the height of both being the same (6, 2). A solid wall of masonry enclosed the woodwork (1Ki 10:9). The area of this hall was surrounded by four rows of cedar pillars. The statement in 1Ki 10:2 is commonly taken to indicate four straight lines of pillars, and much perplexity has been caused on this supposition by the subsequent statement (1Ki 10:3) that there were 45 pillars, 15 in a row. If there were 4 rows, intersecting the hall lengthways, and 15 intersecting its breadth, there must have been 60 pillars in all. This has led some arbitrarily to read three for four, contrary to all the codices and all the versions, the Sept. excepted.:  But טוֹר does not signify a series in line, but a series surrounding or enclosing (comp. 1Ki 6:36; 1Ki 7:18; 1Ki 7:20; 1Ki 7:24; 1Ki 7:42; Eze 46:23); so that the four rows of pillars went round the hall, forming four aisles inside the wall, or, as the Vulgate renders the passage, “quatuor deambulacra inter columnas cedrinas” (fig. 3). On these pillars beams of cedar-wood rested, running from the front to the wall, and forming a substantial rest for the upper story. This consisted of side chambers or galleries (צְלָעוֹת, comp.1Ki 6:5; 1Ki 6:8), and it is to the number and order of these that the statement in Eze 46:3 refers: “And the chambers which were upon the beams, forty-five [in number]; fifteen in each row [circuit], were wainscoted with cedar-wood” (fig. 4, a a). These were roofed with beams ( שְׁקֻפַים A.V. “windows,” which the word never means) in three rows, i.e. there were three stories of galleries, and in these sights (מֶחֵָזה; Sept. χῶρα) over against each other in three ranks, i.e. each chamber in the three stories had an opening to the interior, facing a corresponding opening in the opposite chamber (fig. 4, b b). The different compartments of the galleries communicated with each other by means of doors. These, as well as the windows (the Sept., has χῶραι in Eze 46:5, which shows that it read הִמֶּהזֵוֹתwhere the present reading is הִמְּזוּזוֹת, of which it is impossible to make sense), were square with an over beam. These galleries were probably reached by a winding stair in the outer wall (figs. 3 and 4, d d), as in the Temple (6, 8).

From this description, the idea we form of “the House of the Forest of Lebanon” is that of a large hall, open in the centre to the sky, the floor of which was surrounded with four rows of pillars, affording a promenade, above which were three tiers of galleries open to the interior, divided each into fifteen compartments like the boxes in a theatre, but, with doors communicating with each other. As the height of the entire building was thirty cubits, we may divide this so as to allot eight feet to the supporting pillars, eighteen to the galleries, and four to the beams and flooring of the galleries. The building, thus conceived, answers to. the description of it by Josephus, as Κορινθίως ἐστεγασμένος, by which he means, not that it was in the Corinthian style of architecture (Keil), but that it was built after the Corinthian fashions that of a hall, surrounded by a row of pillars with heavy architraves, on which rested beams running to the wall, and supporting a floor, which again supported shorter pillars, between which were windows, the whole being hypoethral (Vitruv. 6:3, 1).

(b.) If now we regard this building (fig. 5, B) as placed lengthwise in the middle of a court (A), it is easy to understand the arrangement of the portico of pillars (D), the length of which was the same as the breadth of the building (Eze 46:6). These did not run along the side of it, but were behind it, forming a colonnade fifty cubits long by thirty wide, conducting to the residence of the king. This terminated in a. porch, or entrance-hall, which had pillars and an עב, i.e. a threshold or perron (A.V. “thick beam;” Targ. סקופתא, limen). By this was the entrance to the throne-room or hall of judgment (E), which was wainscoted with cedar from floor to ceiling ( הִקַּירוֹת[this is the reading followed by the Vulg. and Syr. instead of the second הִקִּרְקָע, which is a manifest error], 7:7). Then came the king's residence in another court (F) behind the throne-room; and of this the residence of the queen, which may or may not have been the harem, formed a (probably the back) part. The space G is added conjecturally, for the court containing the offices of the palace, and perhaps “the king's prison.” All these buildings Were externally of hewn stone, and the whole was surrounded by a solid wall enclosing a court.

3. Very different again is the reconstruction proposed by Prof. Paine, in his Solomon's Temple, etc., of whose scheme we here subjoin a brief outline. He maintains that the structure was situated on the north side of the Temple, immediately adjoining its area, where the tower of Antonia eventually stood, adducing 2 Kings 11 in proof of this position. He holds that the entire structure was one, the palace being the same elsewhere called “the House of the Forest of Lebanon.” The pillars are by him distributed on the outside of the building, in successive rows of different heights, supporting the walls in terrace style. There is thus in reality but one story, although there is the appearance externally of several, while within there is a series of benchings like the tiers of a modern gallery. This entire scheme is remarkable for its simplicity. It is altogether congruous with its author's idea of the structure of Solomon's Temple, the essential difference from all other proposed restorations being the gradual enlargement of the building upward. SEE TEMPLE.

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

             in ecclesiastical phraseology is used for a bishop's house, called before the Norman invasion the minster-house, in which he resided with his family of clerks. It was provided with a gatehouse at Chichester and Hereford; at  Wells it is moated and defended by walls; at Durham it is an actual castle; at Lincoln and St. David's it exists only as a magnificent ruin; the chapels remain at York, Winchester, Chichester, Durham, Wells, and Salisbury; and the hall is preserved at Chichester; a few portions remain at Worcester. There is a very perfect example at Ely. Bishops had town houses mostly along the Strand, as el as numerous country houses, like Farnham Rose, Hartlebury, and Bishop's Auckland. The chapels of Lambeth and Ely Place (Holborn), the abbots' houses at Peterborough and Chester, converted at the Reformation into palaces, retain many ancient portions, like those of Bayeux, Sens, Noyon, Beauvais, Auxerre, Meaux, and Laon. See Walcott, Sacred Archceol. s.v.

## Paladini, Filippo[[@Headword:Paladini, Filippo]]

             an Italian painter commended by Hackert, flourished about 1600, and executed several works for the churches in Syracuse, Palmara, Catania, and other places. Lanzi thinks this artist the same as Filippo Palladino (q.v.).

## Paladini, Litterio[[@Headword:Paladini, Litterio]]

             an Italian painter, was born, according to Hackert, in 1691. He studied at Rome under Sebastiano Conca, and afterwards improved himself by a diligent study of the antique models. On his return to Messina he was employed on several considerable fresco works for the church of Monte Vergine. This work is on a grand scale, and is highly commended for correctness of design. He died of the great plague which ravaged Messina in 1743.

## Palaeography[[@Headword:Palaeography]]

             (Gr. παλαιός, old, and γραφή, writing), the science of ancient writings. It comprehends not merely the art of reading them, but such a critical knowledge of all their circumstances as will serve to determine their age, if they happen to be undated, and their genuineness, in the absence of any formal authentication. For these purposes, the paleographer needs to be acquainted with the various substances, such as bark, leaves, skins, paper, etc., which have been used for writing; with the various manners of writing which have prevailed, and the changes which they have undergone; with the various forms of authenticating writings, such as seals, signets, cachets, signatures, superscriptions, subscriptions, attestations, etc., which have been employed at different times; with the various phases through which  the grammar, vocabulary, and orthography of the language of the writing with which he is dealing, has passed; and with more or less, as the case may be, of the history, laws, institutions, literature, and art of the age and country to which the writing professes to belong. Paleography may be said to have been founded by the learned French Benedictine, Jean Mabillon, whose De Re. Diplomatica, first published in 1681 in 1 vol. fol., reprinted in 1709, and again in 1789, in 2 vols. fol., is still, perhaps, the most masterly work on the subject. Along with the Nouveau Traite de Diplomatie (Par. 1750-1765, 6 vols. 4to) of the Benedictines of St. Maur, and the Elements de Paleographie (Par. 1838, 2 vols. 4to) by M. Natalis de Wailly, it is the great authority for French paleography. English paleography is perhaps less favorably represented in Astle's Origin and Progress of Writing (Lond. 1803), that Scottish paleography in Anderson's and Ruddiman's Diplomata Scotire (Edinb. 1739). Muratori treats of Italian paleography in the third volume of his great work, the Antiquitates Italicce Medii Evi; and among later works on the same subject may be mentioned the Diplomatica Pontificia (Rome, 1841) of Marino Marini. The palseography of Greece is illustrated in the Palctographia Grceca (Par. 1708) of Montfaucon. Spanish palseography may be studied in the Biblioteca de la Polygraphia Espaiola (Mad. 1738) of Don C. Rodriguez. Of works on German palaeography, it may be enough to name Eckard's Introductio in Rem Diplomaticam (Jen. 1742); Heumann's Commentarii. de Re Diplomatica (Norimb. 1745); Walther's Lexicon Diplomaticum (Gott. 1745); and Kopp's Palceographia. Citica (Mannh. 1817). Hebrew palaeography has been elaborated by Gesenius in his Geschichte der HebrSischen Sprache sund Schrift, and other works. See Deutsch, Literary Remains, p. 153 sq. The great work on paleography generally one of the most sumptuous works of its class ever published is the Paleographie Universelle (Par. 1839-1845, in 5 vols. fol.) of M. J. B. Silvestre. SEE PALIMPSEST, SEE WRITING.

## Palaeologus[[@Headword:Palaeologus]]

             is the name of an illustrious Byzantine family, which first appears in history about the 11th century, and is in many of its representatives intimately connected with the ecclesiastical history of the Middle Ages. The family attained to imperial dignity in the person of Michael Palceologus (q.v.). SEE EASTERN CHURCH.

## Palaestina[[@Headword:Palaestina]]

             (Exo 15:14; Isa 14:29; Isa 14:31). SEE PALESTINE.

## Palaetyrus[[@Headword:Palaetyrus]]

             SEE TYRE.

## Palafox, Juan De[[@Headword:Palafox, Juan De]]

             a Spanish prelate, noted as. a theological writer, was born in the kingdom of Aragon in 1600. The descendant of an illustrious family, and a distinguished scholar of the University of Salamanca, he was called by Philip IV to a place in the “commission of war,” and afterwards to a like position in the “commission of the Indies.” He embraced a little later the ecclesiastical profession. The king appointed him, in 1639, bishop of Puebla-de-los-Angelos, in Mexico, with extensive administrative powers. In the exercise of his functions Palafox had some disputes with the Jesuits; he submitted these differences to pope Innocent X, and went to Europe to sustain his cause. The king of Spain, satisfied with Palafox's conduct in America, gave him the bishopric of Osma. He died soon after (Sept. 13, 1659), leaving a high reputation for piety. Towards the end of the 17th century a procedure was instituted for his beatification; but the case was delayed for a long time, and, in spite of the efforts of the Spanish government, the court of Rome decided not to confer the honor on a declared enemy of the Jesuits. The works of Palafox were collected and published at Madrid in 1762, in fifteen volumes. Among them are, Le Pasteur de la Nuit de Noel (Pastor de Noche - buena) (Brussels, 1655): — The Shepherd of Christmas-eve, translated into French (Par. 1676): — Le Conquete de la Chine par les Tartares (The Conquest of China by the Tartars), published in Spanish and in French (ibid. 1678); and several mystical treatises, some of which have been translated into French by the abb. Le Roy. See Dinonart, Vie du venerable Don Jean de Palafox, Eveque d'Angelopolis (Col. 1767); Nicolini, History of the Jesuits, p. 309 sq; Hoefer, Nouv, Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Palairet, Elias[[@Headword:Palairet, Elias]]

             was one of the latest of the classical commentators who attempted to illustrate the language of the New Testament from the usage of the various authors of classic Greek, a line of interpretation which in the early part of the last century grew into especial favor with many eminent scholars, both on the Continent and in this country. Palairet, who was a French Protestant minister living at Tournay, in Belgium, published at Leyden, in 1752, in an  octavo volume, some short notes of classical illustrations of sundry passages of the New Testament. These he entitled Observationes philologico-criticoe in sacros Novi Faderis libros. These notes indicate much learning. but they partake of the fault of the school by exaggerating the likeness of the sacred to the classic Greek authors. Palairet, who seems to have afterwards undertaken the pastorship of a French congregation at Greenwich, issued in the year 1755 a specimen, printed in London, of a much. larger work, partaking of the character of a continuous commentary on all the books of the New Testament, on the principle of his Observationes. The work, however, which was to. have been published by subscription, never appeared.

## Palal[[@Headword:Palal]]

             (Heb. Palal', פָּלִל,judge; Sept. Φαλάξ, v.r. Φαλάχ, Φαλάκ, and Φαλάλ), son of Uzar, and one who aided in repairing the wall of Jerusalem (Neh 3:25). B.C. 446.

## Palamas, Gregorius[[@Headword:Palamas, Gregorius]]

             (Γρηγόριος ὁ Παλαμᾶς), an eminent Greek ecclesiastic of the: 14th century, was born in the Asiatic portion of the then reduced Byzantine empire, and was educated at the court of Constantinople, apparently during the reign of Andronicus Palaeologus the elder. He ignored the opportunity of Worldly greatness, of which his parentage and wealth and the imperial favor gave him the prospect, and with his two brothers became, while yet very young, an inmate of one of the monasteries of Mount Athos. Here the youngest of the three died; and, upon the death of the superior of the monastery soon after, the two surviving brothers placed themselves under another superior. With him they remained eight years; and on his death Gregory Palamas withdrew to Scete, near Berrhea, where he built a cell, and gave himself up entirely, for ten years, to divine contemplation and spiritual exercises. The severity of his regimen and the coldness of his cell produced an illness which nearly occasioned his death. The urgent recommendation of the other monks of the place induced him then to leave Scete and to return to Mount Athos; but this change did not suffice for his recovery, and he removed to Thessalonica (Cantacuzenus, History, 2, 39). It was apparently while at Thessalonica that his controversy began with Barlaam, a Calabrian monk, who visited Constantinople soon after the accession of the emperor Andronicus Paleologus the younger, A.D. 1328,  and, professing himself an adherent of the Greek Church and a convert from the Latin Church, against which he also wrote several works, obtained the favor and patronage of the emperor Barlaam appears to have been a conceited man, and to have sought opportunities for decrying the usages of the Byzantine Greeks. For his supercilious humor the wild fanaticism of the monks of Mount Athos presented an admirable subject. Those of them who aimed at the highest spiritual attainments were accustomed to shut themselves up for days and nights together in a corner of a cell, and there abstract their thoughts from all worldly objects. Resting their beards on their chests, and fixing their eyes on their bellies, they imagined that the seat of the soul, previously unknown, was revealed to them by a mystical light, and at its discovery they were rapt into a state of ecstatic enjoyment. The existence of this light, described by Gibbon as “the creature of an empty stomach and an empty brain,” appears to have been kept secret, and was only revealed to Barlaam by an incautious monk, whom Cantacuzenus abuses for his communicativeness. Barlaam eagerly seized the opportunity afforded by this discovery to assail with bitter reproaches the fanaticism of these Hesychasts (ἡσυχάζοντες), SEE HESYCHASTS, or Quietists, calling them Ο᾿μφαλόψυχοι (Omphalopsychi), “men with their souls in their navels,” and he identified them with the Massilians or Euchites of the 4th century.

The monks were roused by these attacks, and as Gregory Palamas was the most able and learned among them, they put him forward as their champion, and employed both his tongue and pen against the attacks of the sarcastic Calabrian. Palamas and his friends tried at first to silence the reproaches of Barlaam by kindly remonstrance, and affirmed, as to the mystical light, that there had been various similar instances in the history of the Church of a divine lustre surrounding the saints in time of persecution, and. that sacred history recorded the appearance of a divine and uncreated light at the Saviour's transfiguration. Barlaam caught at the mention of this light as uncreated, and affirmed that nothing was uncreated but God. and that inasmuch as God was invisible, while the light of Mount Tabor was visible to the bodily eye, the monks must have two gods, one the Creator of all things, confessedly invisible, the other this visible yet uncreated light. This serious charge gave to the controversy a fresh impulse, until two or three years later Barlaam, fearing that his infuriated opponents, who flocked to the scene of the conflict from all the monasteries about Thessalonica and Constantinople, would offer him personal violence, appealed to the patriarch of Constantinople and the bishops there, and charged Palamas not  only with sharing the fanaticism of the Omphalopsychi, and with the use of defective prayers, but also with holding blasphemous views of God, and with introducing new terms. into the theology of the Church. A council was consequently convened in the church of St. Sophia, at Constantinople, in 1341, in the presence of the emperor, the chief senators, the learned, and a vast concourse of the common people. As it was not thought advisable to discuss the mysteries of theology before a promiscuous multitude, the charge against Palamas and the monks of blasphemous notions respecting God was suppressed, and only the charge of holding the old Massilian heresy respecting prayer, and of using defective prayers, was proceeded With. Barlaam first addressed the council in support of his charge; then Palamas replied, retorting upon Barlaam the charge of blasphemy and perverseness.

The council decided in favor of the monks, and Barlaam, according to Cantacuzenus, acknowledged his errors and became reconciled to his adversaries. Mortified, however, at his public defeat, he returned to Italy, and reconciled himself to the Latin Church. Nicephorus Gregoras states that the decision of the council on the question of the Massilian heresy charged against the monks was deferred, that Barlaam was convicted of malignity and arrogance, and that the heresy of Palamas and his party would probably have been condemned also, had not the proceedings of the council been cut short by the emperor's death in 1341. The cause forsaken by Barlaam was taken up by another Gregory, surnamed Acindynus; but the party of the monks continued in the ascendant, and Palamas enjoyed the favor of John Cantacuzenus, who then exercised the chief influence at the court of the emperor John Palaeologus, a minor. It was even reported that Cantacuzenus intended to procure the deposition of the patriarch of Constantinople and the elevation of Palamas. In the civil war which followed (1342-1347) between Cantacuzenus and the court (where the admiral Apocaucus had supplanted him), Palamas, on account of his friendship for Cantacuzenus, was imprisoned in 1346, not on any political charge, but on the ground of his religious views; for, the patriarch now supported Gregory Acindynus and the Barlaamites against the monks of Mount Athos, who were favorable to Cantacuzenus. The Barlaamites thus gained the ascendency, and in a council at Constantinople the Palamites. as their opponents called them, were condemned. The patriarch and the court were, however, especially anxious to clear themselves from the suspicion of acting from political motives in the imprisonment of Palamas. When the successful entrance of Cantacuzenus into Constantinople, in January, 1347, obliged the court to submit, Palamas  was released, and sent to make terms with. the conqueror. The patriarch Calecas had been deposed by the influence of the empress-mother, Anna, just before the triumph of Cantacuzenus, and Gregory Palamas persuaded Cantacuzenus to assemble a synod, by which the deposition was confirmed, and Calecas banished to Didvmotichum. Acindyntus and the Barlaamites were now in turn condemned, and the Palamites once more gained the ascendency. Isidore, one of their number, was chosen patriarch. Palamas himself was soon afterwards appointed archbishop of Thessalonica; though, as that city was in the hands of some of the nobility Whos were hostile to Cantacuzenus, he was refused admittance, and obliged to retire to the island of Lemnos; but he obtained admittance after a time. This was in 1349.

Meanwhile the ecclesiastical troubles continued the Barlaamites withdrew from the communion of the Church; their ranks received continual increase, and Nicephorus Gregoras, the historian, adroitly drew over to their side the empress Irene, wife of Cantacuzenus, by persuading her that the recent death of her younger son, Andronicus, in 1347, was a sign of the ‘divine displeasure at the favor shown by the emperor Cantacuzenus to the Palamites. To restore peace, if possible, to the Church, a synod was summoned after various conferences had been held between the emperor, the patriarch Isidore, Palamas, and Nicephorus Gregoras. Isidore died in 1349, before the meeting of the synod, over which Callistus, his successor, presided. When it met, in 1351, Nicephorus Gregoras was the champion of the Barlaamites, who numbered among their supporters the archbishop of Ephesus and the bishop of Ganus or Gaunus;. the archbishop of Tyre, who was present, appears to have been on the same side. Palamas was the leader of the opposite party, who, having a large majority and the support of the emperor, carried everything their own way. The archbishop of Ephesus and the bishop of Ganus were deposed. Barlaam and Acindynus (neither of whom was present) were declared excommunicated, and their followers were forbidden to propagate their sentiments. The populace, however, favored the vanquished Barlaamites, and Palamas narrowly escaped violence. Of his subsequent history and death nothing seems to be known.

The peculiar leading tenets of the Palamites were the existence of the mystical light discovered by the more eminent monks and recluses in their long exercises of abstract contemplation and prayer, and the uncreated nature of the light of Mount Tabor seen at the transfiguration of Christ. The first attracted the, notice and animadversion of their opponents; but  the second; with the consequences really or apparently deducible from it, was the great object of attack. The last seven books (18-24) of the Historia Byzantina of Nicephorus Gregoras are devoted to a history of this controversy; and in the bitterness of his polemic spirit he charges Palamas with polytheism; with converting the attributes of the Deity into so many- distinct and independent deities; with affirming that the Holy Spirit was not one alone, or even one of seven, but one of “seventy times seven;” with placing in an intermediate rank between God and angels a new and peculiar class of uncreated powers (καινόν τι καὶ ἴδιον ἀκτίστων γένος ἐνεργειῶν), which Palamas called “the brightness (λαμπρότητα) of God and the ineffable light” (φῶς ἄῤῥητον); with holding that any man by partaking of the stream of this light, flowing from its inexhaustible source, could at will become uncreated and without beginning (ἀκτίστῳ ἐθέλοντι γίνεσθαι καὶ ἀνάρχῳ); and with numerous other errors. These alleged heresies were, however, mostly, if not altogether, the inferences deduced by Nicephorus Gregoras and other opponents from the Palamite dogma of uncreated light, and not the acknowledged tenets of the Palamite party. The rise, continuance, and vehemence of the controversy is a singular manifestation of the subtilty and misdirection of the Greek intellect of the, period. The dogma of the uncreated light of Mount Tabor has apparently continued to be the recognised orthodox doctrine of the Greek Church (Capperonnerius, Not. ad Niceph.- Gregor. ii, 1821, ed. Bonn), though probably now neglected or forgotten.

Palamas was a copious writer; many of his works are extant in MS., and are enumerated by Wharton and Gery in the Appendix to Cave, and by Fabricius. Nicephorus says that he wrote more than sixty , orationes; and Boivin states that one MS. in the king's library at Paris contained more than seventy homilies or other short pieces. The statement of Gregoras, therefore, must refer only to pieces written on occasion of Palamas's controversy with him, or must be much too low an estimate. The following have been published: Prosopopceia, s. Prosopopceia, s. Orationes duce judiciales, Mentis Corpus accusantis, et Corporis sese defendetis, una cum Judicum: Seentntia (Paris, 1553): — Εἰς τὴν σεπτὴν μεταμόρφωσιν τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ῾Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ· ἐν ῃ παράστασις ὅτι τὸ κατ᾿ αὐτὴν φῶς ἄκτιστόν ἐστιν. λόγος ά, In venerabilem Domini et Dei ac Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi Transformationem, ubi probatur quod in ea est lumen increatum esse. Oratio Prima. ῾Ομιλία εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τοῦ Κυρίου σεπτὴν  μεταμόρφωσιν ἐν ῃ παράστασις ὡς εἰ καὶ ἄκτιστόν ἐστι τὸ κατ᾿ αὐτὴν θειότατον φῶς, ἀλλ᾿ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐσία Θεοῦ. λόγος β᾿, Tractatus in eandem venerandam Domini Transjfrmationem; in uo probatur, qulangquam increatum est illius divinissimum Lumen, haud tamen Dei. Essentiiam esse. Oratio Secunda. These two orations were published with a Latin version by Combefis in his Auctarium Novissimum (Paris, 1672), ii, 106: Λόγοι β᾿, ἀποδεικτικοἱ ὅτι οὐχὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Υἱοῦ ἀλλ᾿ ἐκ μόνου τοῦ Πατρὸς ἐκοπεύεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ῞Αγιον, Orationes duce demonstrativce qudd non ex Filio, sed ex solo Patre procedat Spiritus Sanctus. These were published in London without date (but probably in 1624), together with a number of other pieces of Barsaam, the Calabrian, and several Greek writers of a comparatively recent period: — Α᾿ντεπιγραφαί, Refutatio Expositionum, s. Epigrapharum Joannis Vecci, published, with a Confutatio by cardinal Bessarion, in the Opuscula Aurea of Petrus Arcudius (Rome, 1630, 1671): — S. Petri Athonitee (s. de Monte Atho) Encomium (in Acta Sanctorum, Junii, a. d. 12:ii, 535): — - Ε᾿πὶ Λατίνων συντομία, Adversus Latinos -Confessio: Ε᾿πιστολὴ πρὸς τὴν θεοστεφῆ βασιλίδα κυρὰν ῎Ανναν τὴν Παλαιολογίναν, Epistola ad divinitus coronatam Augustam Annam Palceologinam, printed by Boivin in his notes to the Hist. Byzant. of Nicephorus Gregoras (Paris, 1702), p. 787. Boivin has also given two extracts from a writing of Palamas, one of some length, Adversus Joannem Calecam; the other very brief, from an Epistola ad Joannem Gatram. Various citations from his works are given. by Nicephorus Gregoras. It is probable that the Tomus or declaration issued by the synod of Constantinople, in 1351, against the Barlaamites was drawn up by Palamas, or under his inspection. It is given by Combefis, with a Latin version, in his Auctarium Novissimum -(Paris, 1672), 2, 135,and is entitled Τόμος ἐκτεθεὶς παρὰ τῆς θείας καὶ ἱερᾶς συνόδου τοῦ συγκροτηθείσης κατὰ τῶν φρονούντων τὰ Βαρλαάμ τε καὶ Α᾿κινδύνου ἐπὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν εὐσεβῶν καὶ ὀρθοδόξων βασιλέων ἡμῶν Καντακουζενοῦ καὶ Παλαιολόγου, Tomus a divina sacracque Synodo adversus eos coacta qui Barlaam et Acindyni opinionis sunt, Cantatcuzeno ac Palceologo religiosis orthodoxisque Imperatoribus nostris, editus ac expositus. The Greek writers belonging to the Romish Church, as Allatius, Nicolaus Comnenus, Papadopoli, and others, heap on Palamas every term of reproach; on the other hand the orthodox Greeks extol him highly, and ascribe miraculous effects to his relics. See Cave, Hist. Litter. (Oxford, 1740-1743); Appendix, vol. 2, by Wharton and Gery, p. 54 sq.; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, 10:454-462, 790; ed. vet. 11:494 sq.  ed. Harles; Oudin, De Scriptoribus Eccles. vol. 3, col. 843; Cantacuzenus, HIist.; Nicephorus Gregoras, Hist. Byzant. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythot, s. v; comp. Neale, Hist. of the Eastern Church, Introd. ii, 745, 746.

## Palamites[[@Headword:Palamites]]

             SEE PALAMAS.

## Palanquin[[@Headword:Palanquin]]

             SEE LITTER.

## Palatini[[@Headword:Palatini]]

             is the name by which was designated one of the three classes of subdeacons in Rome especially appointed to wait upon the bishop.

## Palatinus[[@Headword:Palatinus]]

             a surname of Apollo, under which he was worshipped at Rome, where he had a temple on the Palatine hill.

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

             an ecclesiastical writer of the 17th century, of whose personal history nothing is accessible to us, is the author of a history of the popes, entitled Gesta Pontificum Romanorum a S. Petro usque Innocentium XI, addit. Pontificum imaginibus numismatib. sigillis, etc. (Venetia, 1685, 2 vols. fol.). It is a very exhaustive but not a critical work. Palatius is also the author of Fasti Cardinalium omniumn Romance eccles. cum stemmatib. eorum (ibid. 1703, 2 vols. fol.).

## Paldah[[@Headword:Paldah]]

             SEE STEEL.

## Paleae[[@Headword:Paleae]]

             a name for the 150 decretals and council ordinances added to Gratian's Decretum. They are inserted in the Corpus Juris, but have attained to no legal authority. The name Palece is either a corruption of nraXatoi, i.e. obsolete, or is from the name Paucapalea, a pupil of Gratian, and their first  collector. See Bickell, Disquisitio hist. critic. de paleis (Marburg, 1827); Philipps, Kirchenrecht, 4:160.

## Paleario, Aonio[[@Headword:Paleario, Aonio]]

             (or, as his name was originally written, Aonio degli Pagliari), one of the most noted of Italian characters in the Reformation period, and a martyr to the Protestant cause, was born at Veroli, in the Campagna di Roma, and descended of noble and ancient families by both his parents. He spent his youth in retirement until death robbed him suddenly of his parents, when a friend of his father, Martelli by name, cared for Aonio and guided his education. The bishop of the diocese, Ennio Philonardi, also interested himself in the precocious youth, and paid attention to the formation of his character and the development of his talents. Paleario applied himself early to the Greek and Latin languages, in which he made great progress, and then proceeded to philosophy and divinity. The desire he had for knowledge prompted him in his seventeenth year to go abroad, and,, after travelling through the greater part of Italy, seeking ever the acquaintance and teachings of the most famous professors in every place he visited, he settled for student's work at Rome, where he continued for six years, till that city was taken by Charles V, when the disorders committed by the troops of that prince leaving no hopes of enjoying tranquillity, obliged Paleario to depart (1523). He had at this time a great inclination to travel into France, Germany, and even as far as Greece; but the narrowness of his fortune would not admit of this, and he contented himself with a visit to the different parts of his native country. He made prolonged stays at Siena, Florence, Ferrara, Padua, and Bologna everywhere gathering new stores of learning, and having intercourse with the most illustrious men. He returned again to Rome, but in 1527 left it for Siena, upon which he now determined as his permanent abode, induced to settle there by the pleasantness of the situation and the sprightliness and sagacity of the inhabitants; and accordingly he sold his estate at Veroli, and purchased a country-house in the neighborhood of Siena, called, Ceciniana, because it formerly belonged to Cecina, one of Cicero's clients. Here he entered likewise into matrimony with a young woman of whom he was passionately fond all his life after. She bore him four children, two boys and two girls.

In 1534 Paleario was made professor of ancient languages and philosophy, and a great number of pupils gathered about him, when his career was suddenly disturbed by a quarrel with one of his colleagues, who  grew impatient at seeing his own reputation eclipsed by the superior lustre of Paleario. Having studied the Scriptures and read the writings of the German Reformers, his lectures on moral philosophy were distinguished from those of his colleague by a liberal tone of thinking. This, although gratifying to the students, was offensive to the professor, who obstinately adhered to the old ideas. Cardinal Sadolet, in the name of his friends, set before Paleario the danger of giving way to novelties, and advised him, in consideration of the times, to confine himself to the safer task of clothing the peripatetic ideas in elegant language. This prudential advice was not altogether congenial to the candid mind of Paleario, and the devotion which he felt for truth. The freedom with which he. censured, vain pretenders to learning and religion irritated a class of men who scrupled at no means to oppress and ruin an adversary, and who eagerly seized the opportunity to fasten on him the charge of heresy. His private conduct was watched, and expressions which:had dropped from him in the unsuspecting confidence of private conversation were circulated to his prejudice. But Paleario gave the greatest offence by a book which he wrote on the benefit of the death of Christ, II Beneficio di Christo (1542); a synopsis of its contents, with selections, is given by Dr. Hurst in his Martyrs to the Tract Cause (N.Y. 1872, 12mo), p. 68-80. The little book, which is throughout enriched with quotations from the Holy Scriptures and the Church fathers — Augustine, Origen, Basil, Hilary, Ambrose, Irenaeus, and St.Bernard — excited much attention, not only in Italy, but elsewhere, for it was translated into several foreign languages, and obtained a circulation that is remarkable. Paul Vergerius reports that during the six years following its appearance forty thousand copies were printed and sold in Venice alone. What wonder that the enemies of the Gospel were also attentive to this work, and made every effort to suppress it and to ruin its author? They soon came upon his track. His opponents in Siena conspired against him while he was on a visit to Rome, and indicted him for heresy. On hearing this he quickly returned, in order to defend himself. Most of his judges were passionately embittered against him.

“They are heartless and complaining men,” said he in his defence, “who seek to declare the most innocent action a crime; so that one dares not venture to praise, unpunished, the glory of Christ, who is the Author of all happiness, the King of all nations and peoples. The fact that I have written a book this year, in the Tuscan language, wherein I praise the benefits which have accrued to the human race through the death of Christ, is made  the ground of a criminal charge against me. Can one think of anything more hateful? I have said that once he in whom the Godhead dwelt bodily has shed his blood for our redemption, and that we should have no more doubt as to the mercy of God, but enjoy perfect peace and rest. Supported by the most unquestionable authority of antiquity, the Holy Scriptures, and the Church fathers, I have maintained that whoever directs his eyes to Jesus Christ the crucified, confides in his promises, and places his hopes in him alone, will receive from him the forgiveness of his sills and redemption from all evil, because he cannot disappoint our hopes. And yet these things have appeared to those twelve jurymen — who no longer deserve the name of men — so horrible and fearful that they have all declared with one voice that the author must be condemned to be burned! If I must suffer this penalty — for I regard my writing much more a confession than an invective — then, senators, no better fortune could befall me! In my opinion, at a time like ours no Christian should die in his bed! Accused, imprisoned, scourged, hanged, sewn up in a sack, thrown to the wild beasts, or roasted in the flames — what does it matter, if only by such a death the glorious truth comes evermore to light?”

In the course of his address Paleario turned to his accusers, disclosed to them their wickedness, and proclaimed the whole course of his life. In referring to his circumstances, he said:

“My only temporal happiness consists in living among my books. A woollen rug as a protection against the cold, a piece of linen to wipe away the sweat from my brow, a bed to rest on, and a simple bench to sit upon these are all I need. And do thou, O Christ, merciful Lord, preserve and increase those gifts which I have from thee! Thou hast kindled in me a disdain of all earthly goods, and the firm determination to speak in conformity with the truth, and not according to my own mind and my own will. Do thou add to these favors piety, temperance, and self-denial, and adorn me with all the virtues which are pleasing to thee and thy children!”

Paleario's eloquent defence, in which boldness and candor were tempered by prudence and address, triumphed over the violence and intrigues of his adversaries. He was declared free from the charges of his accusers. He was, however, obliged soon after to quit Siena, as his opponents had by his acquittal become only the more embittered; but, though he changed the place of his residence, he did not escape from the odium which he had  incurred; and we shall afterwards find him enduring that martyrdom which he early anticipated, and for which it appears to have been his object all along to prepare his thoughts. On quitting the Sienese, about the year 1543, he embraced an invitation from the senate of Lucca, where he taught the Latin classics, and acted as orator to the republic on solemn occasions. To this place he was followed by Marco Blaterone, one of his former adversaries, a sciolist who possessed that volubility. of tongue which captivates the vulgar ear, and whose ignorance and loquacity had been severely chastised, but not corrected, by the satirical pen of Aretino. Lucca at that time abounded with men of enlightened and honorable minds; and the eloquence of Paleario, sustained by the lofty bearing of his spirit, enabled him easily to triumph over his unworthy rival, who, disgraced and driven from the city, sought his revenge through the Dominicans at Rome. But by means of his friends in the conclave, Paleario counteracted at that time the informations of his accuser. About 1553 a very warm invitation came to him from the officials of Milan to remove to that place and become a professor of eloquence. The handsome stipend which was proffered him induced the Reformer to reply favorably; and when he had settled at Milan he hoped for no further change until his final departure to the heavenly Jerusalem. But the heresy-hunting Inquisitors, together with his enemies, had determined otherwise. For some ten years there had been daily persecutions, imprisonments, and death punishment for many a soul devoted to the new cause, then steadily gaining adherents in Italy. Paleario's friends feared for him, but he quieted them with the assurance that he knew of no danger.

Upon the accession of Pius V., whom all regarded as the death-messenger to Reformed doctrines in Italy, when Paleario's friends had succeeded in obtaining his. consent for removal to Bologna, he was suddenly arrested in 1568, and by pontifical authority his case, now over twenty years settled, was ordered for a rehearing at Rome. During his trial he was imprisoned in the Torre di Nona, the most wretched of the three prisons of the Inquisition at Rome. His book on the benefit of Christ's death, his commendations of Ochino (q.v.), his defence of himself before the senators of Siena, and the suspicions which he had incurred during his residence at that place and at Lucca, were all revived against him. After the whole had been collected and sifted, the charge at last resolved itself into the four following articles: that he denied purgatory; disapproved of burying the dead in churches, preferring the ancient Roman method of sepulture without the walls of cities; ridiculed the monastic life; and appeared to ascribe justification solely to confidence in the mercy of  God forgiving our sins through Jesus Christ. For holding these opinions he was condemned, after an imprisonment of two years, to be suspended on a gibbet and his body to be given to the flames; and the sentence was executed on July 3, 1570, in the seventieth year of his age. A minute, which professes to be an official document of the Dominicans who attended him in his last moments, but which has neither names nor signatures, states that Paleario died confessed and contrite; but the two letters which he wrote to his family on the day of his death are witnesses against this statement.

If he did not openly express himself in them,, lest they might thereby fail to reach their destination, there is yet seen all through them the same Gospel spirit which had always characterized him. They also afford a negative proof that the report of his recantation was unfounded; for if he had really changed his sentiments, would he not have felt anxious to acquaint his family with the fact? or, if the change was feigned, would not the monks have insisted on his using the language of a penitent when they granted him permission to write? Paleario had before his apprehension taken care to, secure his writings against the risk of suppression by committing them to the care of friends whom he could trust; and their repeated publication in Protestant countries has saved them from those mutilations to which the works of so many of his countrymen have been subjected. From his letters it appears that Paleario enjoyed the friendship and correspondence of the most celebrated persons of that time both in the Church and in the republic of letters.

Among the former were cardinals Sadolet, Bembo, Pole, Maffei, Badia, Filonardo, and Sfondrati; and among the latter Flaminio, Riccio, Alciati, Vittorio, Lampridio, and Buonamici. His poem on the immortality of the soul, entitled De immortalitate animoe, libri tres (1636, 16mo), was received with applause by the learned. Of his orations, it is, perhaps, no high praise to say that they placed him above all the moderns who obtained the name of Ciceronians, from their studious imitation of the style of the Roman orator; they are certainly written with elegance and spirit. His letter on the Council of Trent, addressed to the Reformers, and his testimony and pleading against the Roman pontiffs (Actio in ponifices Romanos et eorum asseclas, ad imperatoremn Rom. reges et principes Christiance reipublicce sunmmos (Ecumenici concilii prcesides, cum de consilio Tridentino habendo deliberatretur, drawn up with a design to get it presented by the emperor's ambassadors to the Council of Trent, is a regular plan in defence of the Protestants, and was published at Leipsic in 1606; see Acta Eaudita for Jan. 1696, p. 44), evince a knowledge of the Scriptures, soundness in the  faith, candor, and fervent zeal worthy of a Reformer and confessor of the truth. In the composition of his tract on the benefit of the death of Christ, it is said that cardinal Pole had a large part, that Flaminio (q.v.) wrote a defence of it, and that activity in, circulating it formed one of the charges on which cardinal Morone (q.v.) was imprisoned and Carnesecchi committed to the flames. No wonder that of such a man M'Crie writes: “When we take into consideration his talents, his zeal, the utility of his writings, and the sufferings which he endured, Paleario must be viewed as one of the greatest ornaments of the Reformed cause in Italy.” The works of Paleario, entitled Opera, ad illam editionem quam ipse auctor recensuerat et auxerat excusa, nunc novis accessionibus locupletata, were brought out at Amsterdam in 1696, and were reprinted at Jena in 1728. The tract on the benefit of the death of Christ fared no better than its author. The Inquisition hunted for the book with such success that nearly every copy was brought into its hands and burned. For three hundred years nothing was known of it save what history reported. In 1843, however, a copy of the Italian edition was discovered in the University of Cambridge, in England, which was brought out, with the French translation of 1552 and the English of 1548, by Churchill Babington at Cambridge, and, with a German translation by Tischendorf, at Leipsic in 1856. See Young, Life and Times of Paleario (Lond. 1860, 2 vols. 8vo); Blackburn, Aonio Paleario and his Friends, with a revised edition of The Benefit of Christ's Death (Philadelphia Presbyt. Board, 1867); Gurlitt, Leben des A. Paleario (Hamb. 1805); Bonnet, A. Palleario et la Ref. de l'Italie (Paris, 1863); M'Crie, Hist. of the Ref. in Italy, p. 131 sq., 278 sq., Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1870, 3, 419.

## Palembang[[@Headword:Palembang]]

             formerly an independent kingdom on the east coast of Sumatra, now a Netherlands residency, is bounded on the north by Jambi, north-west by Bencoolen, south by the Lampong districts, and south-east by the Strait of Banca, has an area of 61,911 square miles, sand a population amounting, in 1885, to 573,697 souls. Much of the land is low-lying swamp, covered with a wilderness of impenetrable bush; but in the south it rises into mountains, of which Oeloe Moesi is 6180 feet in height. Gold-dust, iron- ore, sulphur with arsenic, lignite, and common coal are found; also clays suited for making coarse pottery, etc. Springs of pure oil occur near the coal-fields of Bali Boekit, and of mineral water in various places. Rice,  cotton, sugar, pepper, tobacco, and in the interior cocoa-nuts are grown; the forests producing gutta-percha, gum-elastic, ratans, wax, benzoin, satinwood, etc. The rivers abound with fish; and the elephant, rhinoceros, tiger, panther, and leopard roam the woods, as well as the deer, wild swine, and goats, with many varieties of the monkey. In the dry season the thermometer ranges from 80° to 92° F., and in the rainy season, 76° to 80°; but the climate is not considered unhealthy, except in the neighborhood of the swamps.

The natives are descended from Javanese, who in the 16th century, or earlier, settled in Palembang, and ruled over the whole land. The race, however, has become mixed with other Malays, and the language has lost its purity. In the north-west interior is a tribe called the Koeboes (Kubus), of whose origin nothing is known, but who are probably the remainder of the aborigines. They do not follow agriculture. but go about almost naked, and live chiefly by fishing and hunting. No clear idea of a Supreme Being seems to be possessed by them, though they believe in existence after death. SEE MALAYS.

## Palencia, Alonso De[[@Headword:Palencia, Alonso De]]

             a celebrated Spanish author, deserves a place here for his labors in practical religions literature and his edition of Josephus. Palencia was born in 1423; at the age of seventeen became page to the bishop of Burgos, and, after' travelling in Italy and on the Continent, was made royal historiographer. He died near the close! of his century. He wrote El Espejo de la Cruz (1485), and several other works of like character, still in MS., besides the great historical works on which his fame rests. His version of Josephus was finished in 1492. See Prescott, Ferdinand and Isabella, 1, 136; English Cyclop. s.v., and the literature there given.

## Paleotti, Gabriel[[@Headword:Paleotti, Gabriel]]

             an Italian cardinal, was born at Bologna Oct. 4,1524. His father, who was a lawyer, intended Gabriel also for that profession; but at maturity he decided for the clerical life, and, contenting himself with a simple canonicate, he refused the bishopric of Majorca, which Campeggio wished to resign in his favor. In 1556 he was put on the committee of the Index Expurgatorius. He was sent to the Council of Trent to sustain the interests of the Church, and Pius IV decorated him with the purple March 12, 1565. Pius V endowed him, Jan. 30, 1566, with the bishopric of Bologna. A  particular friend of St. Charles Borromeo and of Sextus V, he received more than thirty votes in the conclave assembled to appoint a successor to the latter. The bishopric of Sabina was given to him March 20, 1591. He died at Rome July 23, 1597. He published, De Bono Senectutis (Antwerp, 1598): — De imaginibus sacris et profanis (Rome, 1594): — Archiepiscopale Bononiensis (ibid. 1594): — De nothis spuriisque filiis .(Frankfort, 1573): — De consistorialibus consultationibus. He drew up Acta Concilii Tridentini for the sessions in which he participated, and Pallavicini and Oderic Regnaud brought out a large part of this work, which, however, has not been published entire. See Ledesma, De vita et rebus gestis G. Paleotti (Bologna, 1647).

## Pales[[@Headword:Pales]]

             a deity worshipped by the ancient Romans, as presiding over shepherds and their flocks.

## Palestine[[@Headword:Palestine]]

             (Heb. Pele'sheth, פְּלֶשֶׁת, Joe 3:4; “Palsestina,” Exo 15:14; Isa 14:29; Isa 14:31) in the Bible means Philistia, “the land of the Philistines;” and so it was understood by our translators. The Heb. word is found, besides the above, only in Psa 60:8; Psa 83:7; Psa 87:4; and Psa 108:9, in all which our translators have rendered it by “Philistia” or “Philistines.” The Sept. has in Exodus Φυλιστιείμ, but in Isaiah and Joel ἀλλόφυλοι; the Vulg. in Exodus Philisthiim, in Isaiah Philisthcea, in Joel Palcesthini. (See below.) In the present article it is used in a much wider sense. It is employed in the same sense in which most of the Greek and Roman geographers understood it (Παλαιστίνη, Palcestina) — as denoting the whole land allotted to the twelve tribes of Israel by Joshua. Some recent writers confine the name to the country west of the Jordan, extending from Dan on the north to Beersheba on the south. Others again appear to extend it northwards as far as the parallel of Hamath, and southward to the borders of Egypt. It is here used, however, to denote the country lying on the east as well as the west side of the Jordan; while, on the other hand, it is confined to the territory actually divided by lot among the Israelites, thus excluding large sections of what is generally known as “The Land of Promise.” Palestine, in fact, is here taken as synonymous with “The Holy  Land” — substantially the same land given by Jehovah to his chosen people, and long held by them. The present article is intended-to bring together a general view of the ancient, and especially the Scriptural, information on this subject, and to illustrate it by the mass of elucidation and confirmation which modern exploration has afforded.

I. Situation. — The geographical position of Palestine is peculiar. It is central, and yet almost completely isolated. It commands equal facilities of access to Europe, Africa, and Asia; while, in one point of view. it stands apart from all. The Jews regarded it as the centre of the earth; and apparently to this view the prophet Ezekiel refers when he says, “Thus saith the Lord God, This is Jerusalem: I have set it in the midst of the nations and countries that are round about her” (Eze 5:5). The idea was adopted and perhaps unduly expanded by the rabbins and some of the early Christian fathers. One of the absurd Christian traditions still preserved in Jerusalem is that the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is the physical centre of the earth; and a spot is marked by a circle of marble pavement and a short column under the dome of the Greek Church which is said. to be the exact point as indicated by our Lord himself (Murray's Handbook, p. 164). The main thought, however, in this tradition is, in principle, strictly true. Palestine stood midway between the three greatest ancient nations, Assyria, Egypt, and Greece. It was for many centuries the centre, and the only centre, of religious light and of real civilization, from which all other nations, directly or indirectly, drew their supplies. It is a remarkable fact, which every thoughtful student of history must admit, that during the whole period of Jewish history light — intellectual, moral, and religious — radiated from Palestine, and from it alone. The farther one receded from that land, the more dim the light became; and the nearer one approached, it shone with the purer radiance. The heavenly knowledge communicated in “sundry times and divers manners” through the Jewish patriarchs and prophets was unfolded and perfected by our Lord and his apostles. In their age Palestine became the birthplace of intellectual life and civil and religious liberty. From these have since been developed all the scientific triumphs, all the social progress, and all the moral grandeur and glory of the civilized world. There was a fulness of prophetic meaning in the words of Isaiah which is only now beginning to be rightly understood and appreciated: “Out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke  many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks” (2, 3, 4).

Palestine is, by the peculiarity of its situation, almost isolated. Connected physically with the great body of the Asiatic continent, it is yet separated from the habitable parts of it by the arid desert of Arabia, which extends from the' eastern border of Syria to the banks of the Euphrates, a distance of nearly three hundred miles. Another desert. not altogether so Wide nor so difficult, sweeps along the southern confines of Palestine, as a barrier against all Egyptian invaders, and in a great measure prevented communication with that nation. The Mediterranean completely shut out the western world. Thus on three of its sides — the east, the south, and the west — was Palestine isolated. Its only direct link of connection with the outer world was Syria on the north; and even there the lofty chains of Lebanon and Hermon confined the channel of communication to one narrow pass, the valley of Coele-Syria. “These,” says Stanley, “were the natural fortifications of that vineyard which was ‘hedged round about' with tower and trench, sea and desert, against the ‘boars of the wood' and ‘the beasts of the field”' (Sin. and Pal. p. 114).

It was not without a wise purpose that the Almighty located his chosen people in such a land. During a long course of ages they were designed to be the sole preservers of a true faith, and the sole guardians of a divine revelation. It was needful, therefore, to separate them geographically from the evil example and baleful influences of heathen nations; and by the munitions of nature to defend them, and that precious record of God's will committed to their custody, from all assaults, physical as well as moral. It has been well said by a recent thoughtful writer, that “the more we learn of its relative position in regard to surrounding countries, and of its own distinctive characteristics, the more clearly is the wisdom of heaven recognised in its special adaptation to the purposes for which it was chosen and consecrated” (Drew, Scripture Lands, p. 2). But when Judaism was at length developed into Christianity — when the grand scheme of redemption was removed by the sufferings and death of the divine Saviour in Palestine from the region of dim prophecy into that of history — then the religion of God was finally severed from its connection, hitherto necessary, with a specific country and a chosen people — it became the religion of mankind. Then Palestine ceased to be God's country, and Israel to be God's people. The isolation of the land hitherto preserved the true faith; the exclusiveness of the people formed an effectual safeguard against  the admission of the philosophical speculations and corrupt practices of other nations; but after the resurrection of Christ, and the establishment of the pure, rational, spiritual faith revealed in the N.T. such material defences were no longer requisite. They would have been even prejudicial to the truth. Palestine was the cradle of the religion of God; on reaching full maturity, the cradle was no longer a fitting abode; the world then became its home and sphere of action. At that transition period the position of Palestine appeared as if specially designed to favor and consummate the divine plan, by the ready access it afforded for the messengers of truth to every kingdom of the known world. Before the establishment of Christianity, the sea had become the highway of nations. The Mediterranean, hitherto a barrier, was now the easiest channel of communication; and from the shores of Palestine the Gospel of Jesus was wafted away to the populous shores and crowded cities of the great nations of the West. It is thus that a careful study of the geographical position, the physical aspect, and past history of Palestine is calculated to throw clear light on the development of the divine plan of salvation, and to afford some little insight into the councils of Jehovah. (See below.)

Climate has a great influence upon man. That climate which is best adapted to develop the physical frame, to foster its powers, and to preserve them longest in healthy and manly vigor, is the most conducive to pure morality and intellectual growth. The heat of the tropics begets lassitude and luxurious effeminacy, while the cold of the arctic regions cramps the energies, and tends to check those lofty flights of poetic genius which give such a charm and sweetness to human life. Situated about midway between the equator and the polar circle, Palestine enjoys one of the finest climates in the world. Fresh sea-breezes temper the summer heats; the forests and abundant vegetation which once clothed the land diffused an agreeable moisture through the bright sunny atmosphere; while the hills and mountains made active and constant exercise necessary, and thus gave strength and elasticity to the frame. Palestine has given to the world some of the most distinguished examples of high poetic genius, of profound wisdom, of self-denying patriotism, of undaunted courage, and of bodily strength. The geographical position and physical structure of the land had much to do with this. God in his infinite wisdom and love placed his elect people in the very best position for the development of all that was great and good. Well might the Lord say by the mouth of his prophet, “What could have been done more to my vineyard, that I have not done in it?”  (Isa 5:4). This position of Palestine, too, together with its great variety of surface, enabled it to produce that abundance and diversity of fruits which so greatly contributed to endear it to its proverbially patriotic inhabitants.

II. The Boundaries of Palestine require to be defined with care and minuteness. Much confusion has arisen in Biblical geography from the way in which this subject has been treated, and from the diversity of views which prevails. No two writers agree on all points. The accounts of ancient geographers — Greek, Roman, and Jewish — are unsatisfactory, and sometimes contradictory; and when we come down to more modern times we do not find much improvement. Some authors confound Palestine with “the Land of Promise,” as mentioned in Genesis and Exodus, and with the land defined by Moses in the book of Numbers (Reland, Paloest. p. 113 sq.; Cellarius, Geogr. ii, 464 sq.; Hales, Anal. of Chronology, i, 413; Kitto, Physical Hist. of Pal. p. 28; Jahn, Biblical Antiquities; Encyclop. Britan. art. Palestine, 8th ed.). Others confine the name to the territory west of the Jordan, and reaching from Dan to Beersheba. Even dean Stanley, usually so accurate and so careful in his geographical details, does not express his views with sufficient clearness on this point (Sin. and Pal. p. 111, 114).

1. Boundaries of the Land promised to Abrahan. — The first promises made to Abraham were indefinite. A country was insured to him, but its limits were not stated. The Lord said to him: at Shechem, “Unto thy seed will I give this land” (Gen 12:7); and again, on the heights of Bethel, after Lot had left him, “Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever” (Gen 13:14-15). It was a commanding spot, but still that view did not embrace one fourth of Palestine. At length, however, the boundaries were defined; in general terms, it is true, but still with sufficient clearness to indicate the vast extent of territory promised to Abraham's descendants: “In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates” (Gen 15:18). “The river of Egypt” was here probably the Nile. It should be observed that the Hebrew word is נָהָר, river (Sept. ποταμός), and not נִחִל, wady, or “torrent-bed,” as in Num 34:5 (Sept. χείμαῤῥος), where Wady el-Arish seems to be meant (see Kalisch, Delitzsch, etc., ad loc.). From the banks of the Nile,  then, to the Euphrates, the country promised to the patriarch extended. The covenant was. renewed with the Israelites just after their departure from Egypt, and the boundaries of the land were given with more fulness: “I will set thy bounds from the Red Sea even to the sea of the Philistines (the Mediterranean); and from the desert (of Sinai) unto the river” (Euphrates; עדאּהנחר; Sept. ἕως τοῦ μεγάλου ποταμοῦ Εὐφράτου; Exo 23:31).

But this great territory was promised upon certain specific conditions. The people were, on their part, to be faithful to God (Exo 23:22-23). They did not fulfil these conditions, and therefore the whole land was not given to them (see Jos 23:13-16; Jdg 2:20-23). But though the whole land was never occupied by the Israelites, there was a near approach to the possession of it, or the exercise of sovereignty over it, in the days of David, of whom it is recorded: “David smote also Hadadezer, the son of Rehob, king of Zobah, as he went to recover his border at the river Euphrates” (2Sa 8:3). That warlike monarch conquered the kingdoms of Hamath, Zobah, Damascus, Moab, Ammon, Amalek, Philistia, and Edom (2Sa 8:5-14) — the whole country, in fact, from the border of Egypt to the river Euphrates, and from the Arabian desert to the Mediterranean. This was the land given in covenant promise to Abraham; but it was never included under the name Palestine.

2. The land described by Moses in Num 34:1-12 is much more limited in extent than that promised to Abraham. He calls it “the Land of Canaan — the land that shall fall unto you for an inheritance” (Num 34:2). Its boundaries are defined with great precision. On the south the border reached from Kadesh-barnea in the Arabah, on the confines of Edom, across the “wilderness of wandering,” to the torrent of Egypt, doubtless that now known as Wady el-Arish. The word is here נחל, torrent, and not נהר, river. This important distinction has been overlooked by Dr. Keith and others (Land of Israel, p. 85 sq.; Bochart, Opera, iii, 764; Shaw, Travels, ii, 45 sq.). The Great Sea was its western border. The northern is thus defined: “And this shall be your north border: from the great sea ye shall point out for you Mount Hor; from Mount Hor ye shall point out your border unto the entrance of Hamath; and the goings forth of the border shall be to Zedad: and the border shall go on to Ziphron, and the goings out of it shall be at Hazar-enan” (Num 34:7-9). The interpretation of this passage has given rise to much controversy. Dr. Keith argues with  considerable force and learning that Mount Hor, or, as it is in the Hebrew, Hor ha-Har (הָהָר הֹר), is Mount Casius, and that the chasm of the Orontes at Antioch is “the entrance of Hamath” (see Keith's Land of Israel, p. 92-105). Dr. Kitto, on the other hand, following Reland (Paloest. p. 118 sq.), Bochart (Opera, 1, 307), and Cellarius (Geogr. 2, 464 sq,), locates this northern border-line near the parallel of Sidon, making some peak of southern Lebanon Mount Hor, and the lower extremity of the valley of CceleSyria the “entrance of Hamath.” SEE HOR, MOUNT. According to Dr. Porter, however, the “entrance of Hamath” is the entrance from the Great Sea, from the west; and he states that to this day natives sometimes call the opening between the northern end of the Lebanon range and that of Bargylus Bdb Hamah, “The door of Hamath.” Van de Velde appears to make the northern end of Coele-Syria, where that valley opens upon the plain of Hamath, “the entrance of Hamath” (Travels, 2, 470); and Stanley adopts the same view (Sin. and Pal. p. 399). SEE HAMATH.

The east border has some well-known landmarks — Riblah, the Sea of Chinnereth, and the Jordan to the Dead Sea (Num 34:10-12). The line ran down the valley of Coele-Syria and the Jordan, thus excluding the whole kingdom of Damascus, with Bashan, Gilead, and Moab. It would seem, however, that the country east of the Jordan was excluded by Moses, not because he regarded it as beyond the proper boundaries of the land of Israel, but because it had already been apportioned by him to the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh (Gen 32:1-32).

The Israelites were never in actual possession of all this territory, though David extended his conquests beyond it, and Solomon for a time exacted tribute from its various tribes and nations. The southern seaboard, and a large section of the Shephelah, remained in the hands of the warlike Philistines. The Phoenicians held the coast-plain north of Carmel; and the chain of Lebanon, from Zidon northward, continued in possession of the Giblites and other mountain tribes (Jdg 3:1-3). It is worthy of note that the sacred writer, when reckoning up the regions still to be conquered, was guided not by the words of the Abrahamic covenant, but by the description of Moses (Jos 13:2-6). The reason why this whole land was not given to the Israelites is plainly stated: the Lord kept some of the aboriginal inhabitants in it for the purpose of chastising the criminal slothfulness and the thoughtlessness and rebellion of his people (Jdg 3:4; see Masius and Keil, ad loc.). Such, then; is the land described by Moses; but the name Palestine was never given to so extensive a region.

3. The boundaries of the land allotted by Moses and Joshua to the twelve tribes are given in the following passages-those of the land east of the Jordan in Numbers 32 and Jos 13:8-32; on the west side in Joshua 15-19. The south border was identical with that described by Moses (comp. Num 34:3-5; Jos 15:2-4). The west border was also the same; the possessions of the western tribes reaching in every instance to the sea (Jos 15:11; Jos 16:3; Jos 16:8; Jos 17:9-10; Jos 19:29). The north border had Zidon as its landmark on the coast. Thence it was drawn south-east across Lebanon, probably along the line of the ancient Phoenician road by Kulaat esh-Shukif to Ijon and Dan (Jos 19:28; 1Ki 15:20); thence it passed over the southern shoulder of Hermon, and across the plateau of Hauran to the northern end of the mountains of Bashan (Num 32:33; Deu 3:8-14; Jos 12:4-6). The only landmark on the east border is Salcah (Jos 12:5; Jos 13:11; Deu 3:10). From Salcah it appears to have run south-west along the border of the Arabian Midbar to the bank of the river Arnon (Jos 12:1-2). Here it turned westward, and followed the course of that river to the Dead Sea, thus excluding the territory of Moab and Edom. SEE TRIBE.

The country allotted to the tribes was thus considerably smaller than that described by Moses; and it was very much less than that given in covenant promise to Abraham. Even all allotted was never completely conquered and occupied. The Philistines and Phoenicians still possessed their cities along the coast (Jdg 1:19; Jdg 1:31); some of the northern tribes held their mountain fastnesses (Jdg 1:33), and the Geshurites and Maachathites continued in their rocky strongholds in Bashan (Jos 13:13).

4. The land distributed in the prophetic vision of Ezekiel is conterminous on the south, west, and north with that of Moses. Its eastern boundary is different. Its landmarks are Hazar-enan, Hauran, Damascus, Gilead, and “the land of Israel by Jordan” (Gen 47:17-18). The last point is indefinite, but probably it means that section east of the Jordan, in Moab, which was assigned to Reuben. This land, therefore, includes, in addition to that of Moses, the whole kingdom of Damascus, and the possessions of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh.

5. Present Limits. — The country to which the name Palestine is now usually given does not exactly correspond with any of these. It is smaller than them all. Its boundaries have never been laid down with geographical precision, but they may be stated approximately as follows: On the south a line drawn from the lower end of the Dead Sea to Beersheba and Gaza; on the west, the Mediterranean; on the north, a line drawn from the mouth of the river Litany to Dan, and thence across the southern foot of Jebel es- Sheik to the plain of Jedun opposite the northern end of the Hauran mountains; on the east, a line running from the northeastern angle through Jerash to Kerak and the Dead Sea. The length of Palestine is thus 130 English miles. Its breadth on the south is 70 miles, and on the north about 40. Its superficial area may be estimated at 7150 square miles. Its southern extremity the end of the Dead Sea, is in lat. N. 31° 5'; and its northern, at the mouth of the Litany, 33° 25'. Its most westerly point, at Gaza, is in long. E. 34° 30'; and its most easterly, at Jerash, 36°. SEE SYRIA.

The eastern shore of the Mediterranean runs in nearly a straight line from Egypt to Asia Minor, and of this line the seaboard of Palestine forms about one third towards, not at, its southern end; Gaza being 50 miles distant from Egypt, while the mouth of the Litany is 250 from Asia Minor. Palestine occupies the whole breadth of the habitable land between the Mediterranean and the Arabian desert. Its boundaries on three sides are therefore natural, and may be said to be impassable — on the west the sea, and on the south and east the desert; not, however, a desert of sand, nor a desert altogether barren, but rather a bleak, dry region, with a thin, flinty soil, yielding some tolerable pasture in spring, though almost bare as a rock in summer and autumn. Nature thus prevented the extension of the Israelitish territory in these directions, and. likewise prevented the close approach of any settled nation; but it left free scope for flocks and herds, and a noble field for the training of an active, hardy race of shepherd warriors, such as David so often led to victory.

On the south-east, Palestine bordered on Edom; but the Dead Sea, the deep valley of the Arabah, and the rugged Wilderness of Judaea, formed natural barriers which prevented all close intercourse. Hostile armies found it difficult to pass them, and a few resolute men could guard the defiles. On the northern border lay the countries of Damascus and Phoenicia, and intercourse with these had a serious effect on the northern tribes. The distinction between Jew and Gentile soon became less sharply defined there than elsewhere. The former lost much of their exclusiveness, and their faith  lost proportionably in purity. Idolatry was easily established in the chief places of the northern kingdom, and the borrowed Baalim of Phoenicia became in time the popular deities of the land (1 Kings 18). This fact of itself shows how wise was that providential arrangement which located the people of God in an isolated land, and prevented, by. the barriers of nature, any close intercourse with those irrational systems, and barbarous and often obscene rites, which, under the name of religion, prevailed among the nations of the world.

III. Names. —

1. Palestine. — In the A.V. of the Bible, as seen above, this word occurs only in Joe 3:4 (גְּלַילוֹת פְּלֶשֶׁת; Sept. Γαλιλαία ἀλλοφύλων, Vulg. terminus Palcesthinoruni): “What have ye to do with me, Tyre, and Zidon, and all the coasts of Palestine?” Here the name is confined to Philistia. In three passages (Exo 15:14; Isa 14:29; Isa 14:31) we have the Latin form Paloestina; but the meaning is the same, and hence the Sept. renders it in one case Φυλιστιείμ, and in the others ἀλλόφυλοι.

The Hebrew word פלשprobably comes from the Ethiopic root falasa, “to wander,” or “emigrate,” and hence פלשתwill signify “the nation of emigrants” — the Philistines (q.v.) having emigrated from Africa (see Reland, Paloest. p. 73 sq.). The people gave their name to the territory in which they settled on the south-west coast of Palestine. In this sense also Josephus uses the Greek equivalent Παλαιστίνη (Ant. i, 6, 2; ii, 15, 3; 6:1, 1; 13:5, 10). But it would seem that even before his time the Greek name began to be employed in a more extended signification. Herodotus states that all the country from Phoenicia to Egypt is called Palestine (7, 89); and he calls the Jews “Syrians of Palestine” (3, 5, 91). An inscription of Ivalush, king of Assyria (probably the Pul of Scripture), as deciphered by Sir H. Rawlinson, names “Palaztu on the Western Sea,” and distinguishes it from Tyre, Damascus, Samaria, and Edom (Rawlinson, Herod. i, 467). In the same restricted sense it was probably employed — if employed at all — by the ancient Egyptians, in whose records at Karnak the name Pulusatu has been, deciphered in close connection with that of the Shairutana or Sharu, possibly the Sidonians or Syrians (Birch, doubtfully, in Layard, Nineveh, 2, 407, note). The extension of the name doubtless arose from the fact that when the Greeks began to hold commercial intercourse with Phoenicia and south-western Asia, they found  the coast from Phoenicia to Egypt in possession of the Philistines; and consequently they applied the name Palcestina loosely to the whole country reaching from the sea to the desert. Josephus uses it in this sense in a few instances (Ant. i, 6, 4; 8, 10, 3; Ap. i, 22); and Philo says, “The country of the Sodomites was a district of the land of Canaan, which the Syrians afterwards called Palestine' (De Abraham. 26; comp. Vita Mosis, 29). The rabbins also gave the name Palestine to all the country occupied by the Jews (Reland, p. 38 sq.). Dion. Cassius states that “anciently the whole country lying between Phoenicia and Egypt was called Palestine. It had also another adopted name, Judaea” (Hist. 37). From this time onward Palestine was the name most usually given to the land of Israel; in some cases it was confined to the country west of the Jordan, but in others it embraced the eastern provinces (see Reland, and authorities quoted by him, p. 39 sq.). By early Christian writers the word was generally, though not uniformly, employed in this sense. Thus Jerome, in one passage: “Terra Judaea, quae nunc appellatur Palsestina” (ad Ezech. 27); but in another, “Philistiim qui nunc Palaestini vosantur” (in Am. i, 6; comp. Isa 14:29). Chrysostom usually calls the Land of Israel Palestine (Reland, p. 40). All ancient writers, therefore, did not use the name in the same sense some applying it to the whole country of the Jews, some restricting it to Philistia (Theodoret, ad Psalms 59; Reland, l.c.). — Consequently, when the name Palestine occurs in classic and early Christian writers, the student of geography will require carefully to examine the context, that he may ascertain whether it is applied to Philistia alone, or to all the land of Israel.

It appears that when our Authorized Version was made, the English name Palestine was considered to be equivalent to Philistia. Thus Milton, with his usual accuracy in such points, mentions Dagon as

“Palestine, in Gath and Ascialon,

And Accaron and Gaza’s frontier bounds”

(Par. Lost, i, 464);

and again as

“That twice-battered god of Palestine”

(Hymn on Nat. 199)

where, if any proof be wanted that his meaning is restricted to Philistia, it will be found in the fact that he has previously connected other deities with  the other parts of the Holy Land. See also, still more decisively, Samson Ag. 144, 1098. But even without such evidence the passages themselves show how our translators understood the word. Thus in Exo 15:14, “Palestine,” Edom, Moab, and Canaan are mentioned as the nations alarmed at the approach of Israel. In Isa 14:29; Isa 14:31, the prophet warns “Palestine” not to rejoice at the death of king Ahaz, who had subdued it. In Joe 3:4, Phoenicia and “Palestine” are upbraided with cruelties practiced on Judah and Jerusalem (Rennell, Geogr. of Herodot. p. 245 sq.).

Soon after the Christian aera we find the name Palsestina in possession of the country. Ptolemy (A.D. 161) thus applies it (Geogr. v, 16). “The arbitrary divisions of Paiaestina Prima, Secunda, mind Tertia, settled at the end of the 4th or beginning of the 5th century (see the quotations from the Cod. Theodos. in Reland, p. 205), are still observed in the documents of the Eastern Church” (Smith, Dict. of Geogr. 2, 533a). Paltestina Tertia, of which Petra was the capital, was, however, out of the Biblical limits; and the portions of Pernea not comprised in Palalstina Secunda were counted as in Arabia.

2. Canaan (כְּנִעִן; Χαναάν). — This is the oldest, and in the early books of Scripture the most common name of Palestine. It is derived from the son of Ham, by whose family the country was colonized (Gen 9:18; Gen 10:15-19; Josephus, Ant. 1, 6, 2). It is worthy of note, as tending to confirm the accuracy of the early ethnological notices in Genesis, that the ancient Phoenicians called themselves Canaanites (Kenrick's Phoenicia, p. 40; Reland, p. 7). The name Canaan was confined to the district west of the Jordan; the provinces east of the river were always distinguished from it (Num 33:51; Exo 16:35, with Jos 5:12; Jos 22:9-10). Its eastern boundary is thus within that of Palestine; but, on the other hand, it reached on the north to Hamath (Gen 10:18, with 17:8). and probably even farther, for the Arvadite is reckoned among the Canaanites, and the earliest name of Phoenicia was Cna or Cana. SEE PHOENICIA.

Wherever the country promised to the Israelites, or dwelt in by the patriarchs, is mentioned in Scripture, it is called “the land of Canaan” (Exo 6:4; Exo 15:15; Lev 14:34; Deu 32:39; Jos 14:1; Psa 105:11), doubtless in reference to the promise originally made to Abraham (Gen 17:8). SEE CANAAN, LAND OF.

In Amo 2:10 alone it is “the land of the Amorite;” perhaps with a  glance at Deu 1:7. A parallel phrase is the “land of the Hittites” (Jos 1:4); a remarkable expression, occurring here only in the Bible, though frequently used in the Egyptian records of Rameses II, in which Cheia or Chita appears to denote the whole country of Lower and Middle Syria (Brugsch, Geogr. Inschrift. 2, 21, etc.).

3. The Land of Promise. — This name originated in the divine promise to Abraham (Gen 13:15). — Its extent and boundaries are given by Moses (Gen 15:18-21; Exo 23:31), and have already been considered. The exact phrase, “Land of Promise,” is not found in the O.T., and only once in the N.T (Heb 11:9, ἡ γῆ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας), but some analogous expression is often used by the sacred writers; thus in Num 22:11, “The land which I sware unto Abraham” (comp. Deu 34:1-4; Genesis 1, 24; Eze 20:42; Act 7:5). Such appellations were used when the object of the writer was to direct the people's attention to the Abrahamic covenant, either in its certainty or in its fulfilment. It is now frequently employed by writers on Palestine who give special attention to prophecy (for a good account of it, see Reland, p. 18 sq.).

4. The Land of Jehovah. — This name is only found in Hos 9:3 : “They shall not dwell in Jehovah's land.” All the countries of the earth are the Lord's; but it appears, as Reland states (Paloest. p. 16), that in some peculiar way Palestine was especially God's land. Thus an express command was given,” The land shall not be sold forever For the land is mine” (Lev 25:23); and the Psalmist says, “Lord, thou hast been favorable unto thy land” (Psa 85:1); and still more emphatic are the words of Isaiah: “The stretching out of his wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel” (8:8; comp. Joe 1:6; Joe 3:2; Jer 16:18). The object of these and many similar expressions was to show that Jehovah claimed the sole disposal of Palestine. He reserved it for special and holy purposes; and he intended in all coming time to dispose of it, whether miraculously or providentially, for carrying out those purposes, either by the agency of the Jews or of others. It was the only land in which the Lord personally and visibly dwelt; first in the Shekinab glory, and again in the person of Jesus. For this land the Lord always. demanded both a special acknowledgment of lordship and certain stipulated returns to him, as tithes and first-fruits (Reland, p. 16, 17).

5. The Land of Israel (אֶרֶוֹ יַשְׂרָאֵל; N.T. γῆ Ι᾿σραήλ). — By this name Palestine was distinguished from all the other countries of the earth. Of course this must not be confounded with the same appellation as applied to the northern kingdom only (2Ch 30:25; Eze 27:17). It began to be used after the establishment of the monarchy. It occurs first in 1Sa 13:19, and is occasionally used in the later books (2Ki 5:2; 2Ki 6:23); but Ezekiel employs it more frequently than all the sacred writers together (though he commonly alters its form slightly, substituting אֲדָמָהfor אֶרֶוֹ), the reason probably being that he compares Palestine with other countries more frequently than any other writer. Matthew, in relating the story of the infant Saviour's return from Egypt, uses the name: “He arose, and took the young child and his mother, and came into the land of Israel” (2:21). The name is found in the apocryphal books (Tob 1:4); in Josephus, who also uses “land of the Hebrews” ( ῾Εβραίων χώρα); and in some of the early Christian fathers (Reland, p. 9). The name is essentially Jewish; it was familiar. to the rabbins, but, in a great measure, unknown to classic writers. It is only applied in the Bible to the country which was actually occupied by the Israelites; and so it was understood by the rabbins, who divided the whole world into two parts, “The land of Israel,” and “the land out of Israel” (Reland, p. 9). In 2Es 14:31, it is called “the land of Sion.”

6. The Land (הָאָרֶוֹ; ἡ γῆ). — This name is given to Palestine emphatically, by way of distinction, as we call the Word of God the Bible. Thus in Rth 1:1. There was a famine in the land” (בארוֹ); and in Jer 12:11, “The whole land is made desolate” (Jer 50:34); and so also in Luke's Gospel, “When great famine was throughout all the land” (Luk 5:25); and in Mat 27:45, “Now from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour.” This also was a strictly Jewish name (Reland, p. 28 sq.). In Daniel it is called “the glorious land” (Dan 11:41).

7. Judaea. — The use of this name in the Bible and by classic writers requires to be carefully noted. At first, its Hebrew equivalent, אֶרֶוֹ יְהוּדָה, was confined to the possessions of the tribe of Judah (2Ch 9:11). After the captivity of the northern kingdom, the name “Judah” became identified with the Jewish nation; and hence, during the second captivity, יהוד, Judaea, was applied to all Palestine and to all the  Israelites. In the same sense it was employed in Josephus, in the N.T., and in classic writers; and it was even made to include the region east of the Jordan (Mat 19:1; Mar 10:1; Josephus, Ant. 9:14,1; 12:4, 11). In the book of Judith it is applied to the portion between the plain of Esdraelon and Samaria (Jdt 11:19), as it is in Luk 23:5; though it is also used in the stricter sense of Judsea proper (Joh 4:3; Joh 7:1), that is, the most southern of the three main divisions west of Jordan. In this narrower sense it is employed throughout 1 Maccabees (see especially 9:50; 10:30, 38; 11:34). It is sometimes (War, i, 1, 1; iii, 3, 5b) difficult to ascertain whether Josephus is using it in its wider or narrower sense. In the narrower sense he certainly does often employ it (Ant. v, 1, 22; War, iii, 3, 4, 5a). Nicolaus of Damascus applied the name to the whole country (Josephus, Ant. i, 7, 2). SEE JUDAEA.

The Roman division of the country hardly coincided with the Biblical one, and it does not appear that the Romans had any distinct name for that which we understand by Palestine. The province of Syria, established by Pompey, of which Scaurus was the first governor (quaestor proprietor) in B.C. 62, seems to have embraced the whole seaboard from the Bay of Issus (Iskanderun) to Egypt, as. far back as it was habitable. that is, up to the desert which forms the background to the whole district. “Judaea” in their phrase appears to have signified so much of this country as intervened between Idumeea on the south and the territories of the numerous free cities on the north and west which were constituted with the establishment of the province — such as Scythopolis, Sebaste, Joppa, Azotus, etc. (Smith, Dict. of Geography, 2, 1077). The district east of the Jordan, lying between it and the desert — at least so much of it as was not covered by the lands of Pella, Gadara, Canatha, Philadelphia, and other free towns — was called Peraea.

8. The Holy Land (אִדְמִת הִקּדֶֹשׁ; ἡ γῆ ἡ ἃγια; Terra Sancta). Next to Palestine, this is now the most familiar name of the country. Zechariah is the first who mentions it, “The Lord shall inherit Judah, his portion of the Holy Land” (Zec 2:12). The rabbins constantly use it, and they have detailed, with great minuteness, the constituents of its sanctity. They did not regard it as all equally holy. Judaea ranked first; after it the northern kingdom; and last of all the territory beyond Jordan (Reland, p. 26 sq.). The very dust and stones and air of the land are still considered holy by the poor Jews (Reland, p. 25). The name Ta-netr (i.e. Holy Land),  which is found in the inscriptions of Rameses II and Thothmes III, is believed by M. Brugsch to refer to Palestine (ut sup. p. 17). But this is contested by M. de Rouge (Revue Archeologique, Sept. 1861, p. 216). The Phoenicians appear to have applied the title Holy Land to their own country, and possibly also to Palestine, at a very early date (Brugsch, p. 17). If this can be substantiated, it opens a new view to the Biblical student, inasmuch as it would seem to imply that the country had a reputation for sanctity before its connection with the Hebrews. The early Christian writers call it Terra Sancta (Justin Martyr, Triphon; Tertullian, De Resurrectione; comp. Reland, p. 23). During the Middle Ages, and especially in the time of the Crusades, this name became so common as almost to supersede all others. In the present day, it is adopted, along with Palestine, as a geographical term. It was originally, and is now, applied only to the land allotted to the twelve tribes; and some Christian writers appear to confine it to the section west of the Jordan. More usually, however, it is employed in the same sense as Palestine (Reland, p. 21-28). In the long list of Travels and Treatises given by Ritter (Erdkunde, Jordan, p. 31-55), Robinson (B. R. ii, 534-555), and Bonar (Land of Promise, p. 517-535), it predominates far beyond any other appellation. Quaresimus, in his Elucidatio Terrce Sanctoe (i, 9, 10), after enumerating the various names above mentioned, concludes by adducing seven reasons why that which he has embodied in the title of his own work, “though of later date than the rest, yet in excellency and dignity surpasses them all;” closing with the words of pope Urban II addressed to the Council of Clermont: “Quam terram merito Sanctam diximus, in quae non est etiam passus pedis quem non illustraverit et sanctificaverit vel corpus vel umbra Salvatoris, vel gloriosa praesentia Sanctze Dei genitricis, vel amplectendus Apostolorum commeatus, vel martyrum ebibendus sanguis effusus.”

9. The modern name of the country is es-Shemn (Geogr. Works of Sadik Isfahani, in Ibn Haukal's Oriental Geogr. p. 7), corresponding to the ancient Aram, and to our Syria. But this of course includes much more than what we usually call Palestine. The Jews to this day call Palestine by the Chaldee name of Areo-Kedusha, or “Holy Land,” though Jewish maps may be found with “Land of Canaan,” etc., upon them.

IV. Historical Allusions. —

1. Early References. — The earliest notice of Palestine is a latent one, and is contained in these memorable words of Moses:  ‘In the Most High's portioning of the nations, In his dispersion of the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the peoples According to the number of the sons of Israel. For the portion of Jehovah is his people, Jacob the lot of his inheritance” (Deu 32:8-9).

Thus the divine eye rested on Canaan, and it was set apart for Israel from the first; so that all other intermediate possessors were illegitimate tenants of a land assigned by its true owner to another. The ecclesiastics of the third century, however, dreamed a more ambitious dream. They linked Paradise and Palestine together, and record that Adam, shortly after his expulsion, migrated westward (Cain eastward), and deposited his bones, or at least his skull, in one of the hills on which Melchizedek afterwards built his city; from which event the place was called Golgotha, “the place of a skull.” Whatever the fact may be, the thought is not conceived amiss — that the first Adam should dwell in the same land as the second, and lay his body in the same grave. Hebron is made to claim this honor by some; but all these fabulists agree that Adam died in Palestine; and they have determined that .the Church of the Holy Sepulchre is the centre of the earth--ὀμφαλὸς γῆς, umbilicus terre; just as the Greeks decided regarding Delphi and Apollo's shrine-” Apollo, qui umbilicum certum terrarum obtines” (see Jerome, De Loc. Hebr.; Pererius Valentinus, On Genesis, 1, 294, 416, where the references to the fathers are given). This legend as to Adam is not altogether of Christian origin. The Jews have a tradition that he died in Palestine, affirming that the four, from whom Kirjath-Arba took its name, were not only four patriarchs — Adam, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob — but four matrons — Eve, Sarah, Rebekah, Leah. The better known and more probable tradition of the Jews is that Melchizedek, king of Salem, was Shem, son of Noah (Jerome, Comm. on Isaiah 41).

2. Pagan Fables. — To Joppa, now Jaffa, there is attached the wild legend of Andromeda, the maiden exposed by her father Cepheus to the sea- monster, and rescued by Perseus. The story of the surf, the rock, the chain, the broken links still visible, has been told not only by Greek poets, bit by Christian annalists or travellers, from Jerome down to Felix Fabri (Pliny, Ovid, Jerome, Fabri's Evagatorium). This Cepheus, according to Pliny, was king of Palestine, though an Ethiopian; according to Ovid, he was son of Phoenix, who gave name to Phoenician Palestine; while according to Tacitus he was king of the Jews — “AEthiopium prolem (he calls them) quos rege Cepheo, metus atque odium mutare sedes pepulit” (Tacit. Hist. v, 2). Pagan memories and myths crowd themselves much more  numerously' into the rocks and nooks of the “Holy Land” than we generally know; names, exploits, temples, haunts of gods and goddesses are associated with very many localities along the line of the Phoenician and Philistian shore, from the Gulf of Issus down to the Egyptian seaboard. Palestine was not a blank when Israel entered it. It swarmed with gods; and Joshua's task was not merely to assail hostile forts or armies, but to raze temples whose every stone was obscenity, whose every altar blasphemy. — The “Land of Promise” (like the human spirit) was the haunt of every unclean and hateful idol, before it was the dwelling of the living God. First unclean; then clean; and now unclean again; this is the history of the land. Herodotus speaks of a temple of the celestial Venus at Ascalon, and notes it as the most ancient of all her shrines (Herod. 1, 105; see Rawlinson's Herod. 1, 247); Athenaeus mentions the drowning of Atergatis, or Derceto, the Syrian Venus, in a lake near Ascalon, by Mopsus, a Lydian (Rawlinson's Herod. 1, 364); Lucian refers to this later as the place where sacred fishes were reared, in honor of the sea-born goddess. At the other extremity of the land, or Lebanon, this same Venus was worshipped with vile rites. Byblus, Adonis, Heliopolis were associated with like deities and like worship (see Kenrick, Phoenicia, p. 306, 312). To this region also belong the lustful myths of the Syrian Astarte and, the Greek Europa; the fable of Daedalus (also called Hephaistos or Vulcan), the father of the Phoenician Cabiri, and of Hercules, the tutelary god of Tyre and discoverer of the Tyrian purple, to whom Hiram, the friend of Solomon, built a temple, if Menander, quoted by Josephus, wrote the truth (Joseph Ant. 8:5. 3). Along the sea-coast we find, in disorderly profusion, the legends of the West, the rudiments of the gods of Greece; while in the interior we find the legends of the East, the worn-out relic of the gods of Babylon and Assyria Widely over Palestine had these fables settled down, like so many unclean birds, to preoccupy each crag and cliff, and prevent the entrance of true faith and holy worship. It was as if the idols of Shinar, in their migration to Europe, had been permitted to rest for a season in Judaea before finally settling down on the hills and in the groves of Greece.

Though Palestine was, in the divine purpose, destined for Israel by God, yet Israel was not its first possessor. Other nations, seven in number (if not more), meted it out between them — children of Ham, not of Shem; nay, Jerusalem itself owed its origin to them, “Thy father was an Amorite, thy mother a Hittite” (Eze 16:3). These Canaanites were allowed to occupy it for a season, that they might prepare it for its proper owners.  Wells were dug, houses were built, towns were reared, terraces were made, vineyards and olive-yards were planted, the whole land was brought under cultivation, so that. when Israel came he found all things made ready for his occupancy (Deu 6:11; Porter, Five Years in Damascus; Giant Cities of Bashan). The fact is a singular one, unique in the history of nations; and it explains how a people, amounting to between two and three millions, all at once sat down in comfort and plenty in a new territory. They entered the desert with the spoil of Egypt on their hands; they took possession of Canaan with the riches and abundance of seven nations at their disposal.

3. Classical References. — The Egyptian hieroglyphics contain references to the nations of Canaan. The splendor of Karnak under Thotlimies is indebted as much to the Phoenician Arvad as to the southern Cush (Osburnl, Egypt, 2, 284). The paintings of Abu-Simbul tell us how Rameses

“Makes to tremble the rebels of the Jebusites;”

and how Sesostris “fought with the Hittites in the plains of the north” how he swept over Phoenicia —

He prevails over you; Ye cutters of Tyre,

Ye dividers of Arvad He casts you down,

He hews you in pieces!”

Hadasha (Kadesh Barnea), in the land of the Amorite, is seen on a wooded hill, attacked by enemies. The Pharaohs of both Egypts are seen busy in punishing a Jebusitish aggression against Phenne, which Mr. Osburn understands to be not the Idumaean Phoeno, but Wady Magharah, the mining district in the Sinnaitic desert (Osburn, Egypt, 2, 473). The hieroglyphical name for Canaan is Naharain (ibid. p. 474). But this is not the place for enumerating these Egyptian references to Palestine and its cities; nor for investigating the no less important and interesting notices of them in the Assyrian relics. Perhaps the time has not yet come for a work on this subject, inasmuch as new information is finding its way to us every year; but the reader would do well to study the works of Layard, Rawlinson, Botta, Bonomi, and Smith.  Homer (who probably wrote in Solomon's reign) makes no mention of the Jews or of Palestine. though he very frequently names Phoenicia and Sidon. That Phoenicia, so often sung in the Odyssey, was Judsea, its king Solomon, and the twelve princes of its court the heads of the twelve tribes, has been maintained, but Homer must have been nodding grievously if he had persuaded himself that Corfil was at all like Palestine. Herodotus (more than 400 years after) speaks of “the Syrians in Palestine” in connection with the practice of circumcision; of Kadytis, of Phoenicia, of the “seacoasts of Syria” (2, 104, 159; 7:89; Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 171, note). Lysimachus, about B.C. 400 (as quoted by Josephus), speaks of Judsea, of Hierosyla or Hierosolyma, and of the leprosy of the Jews (Joseph. contra Ap. i, 34; Meier's Judaica, p. 2). Berosus (B.C. 320) mentions Nebuchadnezzar's expedition into Syria, and his taking Jews and Phoenicians captives (Joseph. Ant. 10:11. 1; Giles, Heathen Records, p. 55). Manetho (B.C. 280) speaks of a land “now called Judaea,” and of Jerusalem a city that would “suffice for many myriads of men” (Joseph. contra Ap. i, 14; Giles, p. 63). Hecateus. (B.C. 300) mentions Syria and “the 1500 priests of the Jews, who received the tenth of the produce.” He describes Jerusalem thus: “There are of the Jews numerous fortresses and villages throughout the country; and one strong city of about fifty furlongs in circuit, inhabited by about twelve myriads of men, which they call Jerusalem.” He then mentions the Temple, the altar, the lamp, the priests, etc. (Giles, p. 68, 70). Agatharchides (B.C. 170) speaks of “the nation of the Jews and their strong and great city” (Joseph. Ant. 12:1,1). Polybilis just names the Jews; but Strabo, Diodorus Sicululs and Pomponius Mela have frequent references to them and to Palestine (Meier; p. 10-21). Virgil makes no mention of the Jews or their land; but Cicero, Ovid, and Horace contain references to it (Giles, p. 10, 12). Pliny (elder and younger), Plutarch, Suetolius, and even Martial, Petronius, and Juvenal, refer to them. We must leave our readers to follow out these Gentile references in later centuries, in Justin, Dio Cassius, and Procopius; reminding them merely of Lucian's description of St. Paul, “the Galilaean, bald-headed and long-nosed, who went through the air into the third heaven” (Dial. Peregr. et Philop.). In addition to Meier and Giles, Krebs's work, Decreta Romanorumpro Judceis facta e Josepho, can be consulted. The classical allusions to the Jews and their land are in general very incorrect, and betray a greater amount of ignorance and prejudice than might have been expected from cultivated pens; but they are curious.

4. The notices of Palestine in Jewish, Christian, Mohammedan, and modern writings are of course innumerable.

IV. Physical Geography. — The superficial conformation of Palestine is simple, peculiar, and in some respects unique, and the leading features which have in all ages characterized it grow out of this permanent configuration.

1. Main Natural Sections. — The entire country divides itself into four longitudinal belts, each reaching from north to south; and these belts are as distinct in their political history as in their physical structure. In fact, a careful study of the physical geography of Palestine — its plains, mountains, valleys, and great natural divisions — affords the best key to its history.

The geographer who travels through the country, or the student who carefully notes one of the best constructed maps, such as Van de Velde's, must observe the strip of plain extending along .the seaboard from the mouth of the Litany to Gaza. Narrow on the north, and interrupted by three bold promontories, it expands gradually towards the south into a broad champaign. Its low elevation and sandy soil make the coast-line tame and almost straight. Were it not for the headland of Carmel, the shore would be a straightline, without bay or promontory.

From the end of Lebanon on the north a mountain range runs through the centre of the country. Its course is not parallel to the coast; the latter tends from N.N.E. to S.S.W.; whereas the mountains run more nearly, though not quite, south, thus leaving a broader margin of plain at the southern extremity. The ridge is intersected near its centre by a cross-belt of plain, connecting the Jordan valley with the coast. This plain is Esdraelon. The sections of the ridge to the north and south of it have very different features. That on the north is picturesque, and in some places grand. The outlines are varied; lofty peaks spring up at intervals, and are separated by winding wooded glens. On the south the general aspect of the ridge is dull and uniform, presenting the appearance of a huge gray wall, as seen from the coast. But in travelling down the road which runs along the broad back of the ridge to Jerusalem and Hebron the eye sees an endless succession of rounded hill-tops, thrown confusedly together, each bare and rocky as its neighbor. South of Hebron these sink into low swelling hills, similar in  form, but smaller; and these again gradually melt into the desert plain of et- Tih.

But by far the most remarkable feature of Palestine is the Jordan valley, which runs through the land from north to south, straight as an arrow. There is nothing like it in the world. It is a rent or chasm in the earth's crust, being everywhere below the level of the ocean. This deep valley produces a marked effect on the ridges which border it. Their sides towards the valley are far more abrupt than elsewhere in Palestine; the ravines ‘that descend from them are deeper and wilder; and towards the south, along the shores of the Dead Sea, there is a look of rugged grandeur and desolation such as is seldom met with.: The valley is of nearly uniform breadth, about ten miles from brow to brow, expanding slightly at Tiberias and the Dead Sea, as if greater depth had made some enlargement of the lateral boundaries necessary. This valley forms a very striking feature on every map of Palestine; and it becomes the more striking the more accurately the physical geography of the land is delineated.

The remaining part of Palestine east of the Jordan forms a tract of table- land, to which the central valley gives some remarkable features. Every traveller in Palestine is familiar with the mountain-range — steep, straight, and of nearly uniform elevation — which, from every point in Judaea, Samaria, and Galilee, bounds the view eastward. This, in reality, is not a mountain range; it is the side or bank of the eastern plateau, having itself an elevation of from 2000 to 3000 feet, to which the depression of the Jordan adds another thousand. At only a few places, on the extreme north; and near the centre, do the tops of this ridge rise above the general level of the plateau. The ravines that descend from it are of great depth. At the north- east angle of Palestine is an isolated mountain-ridge, dividing the fertile table-land of Bashan from the arid wastes of Arabia.

Such is an outline of the general features of Palestine. It prepares the way for a detailed examination of the several divisions, and also for a more satisfactory review of the historical geography of the country. Each great physical feature has exercised from the earliest periods, as will be seen, a most important influence upon the people. The chasm of the Jordan effectually divided the east from the west; and the cross-belt of Esdraelon divided almost as effectually the north from the south. The maritime plain gave birth to two nations-one of merchants, another of warriors. It also became, in later ages, the highway between Egypt and Assyria. But the  steep sides and rugged passes of the mountains presented such difficulties that few attempted to invade them. The mountain-ridge of Judah and Samaria was thus isolated; it was defended by a double rampart. an outer and an inner. It was the heart and stronghold of the Jewish nation; it was the sanctuary of the Jewish faith; and it was the stage on which most of the events of the national history were enacted.

(1.) The Maritime Plain. — From the bank of the Litany on the north, for a distance of some twenty miles, the plain is a mere strip, nowhere more than two miles wide, and generally much less. The surface is undulating, and intersected by ridges of whitish limestone, which shoot out from Lebanon, and break off in cliffs on the shore. Two of them — Rasei Abiad, “The White Cape,” and Ras en-NakAra, together constituting the ancient “Scala Tyriorum,” “Ladder of Tyre” — rise to a height of from 200 to 300 feet, and drop into the deep sea splendid cliffs of naked rock. Though the plain is here broken, and is now dreary and desolate, its soil, between the rocks, is deep and of wonderful fertility. It is abundantly watered also by copious fountains, and by streams from Lebanon. At the widest and best part of it, on a low promontory and an adjoining island, stood Tyre, a double city.

South of the Ladder of Tyre the features of the plain and the coast undergo a total change. This promontory, in fact, is the real commencement of the maritime plain, and the natural boundary of Palestine and Phoenicia (q.v.). The white cliffs and bold headlands now disappear; the shore is low and Sandy; the plainflat, rich, and loamy, and only a few feet above the sea- level. It spreads out in far reaches of cornfields and pasture-lands several miles inland, the mountains making a bold sweep to the east. On a low bank, projecting into the Mediterranean from the centre of this plain, stands Acre, the modern as well as the mediaeval stronghold of Palestine. Across the plain, a few miles southward, flows the river Belus; and on its banks may still be seen that vitreous sand from which glass is said to have been first made (Strabo, 16 p. 758; Pliny, 36:65). Still farther south, the Kishon, a sluggish stream with soft, sedgy banks, falls in from the plains of Esdraelon. There is more water and more moisture in this part of the plain than in any other. part of Palestine; it is consequently among the most fertile sections of the country.

The course of the Kishon breaks what might be called the natural conformation of Palestine. It intersects the central mountain-range; and a branch or arm of the range, as if displaced by the river, shoots out in a  north-westerly direction, and, projecting into the Mediterranean, forms a bold headland — the only prominent feature along the shore of Palestine. This is Carmel (q.v.). Its elevation is about 1800 feet; its sides are steep and rugged. deeply furrowed, by ravines, and partially clothed with forests of dwarf oaks. There is little cultivation on the ridge; but its pastures are rich, and its flowers in early spring are bright and beautiful. The promontory of Garmel is bluff, but, as it does not dip into the sea, room is left for a good road round its base.

Immediately south of Carmel the plain again opens tip, and continues without interruption to Gaza. Narrow at first, and broken by a low ridge of rocky tells running parallel to the coast, it gradually expands into the undulating pasture-lands of Sharon. The plain is not so flat here as at Acre, nor is it so well watered, though there are still streams and large fountains, with fringes of reeds and broad belts of green meadows. Here and there are. clumps of trees and scraggy copse, the remnants of ancient forests; but most of the plain is bare and parched. There is scarcely any cultivation. Farther south the surface becomes flatter, the average elevation less, and vegetation more scanty, owing to the lighter soil and lack of moisture. Around Joppa, Lydda, and Ramleh are pleasant orchards and large olive- groves, surrounded by wastes of drift sand. Here Sharon unites with Philistia, which, after an interval of naked downs, extends in widespreading cornfields and vast expanses of rich, loamy soil southward almost to the valley of Gerar. This is the Shephelah — the “low country” of the Bible: the home of the Philistines, over which they drove their iron war-chariots, and on which they bade defiance to the light mountain-troops of Israel. SEE PHILISTIA.

The maritime plain south of Carmel has some general features worthy of note. Along the whole seaboard runs a broad belt of drift sand, generally flat and wavy, but in places raised up into mounds varying from fifty to two hundred feet in height. The mounds and drifts are mostly bare and of a ruddy gray color; though here and there they are covered with long wiry grass and bent. The sand is most destructive, and nothing can stay its progress. It has encircled the ruins of Casarea with a barren desert; it is slowly. advancing on the orchards of Joppa. threatening them with destruction; it has drifted far inland to Ramleh and Lydda; it has almost entirely covered up the city of Askelon, and is now invading the fields, vineyards, and olive-groves of Mejdel, Hamameh, and other neighboring villages. From Askelon southward the hills are higher than elsewhere; and  at Gaza the sand-belt is not less than three miles wide. The aspect of these bare hills and long reaches of naked drift is that of utter, terrible desolation.

Another feature of the plain is the depth of its wadys or torrent-beds. At the northern end of Sharon their banks are comparatively low and sedgy, bordered by tracts of meadow, which, owing to their depression and the accumulation of sand along the coast, are overflowed during, the rainy season, and thus converted into pools and morasses, some of which do not entirely dry up during the summer. In Philistia the wadys are deeply cut in the loamy or sandy soil; their banks are dry, hard, and bare; their beds too are dry, covered with dust, white pebbles, and flints.

The whole plain is bare and bleak. There are no trees, no bushes, and no fences of any kind, with the exception of one or two small remnants of pine and oak forests in the northern part of Sharon, and the orchards and olive- groves around a few of the principal villages, and the hedges of cactus that encircle them. One can ride on for days without let or hindrance. In summer all vegetation disappears. The, plain stretches out, mile after mile, in easy undulations, like great waves, everywhere of a brownish gray color, appearing as if scathed by lightning. In early spring, however, it is totally different. It does not look like the same country. It is covered with green grass, and, where cultivated, with luxuriant crops of green corn; it is all spangled with flowers of the brightest colors, and in Sharon with forests of gigantic thistles. The coloring then far surpasses. anything ever seen in Europe; but still the absence of houses, fields, and fences gives a dreary look. The villages are few, mostly very small and very. poor, and at long intervals. In Sharon, and in the southern section of Philistia, there are stretches of twenty miles and more without a village. The plain is everywhere dotted, however, with low rounded tells — a few of them, as Tell es-Safieh, Arak el-Menshtyeh, and others, rising to a height of 200 feet and more and these are covered with white debris, intermixed with hewn stones and fragments of columns, the remains of primaeval cities. The plain has no good quarries; the rock along the coast, and over a great part of the .plain, is a soft friable sandstone, not fit for architectural purposes. The ordinary houses, therefore, were built of brick, and soon crumbled away, and are now heaps of dust and rubbish. The remains of a few temples, and of the churches and ramparts erected by the Crusaders at Gaza, Askelon, Lydda, Ramleh, and Casarea, are almost the only relies of antiquity now standing on the maritime plain.  The eastern border of the plain is not very clearly defined. The hills melt into it gradually. In some places an elongated ridge shoots far down into the lowland, such as the ridge at Bethhoron, at Zorah, at Deir Dubbin, etc. In other places broad valleys run far up among the mountains. These ridges and valleys were the border-land of the Israelites and Philistines, and were the scenes of many a wild foray and many a hardfought battle. The valleys are exceedingly fertile.

The only road by which the two great rivals of the ancient world could approach one another — by which alone Egypt could get to Assyria, and Assyria to Egypt — lay along this broad flat strip of coast which formed the maritime portion of the Holy Land, and thence by the plain of the Lebanon to the Euphrates. True, this road did not, as we shall see, lie actually through the country, but at the foot of the highlands which virtually composed the Holy Land; still the proximity was too ‘close not to be full of danger; and though the catastrophe was postponed for many centuries, yet, when it actually arrived, it came through. this channel.

The breadth of this noble plain varies considerably. At CEesarea on the north. it is not more than eight miles wide; at Joppa it is about twelve; while at Gaza, on the south, it is nearly twenty. Its elevation above the level of the sea has not been ascertained by measurement, but from its general appearance it does not seem to have an average of more than 100 feet.

It is probable that the Jews never permanently occupied more than a small portion of this rich and favored region. Its principal towns were, it is true, allotted to the different tribes (Jos 15:45-47; Jos 16:3, Gezer; 17:11, Dor, etc.); but this was in anticipation of the intended conquest (Jos 13:3-6). The five cities of the Philistines remained in their possession (1 Samuel 5; 1Sa 21:10; 1 Samuel 27); and the district was regarded as one independent of and apart from Israel (27:2; 1Ki 2:39; 2Ki 8:2-3). In like manner Dor remained in the hands of the Canaanites (Jdg 1:27), and Gezer in the hands of the Philistines till taken from them in Solomon's time by his father-in-law (1Ki 9:16). We find that towards the end of the monarchy the tribe of Benjamin was in possession of Lydd, Jimzu, Ono, and other places in the plain (Neh 11:34; 2Ch 28:18); but it was only by a gradual process of extension from their native hills, in the rough ground of which they were safe from the attack of cavalry and chariots. Yet, though the Jews never had any hold on the region, it had its  own population, and towns probably not inferior to any in Syria. Both Gaza and Askelon had regular ports (majumas); and there is evidence to show that they were very important and very large long before the fall of the Jewish monarchy (Kenrick, Phoenicia, p. 27-29). Ashdod, though on the open plain, resisted for twenty-nine years the attack of the whole Egyptian force: a similar attack to that which reduced Jerusalem without a blow (2 Chronicles 12), and was sufficient on another occasion to destroy it after a siege of a year and a half, even when fortified by the works of a score of successive monarchs (2Ki 25:1-3).

In the Roman times this region was considered the pride of the country (Joseph. War, 1, 29, 9), and some of the most important cities of the province stood in it Caesarea, Antipatris, Diospolis. The one ancient port of the Jews, the “beautiful” city of Joppa, occupied a position central between the Shephelah and Sharon. Roads led from these various cities to each other-to Jerusalem, Neapolis, and Sebaste in the interior, and to Ptolemais and Gaza on the north and south. The commerce of Damascus, and, beyond Damascus, of Persia and India, passed this way to Egypt, Rome, and the infant colonies of the west; and that traffic and the constant movement of troops backwards and forwards must have made this plain one of the busiest and most populous regions of Syria at the time of Christ. Now Cesarea is a wave-washed ruin; Antipatris has vanished both in name and substance; Diospolis has shaken off the appellation which it bore in the days of its prosperity, and is a mere village, remarkable only for the ruin of its fine mediaeval church, and for the palmgrove which shrouds, it from view. Joppa alone maintains a dull life, surviving solely because it is the nearest point at which the sea-going travellers from the West can approach Jerusalem. For a few miles above Jaffa cultivation is still carried on, but the fear of the Bedawin who roam (as they always have roamed) over parts of the plain, plundering all passers-by, and extorting black-mail from the wretched peasants, has desolated a large district, and effectually prevents its being used any longer as the route for travellers from south to north; while in the portions which are free from this scourge, the teeming soil itself is doomed to unproductiveness through the folly and iniquity of its Turkish rulers, whose exactions have driven, and are driving, its industrious and patient inhabitants to remoter parts of the land.:

(2.) The Central Mountain-range. — The deep narrow ravine of the Litany separates Lebanon (q.v.) proper from Palestine. The mountain-chain on its southern bank, however, is a natural prolongation of that on the northern.  Its altitude is not so great, but its course is the same, its geological strata and physical features are the same, and when. seen from any point, east or west, the ridge appears as one. On the south bank of the river the ridge is broad, reaching from the Jordan valley to the sea, about twenty miles. Its summit is mostly an irregular undulating table-land, having fertile plains of considerable extent intervening between the hill-tops. The outline is varied and picturesque; the plains are green with corn and grass, and the peaks and ridge backs are covered more or less densely with forests of oak, terebinth, maple, and other trees. The trees grow to a larger size than is elsewhere seen in Palestine: many of them would not disgrace the great forests of Europe (Van de Velde, 1, 170; 2, 418). The watershed is much nearer the eastern than the western side; in fact, it is in some places quite close to the eastern brow of the ridge, from which short abrupt glens descend to the Jordan. The valleys on the western slopes are long, winding, and richly wooded; and among them we have the finest-indeed, it might be said, the only in scenery in Western Palestine. On the lower parts of the declivities and in the beds of the valleys are still extensive olive groves, showing how appropriate was Asher's blessing, “Let him dip his foot in oil” (Deu 33:24; Van de Velde, 2, 407).

This northern section of the mountain-chain culminates, a little to the west of Safed, in Jebel Jermuk (4000 feet), the highest land in Western Palestine. Safed itself stands on a commanding peak. From this point the ridge sinks rapidly, becoming more an assemblage of detached hills i and ridges than a regular chain. It almost looks as if the great chain had been shattered to pieces, and the fragments thrown confusedly together. The upland plains, which constitute a distinguishing feature of the higher section, here become larger and richer, with a surface like a bowling-green, and interspersed here and there with cornfields, olive-groves, orchards of pomegranates, apricots, and other fruit-trees (Van de Velde, 2, 406). The plain of Battauf is ten miles long by about two wide. From its eastern end at Jebel Hattin, another plain extends, with gentle undulations, along the brow of the basin of Tiberias, southward to Tabor; and another runs westward from Hattin to Sefirieh. The hill-tops and ridges which separate them are rugged, rocky, and thinly covered with dwarf oak and terebinth, and with jungles of thornbushes. South of these plains a transverse ridge of hills, commencing , with Tabor on the east, extends to the plain of Acre on the west. Tabor (q.v.) is green and well-wooded. The section adjoining it, encircling Nazareth (q.v.), is mostly bare and rocky, while the western end  presents some beautiful scenery — green vales covered with long grass and bright-colored thistles, winding down to the plains on the south and west, between richly wooded peaks and ridges.

Vegetation among the mountains of Galilee is much more abundant than elsewhere west of the Jordan, Long rank grass and huge thistles, and a splendid variety of wild-flowers, cover mountain, vale, and plain in early spring; and even during the heat of summer and the scorching blasts of autumn that parched, scathed look, which is universal farther south, is here unknown. This is owing, in part, to the cool breezes from Hermon and Lebanon, and in part to the forests which condense the moisture of the atmosphere, yielding heavy fertilizing dew. Fountains are abundant and copious; and the torrent-beds are rarely — many of them never — dry. Another fact is deserving of notice. The whole region, considering its great fertility and beauty, is thinly peopled. A vast portion of it appears utterly desolate. The “highways lie waste, the earth mourneth and languisheth.” The bald mountains of Judah are far more densely peopled even yet than this highland paradise.

The plain of Esdraelon (q.v.), as stated above, intersects the mountain- chain, and forms a connecting link between the maritime plain and the Jordan valley. In this respect it may be termed the gateway of Central Palestine; and history tells how fully, and often how fatally hostile nations and marauding tribes availed themselves of it to enter and spoil the land. It joins the plain of Acre on the west at the base of Carmel; it is connected with Sharon by an easy pass at Megiddo; and on the east two broad arms stretch down from it in gentle slopes to the principal fords and passes of the Jordan. Its features and history have already been so fully given that it need not here be described.

The isolated ridges of Moreh (now called by natives Jebel ed-Duhy, by travellers Little Hermon) and Gilboa, which lie between the eastern arms of Esdraelon, present a marked contrast to Tabor and the mountains of Galilee. They show that the humid and fertile north is giving place to the parched and naked south. They are bare, white, and treeless; and their declivities look in places as if they had been covered with flag-stones. They are isolated, broken links lying between the chains of Galilee and Samaria.

While Esdraelon intersects the mountain-chain, a portion of the chain. appearing as if displaced, shoots on from the mountains of Samaria in a  north-western direction; and, running to the Mediterranean, intersects the maritime plain. This is Carmel, which, though physically. united to the southern, bears more resemblance, in its luxuriant grass, green foliage, and bright flowers, to the northern ridge. Carmel and the northern, end of the Samaria range present the appearance of a continuous transverse ridge, enclosing Esdraelon on the south.

Between Esdraelon and Bethel — the territory originally allotted to the sons of Joseph, forty miles in length — the mountain-ridge presents some peculiar and striking features. The summits are more rounded and more rocky than those in Galilee; and the sides, though in many places bare, are generally clothed with scraggy woods of dwarf oak, terebinth, and maple, or with shrubberies of thorn-bushes. The fertile upland plains are still found here, though smaller than those in Galilee; the largest is the plain of Mukhna, along the eastern base of Gerizim, measuring about six miles by one. The plains of Saniur, Kubatiyeh, and Dothan are much smaller. The hill-sides around them grow steeper and wider towards the south. The valleys running. into Sharon are long, winding, mostly tillable — though dry and bare; while those on the east, running into the chasm of the Jordan, are deep and abrupt; but being abundantly watered by numerous fountains and being planted with olive-groves and orchards, they have a rich and picturesque appearance (comp. Van de Velde, 2, 314). In fact, the eastern declivities of the mountains of Ephraim, wild and rugged though they are. contain some of the most beautiful scenery and some of the most luxuriant orchards in Central Palestine (ibid. p. 335). Dr. Robinson writes of Telluzah, the ancient Tirzah (Son 6:4), a few miles north of Nabulus, “The town is surrounded by immense groves of olivetrees, planted on all the hills around; mostly young and thrifty trees” (3, 302); and of one of the great wadys east of it, “Nowhere in Palestine, not even at Nabulus. had I seen such noble brooks of water” (ibid. p. 303); and again of the whole district, “This tract of the Faria, from el-Kurawa in the Ghor to the rounded hills which separate it from the plain of Sanur, is justly regarded as one of the most fertile and valuable regions of Palestine” (p. 304 sq.). The features of the mountains are different from those of Galilee. Here there is more wildness and ruggedness, the tracts of level ground are smaller, the valleys are narrower, and the banks steeper. While the rich upland plains produce abundant crops of grain, yet this is a region on the whole specially adapted for the cultivation of olives, fruits, and grapes. The more carefully its features, soil, and products are examined, the more  evident does it become that Ephraim was indeed blessed with “the chief things of the ancient mountains” — vines, figs olives, and corn, all growing luxuriantly amid the “lasting hills” It was not in vain that the dying patriarch deliberately rested his right hand on the head of Joseph's younger son, saying, “In thee shall Israel bless, saying, God make thee as Ephraim” (Gen 48:18-20; comp. Stanley, S. and P. p. 226).

Passing southward from Samaria into Judaea — from the territory of Ephraim and Manasseh into that of Benjamin and Judah — both the physical features and the scenery of the range undergo a great change. The change doles not take place rapidly — it is gradual. Immediately south of Shiloh the change begins. The little upland plains, which, with their green grass and green corn and smooth surface, so much relieve the monotony of the mountain-tops, almost disappear in Benjamin, and in Judah they are unknown. Those which do exist in Benjamin, as the plains of Gibeon and Rephaim, are small and rocky. The soil alike on plain, hill, and glen is. poor and scanty; and the gray limestone rock everywhere crops up over it, giving the landscape a barren and forbidding aspect. Natural wood disappears; and a few small bushes, brambles, or aromatic shrubs alone appear upon the hill-sides. The hill-summits now assume that singular form which prevails in Judah, and which Stanley has well described: “Rounded hills, chiefly of a gray color — gray partly from the limestone of which. they are formed, partly from the tufts of gray shrub with which their sides are thinly clothed — their sides formed into concentric rings of rock, that must have served in ancient times as supports to the terraces, of. which there are still traces to the very summits; valleys, or rather the meetings of those gray slopes with the beds of dry water-courses at their feet-long sheets of bare rock laid like flagstones, side by side, along the soil — these are the chief features of the greater part of the scenery of the historical parts of Palestine. These rounded hills, occasionally stretching into long undulating ranges, are for the most part bare of wood. Forest and large timber are not known. Cornfields and in the neighborhood of Christian populations, as at Bethlehem, vineyards creep along the ancient terraces. In the spring the hills and valleys are covered with thin grass, and the aromatic shrubs which clothe more or less almost the whole of Syria and Arabia.

But they also glow with what is peculiar to Palestine, a profusion of wild flowers, daisies, the white flower called the star of Bethlehem, but especially with a blaze of scarlet flowers of all kinds, chiefly anemones, wild tulips, and poppies” (S. and P. p. 136 sq.).  Fountains are rare, and their supplies of water scanty and precarious among the mountains of Benjamin and Judah. Wells take their place, bored deep into the white soft limestone rock; covered cisterns, into which the rain-water is guided, are also very numerous, and large open tanks. The glens which descend westward are long and winding, with dry rocky beds, and banks breaking down to them in terraced declivities. The lower slopes near the plain of Philistia are neither so bare nor so rugged as those nearer the crest of the ridge. Dwarf trees and extensive shrubberies, and aromatic plants, partially cover them; while little groves of olives, and orchards of figs and pomegranates, appear around most of the villages. The valleys, too, become wider, sometimes expanding, as Surar, es-Sumt (Elah), and Beit Jibrin, into rich and beautiful cornfields. The eastern declivities of the ridge, so fertile and picturesque in Samaria, are here a wilderness — bare, white, and absolutely desolate; without trees or grass or stream or fountain. Naked slopes of white gravel and white rock descend rapidly and irregularly from the brow of the ridge, till at length they dip in the frowning precipices of Quarantania, Feshkah, Engedi, and Masada, into the Jordan valley or the Dead Sea. Naked ravines, too, like huge fissures, with perpendicular walls of rock, often several hundred feet in height, furrow these slopes from top to bottom. The wild and savage grandeur of wadys Farah, el-Kelt, en-Nar, and Khureitfn is almost appalling. This region is the Wilderness of Judaea. It extends from the parallel of Bethel on the north to the southern border of Palestine. Its length is about forty miles, and its breadth average's nine. It has always been a wilderness, and it must always continue so (Jdg 1:16; Mat 3:1) the home of the wandering shepherd (1Sa 17:28) and the prowling bandit (Luk 10:30). It is the only part of Palestine to which that name can be properly applied. SEE JUDAH.

In the centre of this rugged region, on the very crest of the mountain-ridge, girt about with the muniments of nature, stood Jerusalem and the other historic cities and strongholds of the kingdom of Judah-many of them taking their names from their lofty sites, as Gibeon and Ramah and Gibeah and Geba. In vigorous exercise among these mountains, and in following and defending their flocks over the bare ridges and through the wild glens of the wilderness, the hardy soldiers of David received their training; and they proved that in mountain warfare they were invincible. This is not a region for corn. The husbandman would obtain from its thin, parched soil a poor return for his hard labor. But the terraced hill-sides, the warm  limestone strata, and the sunny skies render it the very best field for the successful culture of the vine and the fig; while the aromatic shrubs of the wilderness, and the succulent herbage among the rocks and glens, afforded suitable food for flocks of sheep and goats. The dying patriarch appears to have had his eye on this region when he blessed Judah in these words: “Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes: his eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk” (Gen 49:11-12). Though this section of the range now seems barren and desolate, no district in Palestine bears traces of such dense population informer days. Every height is crowned with a ruin; the remains of towns and villages thickly dot the whole country. Its ruins, its terraced hills, and its arid tortuous glens are now the distinguishing features of Judaea.

The southern declivities of the mountain-range have some marled and peculiar features, which probably gained for them a distinctive name, the Negeb, or “South Country.” From Hebron, where the ridge begins to decline, to Beersheba, where it finally melts away into the desert of Tih, this section extends. Here are bare rounded white or light-gray hills, gradually becoming smaller and farther apart, divided by long irregular dry valleys, which slowly become wider and more desolate, until at length hill and dale merge into an open undulating plateau. The soil on these southern hills is thin and poor; but in some of the valleys it is richer, and during spring and early summer the pasture is luxuriant. It was one of the regions most frequented by the patriarchs. It was a dry parched land, as its Scripture name Negeb would seem to imply. It contains no perennial streams. Its torrent-beds are as dry during a great part of the year as its hill-tops; it is only after heavy rains, here very rare even in winter, that they contain any water. Fountains, too, are few and far between; and hence the patriarchs, like the modern nomads who pasture their flocks on it, were forced to depend on wells and tanks for their supply of water. These are very numerous. Miss Martineau, in riding from the desert to Hebron, notes, “All the day we continually saw gaping wells beside our path, and under every angle of the hills where they were likely to be kept filled” (Eastern Life, p. 433). Water was absolutely necessary for the wants of men and animals; hence the labor expended on wells and the obstinacy with which rival tribes disputed their possession (Gen 21:25; Gen 21:30; Gen 26:15, etc.). Vineyards and olive-groves disappear a few miles south of Jerusalem; the larger oak-trees, which are seen here and there farther north, give place to  bushes and low shrubs; cultivated fields, too, and all signs of settled habitation, give place to rude enclosures for sheep, and black tents and roving Arabs. All picturesque beauty, all natural richness of scenery, is gone. The green pastures and the bright flowers of early spring are the only redeeming features (Bonar, Land of Promise, p. 29, 46; Martineau, p. 431; Stanley, p. 100). Mr. Drew has delineated the features of the southern declivities with great fidelity:

“In no part of the prospect was there any loveliness, or any features of greatness and sublimity, Every aspect of the country that might be called beautiful is seen in the narrows section of the mountain district immediately on the south of Hebron. No lakes or rivers, or masses of foliage, or deep ravines, or any lofty towering heights are within the range of sight to one in the centre of the territory. . . For a few weeks late in spring-time a smlilinga aspect is thrown over the broad downs, when the ground is reddened with the anemone, in contrast with the soft white of the daisy, and the deep yellow of the tulip and marigold. But this flush of beauty soon passes and the permanent aspect of the country is not wild indeed, or hideous, or frightfully desolate, but, as we may say, austerely plain — a tame, unpleasant aspect, not causing absolute discomfort while one is in it, but left without any lingering reminiscence of anything lovely or awful or sublime. As for the soil, the thin and scanty verdure, barely covering the limestone which spreads almost everywhere beneath the desert surface, sufficiently explains its nature. Here and there patches of deeper earth and richer swards with claumps of trees, vary these pastures of the wilderness; as again they are broken by vide areas, thickly covered with shrubs of considerable height and size” (Scripture Lands, p. 5-7).

It is obvious that in the ancient days of the nation, when Judah and Benjamin possessed the teeming population indicated in the Bible, the condition and aspect of the country must have been very different. Of this there are not wanting sure evidences. There is no country in which the ruined towns bear so large a proportion to those still existing. Hardly a hill- top of the many, within sight that is not covered with vestiges of some fortress or city. ‘That this numerous population knew how most effectually to cultivate their rocky territory is shown by the remains of their ancient terraces, which constantly meet the eye, the only mode of husbanding so scanty a coating of soil, and preventing its being washed by the torrents  into the valleys. These frequent remains enable the traveller to form an idea of the appearance of the landscape when thus terraced. But, besides this, forests appear to have stood in many parts of Judaea until the repeated invasions and sieges caused their fall, and the wretched government of the Turks prevented their reinstatement; and all this vegetation must have reacted on the moisture of the climate, and, by preserving the water in many a ravine and natural reservoir where now it is rapidly dried by the fierce stan of the early summer, must have materially influenced the look and the resources of the country.

The following elevations: are taken (with some corrections from later sources) from Van de Velde, who has collected them from the best authorities, and arranged them, with valuable notes, in his Memoir of Map.n . In order to connect the Palestine ridge with Lebanon, of which it is the natural continuation, and with the desert of Tih into which it falls, the heights of a few points beyond the boundaries of Palestine on the north and south are given:

Tom Niha, the culminating point of southern Lebanon, fifteen miles north of the LitanyFeet 6500Kefr Huneh, a pass over the ridge four miles farther south4200Kula'at esh-Shukif (Belfort), overhanging the Litany2205 IN PALESTINE.

Kedesh-Naphtali, twelve miles south of the Litany (Kedesh is in an upland plain surrounded by peaks and ridges several hundred feet higher than the town)1354Jebel Jermuk, the highest point in Western Palestine (about)4000Safed2775Jebel Kaukab, near Cana of Galilee1736Turan, on the plain of Sefurieh872Kurn Hattin, the traditional scene of “the Sermon on the Mount”1096Mount Tabor1865Nazareth, situated in a valley1237Plain of Esdraelon, nearly due south of Nazareth382Jebel ed-Duhy (Little Hermon)1839

Mount Gilbon, highest point2200Mount Carmel, highest point1800Jebel Haskin, the highest point between Gilboa and Ebal2000Upland plain of Sanur1330Mount Ebal2700Mount Gerizim2650Plain of Mukhna, at the base of Gerizi1595Top of the ridge south of the plain of Mukhliua2037The ridge of Sinjil, near Shiloh3108Bethel2401Neby Samwil. (This appears to be too low.)2649Jerusalem, highest point of the city2585Mount of Olives2665Bethlehem2704Pools of Solomon (in a valley)2513Ruins of Ramah, three miles north of Hebron2800Hebron (in a valley, with higher; ridges round it)3029Cannmel, eight miles south of Hebron2238Ed-Dhoheriyeh, fifteen miles south-west of Hebron2174Beersheba1100 BEYOND THE SOUTHERN BORDER.El-Khulasa, in.the desert of Tih704From these measurements it will appear how singularly uniform the elevation of the range is from Esdraelon to Hebron. This gives it the appearance of a vast wall as seen from the sea. Its aspect from the Jordan valley is different; it seems to have a much greater elevation on the south, owing to the depression of the Dead Sea and the adjoining plain.

The transverse valleys that intersect this central mountain region have already been referred to, but they constitute so important a feature that we dwell upon them more in detail. This grand watershed of the country sends off on either hand — to the Jordan valley on the east and the Mediterranean on the west, and be it remembered (with one or two exceptions) east and west only — the long tortuous arms of its many torrent-beds. But though keeping north and south as its general direction,  the line of the watershed is, as might be expected from the prevalent equality of level of these highlands, and the absence of anything like ridge or saddle, very irregular, the heads of the valleys on the one side often passing and “overlapping” those of the other. Thus in the territory of the ancient Benjamin the heads of the great wadys Fuwar (or Suweilit) and Mutyah (or Kelt) — the two main channels by which the torrents of the winter rains hurry down from the bald hills of this district into the valley of the Jordan — are at Bireh and Beitin respectively, while the great wady Belat, which enters the Mediterranean at Nahr Aujeh a few miles above Jaffa, stretches its long arms as far as, and even farther than, Taivibeh, nearly four miles to the east of either Bireh or Beitin. So also in the more northern district of Mount Ephraim around Nabulus, the ramifications of that extensive system of valleys which combine to form the Wads. Ferrah- one of the main feeders of the central Jordan interlace and cross by many miles those of the Wady Shair, whose principal arm is the valley of Nabulus. and which pours its waters into the Mediterranean at Nahr Falaik.

The valleys on the two sides of the watershed, as already noted, differ considerably in character. Those on the east — owing to the extraordinary depth of the Jordan valley into which they plunge, and also to the fact already mentioned that the watershed lies rather on that side of the highlands, thus making the fall more abrupt — are extremely steep and rugged. This is the case during the whole length of the southern and middle portions of the country. The precipitous descent between Olivet and Jericho, with which all travellers in the Holy Land are acquainted, is a type, and by no means an unfair type, of the eastern passes, from Zuweirah and Ain-Jidi on the south to Wady Bidan on the north. It is only when the junction between the plain of Esdraelon and the Jordan valley is reached that the slopes become gradual, and the ground fit for the maneuvers of anything but detached bodies of footsoldiers. But, rugged and difficult as they are, they form the only access to the upper country from this side, and every man or body of men who reached the territory of Judah, Benjamin, or Ephraim from the Jordan valley must have climbed one or other of them, The Ammonites and Moabites, who at some remote date left such lasting traces of their presence in the names of Chephar ha-Ammonai and Michmash, and the Israelites pressing forward to the relief of Gibeon and the slaughter of Beth-horon, doubtless entered alike through the great Wady Fuwar already spoken of. The Moabites, Edomites, and Mehunim swarmed up to their attack on Judah through the crevices of Ain-Jidi (2  Chronicles 20:12, 16). The pass of Adummim was in the days of our Lord — what it still is — the regular route between Jericho and Jerusalem. By it Pompey advanced with his army when he took the city.

The western valleys are more gradual in their slope. The level of the external plain on this side is higher, and therefore the fall less, while at the same time the distance to be traversed is much greater. Thus the length of the Wady Belat, already mentioned, from its remotest head at Taivibeh to the point at which it emerges on the plain of Sharon, may be-taken as twenty to twenty-five miles, with a total difference of level during that distance of perhaps 1800 feet, while the Wady el-Aujeh, which falls from the other side of Taiyibeh into the Jordan, has a distance of barely ten miles to reach the Jordan valley, at the same time falling not less than 2800 feet. Here again the valleys are the only means of communication between the lowland and the highland. From Jaffa and the central part of the. plain there are two of these roads “going up to Jerusalem:” the one to the right by Ramleh and the Wady Aly; the other to the left by Lydda, and thence by the Beth-horons, or the Wady Suleiman, and Gibeon. The former of these is modern, but the latter is the scene of many a famous incident in the ancient history. Over its long activities the Canaanites were driven by Joshua to their native plains; the Philistines ascended to Michmash and Geba, and fled back past Ajalon; the Syrian force was stopped and hurled back by Judas; the Roman legions of Cestius Gallus were chased pell-mell to their strongholds at Antipatris.

Farther south the communication between the mountains of Judah and the lowland of Philistia are hitherto comparatively unexplored. They were doubtless the scene of many a foray and repulse during the lifetime of Samson and the struggles of the Danites, but there is no record of their having been used for the passage of any. important force in ancient or modern times. North of Jaffa the passes are few. One of them, by the Wady Belat, led from Antipatris to Gophna. By this route St. Paul was probably conveyed away from Jerusalem. Another leads from the ancient sanctuary of Gilgal, near Kefr-Saba, to Natbulus. These western valleys, though easier than those on the eastern side. are of such a nature as to present great difficulties to the passage of any large force encumbered by baggage. In fact these mountain passes really formed the security of Israel, and if she had been wise enough to settle her own intestinal quarrels without reference to foreigners, the nation might, humanly speaking, have stood to the present hour.

The height, and consequent strength, which was the  frequent. boast of the prophets and psalmists in regard to Jerusalem, was no less true of the whole country, rising as it does on all sides from plains so much below it in level. The armies of Egypt and Assyria, as they traced and retraced their path between Pelusim and Carchemish, must have looked at the long wall of heights which closed in the broad level roadway they were pursuing, as belonging to a country with which they had no concern. It was to them. a natural mountain fastness, the approach to which was beset with difficulties, while its bare and soilless hills were hardly worth the trouble of conquering, in comparison with the rich green plains of the Euphrates and the Nile, or even with the boundless cornfield through which they were marching. This may fairly be inferred from various notices in Scripture and in contemporary history. The Egyptian kings, from Rameses II and Thothmes III to Pharaoh Necho, were in the constant habit of pursuing this route during their expeditions against the Chatti, or Hittites, in the north of Syria; and the two last-named monarchs fought battles at Megiddo, without, as far as we know, having taken the trouble to penetrate into the interior of the country. The Pharaoh who was Solomon's contemporary came up the Philistine plain as far as Gezer (not far from Ramleh), and besieged and destroyed it, without leaving any impression of uneasiness in the annals of Israel. Later in the monarchs Psammetichus besieged Ashdod in the Philistine plain for the extraordinary period of twenty-nine years (Herod. 2, 157); during a portion of that time an Assyrian army probably occupied part of the same district, endeavoring to relieve the town. The battles must have been frequent; and yet the only reference to these events in the Bible is the mention of the Assyrian general by Isa 20:1, in so casual a manner as to lead irresistibly to the conclusion that: neither Egyptians nor Assyrians had come up into the highland. This is illustrated by Napoleon's campaign in Palestine. He entered it from Egypt by El-Arish, and after overrunning the whole of the Iowland, and taking Gaza, Jaffa, Ramleh, and the other places on the plain, he wrote to the sheiks of Nabulus and Jerusalem, announcing, that he had no intention of making war against them (Corresp. de Vap. No. 4020, “19 Ventose 1799”). To use his own words, the highland country “did not lie within his base of operations;” and it would have been a waste of time, or worse, to ascend thither. In the later days of the Jewish nation, and during the Crusades, Jerusalem became the great object of contest; and then the battle-field of the country, which had originally been Esdraelon, was transferred to the maritime plain at the foot of the passes communicating most directly with the capital. Here Judas Maccabaeus achieved some of  his greatest triumphs, and here some of Herod's most decisive actions were fought; and Blanchegarde, Askelon, Jaffa, and Beitnuba (the Bettenuble of the Crusading historian) still shine with the brightest rays of the valor of Richard I.

(3.) The Jordan Valley. — The physical geography of this natural division of Palestine has already been so fully described that it will only be necessary in this place to supplement a few points serving to connect it with the mountain-chain on the west and the plateau on the east, and thus to apportion to it its place in the general survey of the country. SEE JORDAN.3

The Jordan valley is the most remarkable feature in the physical geography of Palestine. Its great depression makes it so. It is wholly, or almost wholly, beneath the level of the ocean, It runs in a straight line through the country from north to south. From Dan, on the northern border, to the southern angle of the Dead Sea, its length is 150 English miles. Its breadth at the northern end is about six; at the Sea of Galilee it is nine; and at Jericho, where it is widest, it is about thirteen. There are places between these points where it is much narrower. Immediately south of Lake Merom it is a high terrace — an offshoot from the culminating peaks at Safed- which has an elevation of about 900 feet, and breaks down to the Jordan on the east in steep banks, and to the shores of the Sea of Galilee on the south in long terraced declivities. From the western side of the terrace the mountains rise steeply; so that the terrace itself may be considered as a higher section of the valley. Along the south-west shore of the Sea of Galilee a dark ridge shoots out eastward and descends to the banks of the Jordan in frowning cliffs, narrowing the valley to a width of about four miles. The next point where the western ridge projects is at Kurn Surtabeh, east of Shiloh. This peak resembles the horn of a rhinoceros, and hence its name — from it a rocky ridge of white limestone runs across the valley almost to the banks of the river in its centre. The peak of Surtabeh is remarkable as one of the signal-stations of the ancient Israelites, on which beacons were lighted to announce the appearance of the new moon (Talmud, Rosh. Ha-Shana, ii; Reland, p. 346; Robinsson, Biblical Researlches, iii, 293),  The western bank of the valley, though everywhere clearly and sharply defined, is irregular, like a deeply indented coast-line, occasioned by the broken character of the ridge behind, and the glens and broad plains which run into it. The eastern bank is different. It is straight as a wall, except for a short distance in the centre, where the rugged hills and deep glens of Gilead break its uniformity. On the whole it is more abrupt than the western; and its top appears almost horizontal. This regularity arises from the fact that it is not, strictly speaking, a mountain-chain, but rather the bank or supporting wall of a natural terrace.

The northern section of the Jordan valley is flat. Around the site of Dan extends a plain of great fertility, now in part cultivated by Damascus merchants, as it was in primaeval days by the Sidonians (Jdg 18:7). The uncultivated parts are covered with rank grass, and thickets of dwarf oak, sycamore, arbutus, and oleander. South of this is a large tract of' marshy ground, extending to the shores of Merom the home of wild swine, buffaloes, and innumerable water-fowl. The marsh and lake are fed not only by the Jordan, but by great numbers of fountains along the side of the plain. and streams from the surrounding mountains. The lake Merom (q.v.) occupies the lower part of this basin, and has a broad margin of fertile land along each side. Below the lake the regularity of the valley is interrupted by the projecting terrace already mentioned, and the river is pushed over close to the eastern bank, along which it runs in a deep, wild glen. At the mouth of the upper Jordan, on the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee, is a low rich plain, several miles in extent, famous for its early and luxuriant crops of melons and encumbers. It is cultivated by some families of nomad Arabs. The lake here fills the valley from side to side, with the exception of the little fertile plain of Gelinesaret (q.v.) on the western shore. The eastern shore keeps close to the base of the hills, which rise over it in steep, bare acclivities. SEE GALILEE, SEA OF.

Between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea the valley is divided into two sections by the projecting ridge of Surtabeh, above mentioned. The upper section has a gently undulating surface, a rich, loamy soil, abundantly watered by streams from both the eastern and western mountains, and by. numerous fountains along their base. A few spots are cultivated by the semi-nomad tribes of Ghawarineh, who take their name from the valley, here called el-Ghor. The uncultivated portions are covered with tall rank grass and jungles of gigantic thistles. The Jordan winds down the centre in a tortuous channel along the bottom of a ravine, whose high chalky banks  are deeply furrowed and worn into lines and groups of white conical mounds.

At Kurn Surtabeh there is a break in the valley, as from an upper to a lower terrace. A ridge or bank extends across it from west to east, and is broken up in the centre, where the river cuts through, into “labyrinths of ravines with barren chalky sides, forming cones and hills of various shapes, and presenting a most wild and desolate scene” (Robinson, 3, 293). South of this point, the mountain-chain on the west recedes, and the plain expands; its surface becomes flatter; fountains and streams are neither so frequent nor so copious; and the intense heat and rapid evaporation make the surface parched and bare. Along the sides of the mountains, especially at the openings of ravines, are here and there masses of verdure and foliage; but the vast body of the plain is bare. A large part, too, towards the Dead Sea, is covered with a white saline crust, which gives it the appearance of a desert. But the rank luxuriance of the vegetation around fountains, along the banks of streams, and wherever irrigation is employed, as at Jericho, shows the natural richness of the soil, and proves that industry alone is wanting to develop its vast resources. The whole of this lower valley is now almost deserted. With the exception of the few inhabitants of er-Riha (Jericho), and a few families of nomad Ghawarineh, no man dwells there; and a curse, moral as well as physical, appears to rest upon the region.

The river here winds as before through a glen down the centre of the valley. The banks of the glen are steep, white, bare, and worn into little- hills; while the river-sides are fringed with the richest foliage. Owing to the depth of this glen, neither river nor foliage is seen from the plain until the very brow is reached. The plain along the northern shore of the Dead Sea is low and flat, and in the centre, near the Jordan, slimy. The sea fills up the whole breadth of the valley; the precipitous mountains upon the east and west rising from the shore-line — sometimes from the bosom of the water. The scenery of this region is more dreary than that in any other part of Palestine. The white plain on the north, the white naked cliffs on the east and west, the gray haze, caused by rapid evaporation, quivering under the burning sunbeams — all combine to form a picture of stern desolation such as the eye seldom beholds.

The western shore of the sea follows the base of the cliffs to the southern extremity, where the salt hills, called Khashm Usdum, “the ridge of Sodom,” project from the west far into the Ghor. On the east, the shore-  line keeps close to the mountains for about threequarters of its length; then a long, low, sandy promontory, called el-Lisan, “the Tongue,” juts out into the sea. South of this there is a broad strip of marshy plain, covered with jungles of reeds and dense shrubberies of tamarisk. Here some tribes of fierce lawless Arabs pitch their tents and cultivate a few fields of wheat and millet. The whole southern shore of the sea is low and slimy. SEE SEA, SALT.

In regard to its levels, the whole Jordan valley divides itself into five stages, as follows:

1. The basin of Merom, now called el-Huleh;

2. The basin of Tiberias;

3. The valley to Kurn Surtabeh;

4. The plain of Jericho;

5. The Dead Sea.

The levels taken by different travellers are very unsatisfactory. The elevation of the fountain of the Jordan at Dan, and consequently of the northern extremity of the great valley, may be regarded as undetermined. The following are given (with the exception of the last) by Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 181):

Tell el-Kady (Dan), by De Forest6 FeetVon Wildeubruch537De Bertoul344The Lake Merom, by induction from Wildelibruch's elevation of Jacob's Bridge, about120The Lake Merom, by De Bertou20Khan Jubb Yusef, on high terrace between Merom and Sea of Galilee883 BELOW THE SEA-LEVEL.

Sea of Galilee, by Lynch653Bridge of Mejamia, between Beth-shean and Gadara, by Lynch704Ruined bridge a few miles above Kurn Surtabeh, by Lynch109Pilgrim's bathing-place on the Jordan, by Poole1209Jericho, by Poole798“De Bertonu1034Kasr Hajla, on the plain near Jericho, by Symonds1069The Dead Sea, by Lynch1317“ ““ “Symonds1312“‘ ““ “De Bertou1377“ ““ “Poole1316““ ““ the English engineers1292Buried as it is thus between such lofty ranges, and shielded from every breeze, the atmosphere of the Jordan valley is extremely hot and relaxing. Its enervating influence is shown by the inhabitants of Jericho, who are a small, feeble, exhausted race, dependent for the cultivation of their lands on the hardier peasants of the highland villages (Robinson, 1, 550), and to this day prone to the vices which are often developed by tropical climates, and which brought destruction on Sodom and Gomorrah. But the circumstances which are unfavorable to morals are most favorable to fertility. Whether there was any great amount of cultivation and habitation in this region in the times of the Israelites the Bible does not say; but in post-biblical times there is no doubt on this point. The palms of Jericho and of Abila (opposite Jericho on the other side of the river), and the extensive balsam and rose gardens of the former place, are spoken of by Josephus, who calls the whole district a “divine spot” (θεῖον χωρίον, War, 4:8). Bethshan was a proverb among the rabbins for its fertility. Succoth was the site of Jacob's first settlement west of the Jordan; and therefore was probably then, as it still is, an eligible spot. In later times indigo and sugar appear to have been grown near Jericho and elsewhere; aqueducts are still partially standing, of Christian or Saracenic arches; and there are remains all over the plain between Jericho and the river of former residences or towns and of systems of irrigation (Ritter, Jordan, p. 503, 512). Phasaelis, a few miles farther north, was built by Herod the Great; and there were other towns either in or closely bordering on the plain. At present this part  is almost entirely desert, and cultivation is confined to the upper portion, between Sakut and Beisan. There indeed it is conducted on a grand scale; and the traveller as he journeys along the road which leads over the foot of the western mountains overlooks an immense extent of the richest land, abundantly watered, and covered with corn and other grain. Here, too, as at Jericho, the cultivation is conducted principally by the inhabitants of the villages on the western mountains. All the irrigation necessary for the towns, or for the cultivation which formerly existed or still exists in the Ghor, is obtained from the torrents and springs of the western mountains. For all purposes to which a river is ordinarily applied the Jordan is useless. So rapid that its course is one continued cataract; so crooked that in the whole of its lower and main course it has hardly half a mile straight; so broken with rapids and other impediments that no boat can swim for more than the same distance: continuously; so deep below the surface of the adjacent country that it is invisible, and can only with difficulty be approached, resolutely refusing all communication with the ocean, and ending in a lake, the peculiar conditions of which render navigation impossible-with all these characteristics the Jordan, in any sense which we attach to the word “river,” is no river at all; alike useless for irrigation and navigation, it is in fact, what its Arabic name signifies, nothing but a “great watering-place” (Sheriat el-Khebir).

How far the valley of the Jordan was employed by the ancient' inhabitants of the Holy Land as a medium of communication between the northern and southern parts of the country we can only conjecture. Though not the shortest route between Galilee and Judaea, it would yet, as far as the levels and form of the ground are concerned, be the most practicable for large bodies; though these advantages would be seriously counterbalanced by the sultry heat of its climate, as compared with the fresher air of the more difficult road over the highlands. The ancient notices of this route are very scanty:

(1.) From 2Ch 28:15 we find that the captives taken from Judah by the army of the northern kingdom were sent back from Samaria to Jerusalem by way of Jericho. The route pursued was probably by Nabulus across the Mukhna, and by Wady Ferrahor Fasail into the Jordan valley. Why this road was taken is a mystery, since it is not stated or implied that the captives were accompanied by any heavy baggage which would make it difficult to travel over the central route. It would seem, however, to have been the usual road from the north to  Jerusalem (comp. Luk 17:11 with 19:1), as if there were some impediment to passing through the region immediately north of the city.

(2.) Pompey brought his army and siege-train from Damascus to Jerusalem (B.C. 40) past Scythopolis and Pella, and thence by Koreae (possibly the present Kera-wa at the foot of the Wady Ferrah) to Jericho (Joseph. Ant. 14:3, 4; War, i, 6, 5).

(3.) Vespasian marched from Emmaus, on the edge of the plain of Sharon, not far east of Ramleh, past Neapolis (Nabulus), down the Wady Ferrah or Fasail to Koreae, and thence to Jericho (War, 4:8, 1); the same route as that of the captive Judaeans in No. 1.

(4.) Antoninus Martyr (cir. A.D. 600), and possibly Willibald (A.D. 722), followed this route to Jerusalem.

(5.) Baldwin I is said to have. journeyed from Jericho to Tiberias with a caravan of pilgrims.

(6.) In our own times the whole length of the valley has been traversed by De Berou, and by Dr. Anderson, who accompanied Lynch's Expedition as geologist, but apparently by few if any other travellers.

(4.) The Plateau east of the Jordan. — Eastern Palestine, or the region beyond the Jordan valley, is widely different in its physical geography from Western. Its average elevation is about 2500 feet above the sea. The Jordan valley is a rent or chasm in the earth's crust; the country beyond it is an elevated terrace. This elevation affects the scenery, the climate, the products, and the inhabitants themselves. Nowhere east of the Jordan, at least within the boundaries of Palestine, is there the bare, desolate aspect such as is presented by the sun-scorched plain of Philistia, or the white downs of the Negeb, or the barren wilderness of Judaea. There is more verdure, more richness, and more beauty everywhere on the east. The pastures of Gilead and Bashan are still as attractive as they were when Reuben and Gad saw and coveted them (Num 32:1). The surface of Western Palestine is rough and rugged, varied by plain and mountain ridge; the east is nearly all a table-land, consisting of smooth downs, well designated by the accurate sacred writers as the Mishor (Deu 3:10; Jos 13:9; Jos 13:16, etc.; comp. Stanley, p. 479). It does not appear so from the west, from whence the eye sees only a ridge, like a huge wall,  running along the horizon; for this peculiarity is visible from every point on the east, and is very striking when seen from some commanding spot, as the top of Hermon, or the crest of Jebel Hauran. In Western Palestine, again, the ancient cities are almost obliterated, and the very foundations of the temples and monuments can scarcely be discovered; in the east, the magnificence of the existing ruins, and the perfect preservation of some of the very oldest cities, are subjects of continual surprise and admiration to the traveller. Some have represented Eastern Palestine as mainly a pastoral country, where the three tribes lived in a semi-nomad state, dwelling in tents, and placing their flocks in rude folds like the border tribes of Bedawin. The country itself gives the best refutation to this theory. It is everywhere thickly studded with old cities, towns, and villages — many of them still bearing their Scripture names. In no part of Western Palestine are there evidences of such a dense population as throughout Bashan and Gilead. The country was indeed rich in pastures; but it was also rich in cornfields. The northern section of it is to this day the granary of Damascus.

The northern border of Palestine intersects that part of the ridge of Hermon now called Jebel el-Heish, passing Banias, and the little lake Phiala (now Birket er-Ram), which ancient geographers regarded as the head source of the Jordan (Joseph. War, 3, 10, 7)., This range bears some resemblance in features and scenery to the mountains of Upper Galilee. .It is broad, and is interspersed with green upland plains and wide fertile valleys. Its peaks and sides are mostly covered, more or less densely, with forests of oak, sycamore, terebinth, and here and there clumps of pine- trees. The timber is larger and the woods denser than in any part of Western Palestine (Porter's Damascus, 1, 307). The forests, however, are gradually disappearing under the destroying hand of the Bedawin and the Damascus charcoal manufacturers. At the place where the border-line crosses, the ridge appears to be of about equal altitude with that on the opposite side of the Huleh; but it slowly decreases, and finally sinks into the tableland a few miles south of the ruins of Kuneiterah. The scenery of the southern end is beautiful. Lines and groups of conical hills, perfect in form, covered from base to summit with green grass and sprinkled with evergreen oaks, are divided by meadow-like plains and winding vales, with here and there the gray ruins of a town or village. The grass in spring is most luxuriant; and the wild flowers — anemones, tulips, poppies, marigolds, cowslips — are more abundant than even in Galilee. The whole  landscape glows with them. The superiority of the pastures and the abundance of flowers are owing to the forests, to the high elevation, and to the influence of the neighboring snow-crowned peaks of Hermon. At all seasons dew is abundant; one of the highest summits is called Abu-Nedy, “the father of dew;” and clouds may often be seen hovering over the ridge when the heaven elsewhere is as brass. This illustrates the Psalmist's beautiful imagery: “As the dew of Hermon, that descended on the mountains of Zion” (Psa 133:3). The ridge is now almost desolate. With the exception of two or three small villages, and a few families of nomads, it has no inhabitants. Its rich soil is untilled, and even its pastures are forsaken or neglected.

At the eastern base of the ridge commences the noble plateau of Bashan, at once the richest and the largest plain in Palestine. It extends unbroken southward to the banks of the Yarmuk (thirty miles), and eastward to Jebel Hauran (fifty miles). The western part of it is called Jaulan (גּוֹלָן, Γαυλονῖτις), the eastern Hauran. The former has a gently undulating surface; is studded with conical and cup-shaped tells; is abundantly watered, especially in the northern part, by streams and fountains; and is famed throughout all Syria for the excellence of its pastures. The surface is in places stony, and covered with shrubberies of hawthorn, ilex, and other bushes; elsewhere it is smooth as a meadow. Towards the west the. plateau is intersected by deep ravines or gullies, which carry its surplus waters down' to the Jordan. The high ridge which runs along the eastern side of the Jordan valley from Hermon to Gilead is the supporting wall of. this plateau. Jaulan has now very few settled inhabitants; but it is visited periodically by the vast tribes of the Anazeh from the Arabian desert, whose flocks and herds, numerous as those of their ancestors “the children of the East” (Jdg 6:3-5), devour, trample down, and destroy all before them. The remains of old cities and villages in the plain are very numerous, and some of them very extensive (Porter's Damascus, vol. 2). SEE GOLAN.

The plain of Hauran divides itself naturally into two parts: one, lying on the north-east, is a wilderness of rocks, elevated from twenty to thirty feet above the surrounding plain. . The border is sharply defined, and has received from the sacred writers an appropriate name, the Chebel (Deu 3:4; Deu 3:13; 1Ki 4:13), in the Hebrew. The rocks are basalt, which appears to have been thrown up from innumerable pores or  craters in a state of fusion, to have flowed over the whole ground, and then, while cooling, to have been rent and shattered by some terrible convulsion. For wildness and savage, forbidding deformity, there is nothing like it in Palestine, and it is scarcely equalled in the world. This is the Argob of the Hebrews, the Trachonitis (q.v.) of the Greeks, and the Lejah of the modern Arabs. Its inhabitants have in all ages partaken of the wild character of their country. They have been and are lawless bandits; and their rocky fastness is the home of every outlaw. Along the rocky border of this forlorn region, and even in the interior, are great numbers of primaeval cities, most of them now deserted, though not ruined (comp. Deu 3:4). The remaining portion of Hauran is a plain, perfectly level, with a deep black soil, free from stones, and proverbial for its fertility. At intervals are rounded or conical tells, usually covered with the remains of ancient cities or villages. The water-courses are deep and tortuous, running westward to the Jordan; but none of them contain perennial streams. SEE HAURAN.

Along the eastern border of this noble plain lies an isolated ridge of mountains — the Mountains of Bashan — about forty miles long by fifteen broad. It divides the ancient kingdom of Bashan from the arid steppes of Arabia; and it forms at this point the north-eastern boundary of Palestine. The scenery is picturesque. Being wholly of volcanic origin, the summits rise in conical peaks, and are mostly clothed to the top with oaks. The glens are deep and wild; the mountainsides are terraced, and though rocky and now' desolate, they everywhere afford evidence of the extraordinary richness of the soil and of former careful cultivation. The grass and general verdure surpass anything in Western Palestine; and the brilliant foliage of the evergreen oak and terebinth gives the mountains the look of eternal spring. In another respect, also, the scenery differs widely from that of the west. In the latter the white limestone and chalky strata, and the white soil, give a parched and barren look to the country. In Bashan the rocks are all basalt, in color either dark slaty gray or black; and the soil is black. This makes the landscape somewhat sombre, but on the whole more pleasing than Judaea or Samaria. Though these mountains are far from the sea, and on the borders of an arid wilderness, they do not appear to suffer so much from drought or from the burning sun of summer as the western range. This arises in part from the forests that clothe them, and in part from their greater elevation — the highest peaks cannot be less than 6000 feet above the sea, and the average elevation of the plain of Hauran is greater than  that of the mountains of Western Palestine. It is remarkable, however, that water is extremely scarce in Hauran. — Even in winter, though the snow lies deep upon the mountains, and sometimes covers the plain, the torrents are neither numerous nor large, and there are no perennial streams. Fountains are rare. The ancient inhabitants have expended much labor and skill in attempts to obtain a supply of water. Cisterns and tanks of immense size have been constructed at every town and village. Some are open, as at Bozrah and Salcah; some arched over, as at Kenath and Suleim; some excavated in the rock, forming labyrinths, as at Edrei and Damah. In a few places long subterranean canals have been sunk, in others aqueducts have been made. There is an aqueduct at Shuhba, in the, mountains, upwards of five miles long; and there is one in the plain at Dera not less than twenty. — Irrigation is not practiced in Bashanit is not necessary. The soil is deep and rich, totally different from the scanty gravelly covering of the hills of Judah; the great elevation, too, prevents the intense heat and evaporation which so seriously affect the low plains of Palestine. In another respect Bashan presents a very marked contrast to the west. Its old cities still stand. Their walls, gates, and primaeval houses are in many places nearly perfect. The temples and monuments of the Greek and Roman period, and the churches of the early Christian age, are also in a good state of preservation. There are no remains of antiquity west of the Jordan which would bear comparison with those of Bozrah, Salcah, Kenath, Shuhba, or Edrei; and probably in no other country of the world are there specimens of the domestic architecture of so remote an age (Porter's Damascus, vol. 2; The Giant Cities of Bashan, p. 1 sq.). The province of Hauran is an oasis i the midst of widespread desolation. This is mainly owing to the indomitable courage of the Druses who inhabit it. They have taught rapacious Bedawin and rapacious Turks alike to respect them and the fruits of their industry. Grouped together in a few of the ancient cities and villages on the western slopes of the mountains, and along the southern border of the Lejah, they are able to bid defiance to all their enemies. A number of Christians and Mohammedans are settled among and around them. They cultivate large sections of the plain, and they find a ready market for their grain in Damascus. SEE BASHAN.

South of the river Yarmuk the plain of Bashan gives place to the picturesque hills of Gilead. Their slopes are easy, their tops rounded, and there are undulating plateaus along the broad summit of the ridge. Their elevation, as seen from the east, is not great. The distant view is more that  of an ascent to a higher part of the plain than of a mountain range. The summits seem nearly horizontal, and not more than five or six hundred feet above the plain. On passing in among them the physical features assume new forms, and the scenery becomes very beautiful. Wild glens cut deeply down through the ridge to the Jordan valley. The first of these is the Yarmuk, which contains a rapid perennial torrent rushing along its rocky bed between fringes of willow and oleander. It is the largest tributary to the Jordan, and next to it the largest river in Palestine. Farther south is Wady Yabes, taking its name from the old city of Jabesh-Gilead, which once stood on its bank. Still farther south is the Jabbok, also a perennial stream; though much smaller than the Yarmuk. The scenery of these glens and the intervening hills is not surpassed in any part of Palestine. The steep banks are broken by white limestone cliffs. and they are in most places covered with the glistening foliage of the ilex, intermixed with hawthorn and arbutus; while the slopes overhead and the rounded hilltops wave with forests of oak, terebinth, and occasionally pine. The little meadows along the streams, the open spaces on the mountains, and the undulating forest glades, are all covered with rich herbage. Gilead is still “a place for cattle” (Num 32:1).

The highest peak of Gilead is Jebel Osha, near esSalt. South of it the ridge sinks, and finally melts into the plateau near the ruins of Rabbath-Ammon. None of the peaks of Gilead have been measured, and their height can only be estimated by comparison with the plain behind and the mountains of Samaria opposite. Viewed from the west, the top of the whole ridge on the east side of the Jordan appears nearly horizontal; yet both to the north and south of Gilead the summit of the ridge is on the level of the plateau. Jebel Osha, therefore, can scarcely be more than 700 feet above the plateau, which would make its elevation above the sea less than 4000 feet. This is much lower than the ordinary estimate. Like Bashan, Gilead contains the remains of many splendid cities, the chief of which are Gerasa, Rabbath- Ammon, Gadara, and Pella. The ruins of towns, castles, and villages stud the mountains in all directions! Settled inhabitants are now very few, and they are greatly oppressed by the inroads of the Bedawin, who, attracted by the rich pastures and abundant waters, penetrate all parts of the country. SEE GILEAD.

South of Gilead lies “the land of Moab” (Deu 1:5; Deu 32:49), a plateau like Bashan, but more naked and desolate. Less is known of it than of any other part of Palestine. It has never been fully explored; and, with  the exception of a few travellers passing through and following nearly the same route, the country has, until recently, scarcely been examined. From the ruins of Ammon it extends in a succession of rolling downs to Kerak. On the west it breaks down in stupendous cliffs, 3000 feet and more, to the shore of the Dead Sea. Chasms of singular wildness cut these cliffs to their base. and run far back into the plain. Along the torrent-beds are fringes of willow, oleander, tamarisk, and palms. The ravine of Kerak is its southern boundary; but the grandest of all the ravines is the Arnon, which formed the southern boundary of Reubeni's territory (Deu 3:12). Wady Zurka Main is also a deep ravine, and is remarkable as having near its mouth the famous warm fountains, anciently called Callirrhoe (Joseph. Ant. 17:6, 5; Pliny, 5:16; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 467 sq., 1st ed.). Along the western brow of the plateau, little conical and rounded hills rise at irregular intervals to a height of two or three hundred feet.

The highest is Jebel Attarus. Not far from Heshbon is Jebel Neba, or Nebo (q.v.), a spur from the general Dead Sea wall. There are also some low ridges away to the eastward, separating the southern part of the plain from the desert, of Arabia (Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 375). The soil of the plateau is rich and deep; but being composed mainly of disintegrated limestone, and diffused over white calcareous strata, it is greatly affected by the sun, and assumes a bare and parched aspect during the summer. At the northern end, where it joins Gilead are some remains of oak-forests; and in the deep ravines, and along the north-western declivities, trees and shrubs grow abundantly, but the vast expanse of the upland is treeless and shrubless (Irby and Mangles, p. 474; Burckhardt, p. 364). At Wady Mojeb (Arnon) the plain assumes a more rugged aspect, being strewn with basalt boulders, and dotted with rocky mounds. These extend to Kerak. The general features and character of the plateau agree perfectly with the incidental notices of the sacred penmen. It is “a land for cattle,” famed throughout all Palestine for the abundance and richness of its pastures, and forming a constant source of dispute and warfare among the desert tribes (Burckhardt, p. 368). It was well termed Mishor, a region of “level downs,” a “smooth table-land.” as contrasted with the rough and rocky soil of the western mountains (comp. Stanley, S. and P. p. 317). The plateau of Moab is a thirsty region. Fountains, and even spring wells, are very rare; and there are no perennial streams, yet it abounds with traces of former dense population. The ruins of old cities — many of great extent — and of old villages, stud its surface. In numbers of these we recognise the Bible names, as Hesban, El-al, Medeba, and Arair. The want of fountains and  streams was supplied by tanks and cisterns; which abound in and near all the old towns. The “pools of Heshbon” are still there (Son 7:4; see Murray's Handbook for S. and P. p. 298). But the cities and villages are now deserted. Moab has no settled inhabitants. From Amman to Kerak there is not a single village or house. Large tribes of Bedawin roam over its splendid pastures; and a few poor nomads, with the warlike people of Kerak, cultivate some portions of its soil; but all the rest is desolate.

The elevations of Eastern Palestine have not been taken with accuracy. Some of those collected by Van de Velde appear to be mere estimates. They may be given, however, in the absence of better:

Kunleiterah, at the southern base of Hermon (v. Feet. Schubert)3037Plateau, southward (v. Schubert)3000Plain of Hauran, approximation (Russegger)2650Kuleib, highest summit of Hauraln mountains (Russegger)6400Jebel Ajlun, highest point in north Gilead (much too high), approximation (Russegger)6500Jebel Osha (much too high), about5000The following books contain all the information yet given to the public regarding the plain of Moab: Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 364 sq.; Irby and Mangles, Travels in Egypt, etc., p. 456 sq., 1st ed.; Seetzen, Reisen, i, 405 sq.; ii, 324 sq.; De Saulcy, Voyage Round the Dead Sea, i, 329 sq.; G. Robinson, Travels in Palestine, ii, 179; Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palestine, p. 297 sq.; Tristram, Land of Moab (Lond. and N. Y. 1873). SEE MOAB.

2. General Features. — It may be well now to group together a few of those characteristics of Palestine embodied or referred to in the preceding sketch of its physical geography, and which tend to illustrate some of the statements and incidental notices of the sacred writers.

(1.) To an Occidental Palestine does not appear either rich or beautiful. Calling to mind the glowing descriptions of the Bible, the Eastern traveller is apt to feel grievous disappointment, and even to accuse the sacred writers of exaggeration. They speak of the land as “a land flowing with  milk and honey” (Exo 3:8; Lev 20:24; Deu 6:3; Jos 5:6); “a good land, a land of brooks of water, of fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills; a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig-trees, and pomegranates; a land of oil olive, and honey; a land wherein thou shalt eat bread without scarceness” (Deu 8:7-9); “a land of hills and valleys, and that drinketh water of the rain of heaven; a land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the end of the year” (11:11, 12). Those accustomed to Western verdure, and the full glory of Western harvests, can see little fertility in the naked hills and bare plains of Palestine. A thoughtful consideration of the whole subject, however, and a careful survey of the country, prove that the words of the sacred penmen were not exaggerated.

(a.) In the first place, it must be borne in mind that they were describing an Eastern, not a Western land. When Moses addressed the above words to the Israelites, he was accustomed, and so were they, to the flat surface, and cloudless, rainless sky of Egypt, and to the stern desolation of the Sinaitic desert. Compared with these, Palestine was a land of hills and valleys, of rivers and fountains, of corn and wine.

[1.] After the “great and terrible wilderness,” with its “fiery serpents,” its “scorpions,” “drought,” and “rocks of flint” — the slow and sultry march all day in the dust of that enormous procession — the eager looking forward to the well at which the encampment was to be pitched — the crowding, the fighting, the clamor, the bitter disappointment around the modicum of water when at last the desired spot was reached — the “light bread” so long “loathed” — the rare treat of animal food when the quail descended, or an approach to the sea permitted the “fish” to be caught; after this daily struggle for a painful existence; how grateful must have been the rest afforded by the Land of Promise! — how delicious the shade, scanty though it were, of the hills and ravines, the gushing springs and green:plains, even the mere wells and cisterns, the vineyards and oliveyards and “fruit-trees in abundance,” the cattle, sheep, and goats, covering the country with their long black lines, the bees swarming around their pendent combs in rock or wood! Moreover they entered the country at the time of the Passover, when it was arrayed in the full glory and freshness of its brief springtide, before the scorching sun of summer had had time to wither its flowers and embrown its verdure. Taking all these circumstances into account, and allowing for the bold metaphors of Oriental speech — so  different from our cold depreciating expressions — it is impossible not to feel that those wayworn travellers could have chosen no fitter words to express what their new country was to them than those which they so often employ in the accounts of the conquest — “a land flowing with milk and honey, the glory of all lands.”

[2.] Again, although the variations of the seasons in Palestine may appear to us slight, and the atmosphere dry and hot, yet after the monotonous climate of Egypt, where rain is a rare phenomenon, and where the difference between summer and winter is hardly perceptible, the “rain of heaven” — must have been a most grateful novelty in its two seasons, the former and the latter — the occasional snow and ice of the winters of Palestine, and the burst of returning spring, must have had double the effect which they would produce on those accustomed to such changes. Nor is the change only a relative one; there is a real difference — due partly to the higher latitude of Palestine, partly to its proximity to the sea — between the sultry atmosphere of the Egyptian valley and the invigorating sea-breezes which blow over the hills of Ephraim and Judah.

The contrast with Egypt would tell also in another way. In place of the huge overflowing river, whose only variation was from low to high, and from high to low again, and which lay at the lowest level of that level country, so that all irrigation had to be done by artificial labor — “a land where thou sowedst thy seed and wateredst it with thy foot like a garden of herbs” — in place of this, they were to find themselves in a land of constant and considerable undulation, where the water, either of gushing spring, or deep well, or flowing stream, could be procured at the most varied elevations, requiring only to be judiciously husbanded and skilfully conducted to find its own way through field or garden, whether terraced on the hill-sides or extended to the broad bottoms. But such a change was not compulsory. Those who preferred the climate and the mode of cultivation of Egypt could resort to the lowland plains or the Jordan valley, where the temperature is more constant and many degrees higher than on the more elevated districts of the country; where the breezes never penetrate, where the light fertile soil recalls, as it did in the earliest times, that of Egypt, and where the Jordan in its lowness of level presents at least one point of resemblance to the Nile.

[3.] In truth, on closer consideration, it will be seen that, beneath the apparent monotony, there is a variety in the Holy Land really remarkable.  There is the variety due to the difference of level between the different parts of the country. There is the variety of climate and of natural appearances, proceeding partly from those very differences of level, and partly from the proximity of the snow-capped Hermon and Lebanon on the north and of the torrid desert on the south; and which approximate the climate, in many respects, to that of regions much farther north. There is also the variety which is inevitably produced by the presence of the sea — “the eternal freshness and liveliness of ocean.”

Each of these peculiarities is continually reflected in the Hebrew literature. The contrast between the highlands and lowlands is more than implied in the habitual forms of expression, “going up” to Judah, Jerusalem, Hebron; “going down” to Jericho, Capernaum, Lydda, Caesarea, Gaza, and Egypt. More than this, the difference is marked unmistakably in the topographical terms which so abound in and are so peculiar to this literature. “The mountains of Judah,” “the mountains of Israel,” “the mountains of Naphtali,” are the names by which the three great divisions of the highlands are designated. The predominant names for the towns of the same district — Gibeah, Geba, Gaba, Gibeon (meaning “hill”); Ramah, amathaim (the “brow” of an eminence); Mizpeh, Zophim, Zephathah — (all modifications of a root signifying a wide prospect) — all reflect the elevation of the region in which they were situated. On the other hand, the great lowland districts have each their peculiar name. The southern part of the maritime plain is “the Shephelah;” the northern, “Sharon;” the valley of the Jordan, “ha-Arabah;” names which are never interchanged, and never confounded with the terms (such as enaek, nachal, gai) employed for the ravines, torrent-beds, and small valleys of the highlands. SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

The differences in climate are as frequently mentioned. The psalmists, prophets, and historical books are full of allusions to the fierce heat of the mid-day sun and the dryness of summer; no less than to the various accompaniments of winter-the rain, snow, frost, ice, and fogs — which are experienced at Jerusalem and other places in the upper country quite sufficiently to make every one familiar with them. Even the sharp alternations between the heat of the days and the coldness of the nights, which strike every traveller in Palestine, — are mentioned. The Israelites practiced no commerce by sea; and, with the single exception of Joppa, not only possessed no harbor along the whole length of their coast, but had no word by which to denote one. But that their poets knew and appreciated  the phenomena of the sea is plain from such expressions as are constantly recurring in their works — “the great and wide sea,” its “ships,” its “monsters,” its roaring and dashing “waves,” its “depths,” its “sand,” its mariners, the perils of its navigation (Psalms 107). SEE SEA.

(b.) In the next place, Palestine is not now what it then was. The curse is upon it. Eighteen-centuries of war and ruin and neglect have passed over it. Its valleys have been cropped for ages without the least attempt at fertilization. Its terrace-walls have been allowed to crumble, and the soil has washed down into the ravines, leaving the hill-sides rocky and sterile. Its trees have been cut down, and never replaced. Its fields have been desolated, its structures pillaged, and all its improvements ruthlessly destroyed. The utter insecurity of life and property has taken away all incentive for maintaining the resources of the land, and extortion has robbed it of the last vestiges of thrift. What would the fairest country of Europe be under similar circumstances? But the close observer can still see the vast resources of the land, and abundant evidences of former richness, and even beauty. The products ascribed to it by the sacred writers are just those for which its soil and climate are adapted. The wide plains for wheat and barley; the sheltered glens and deep warm valleys for the pomegranate, the olive, and the palm; the terraced slopes of hills and mountains for the vine and the fig. Then there are the oak-forests still on Bashan; the evergreen shrubberies on Carmel; the rich pastures on Sharon, Moab, and Gilead; and the full blush of spring flowers all over the land.

(2.) Palestine now seems almost deserted. Few countries in the old world are so thinly peopled. Some of the plains — the lower Jordan, for example, and Southern Philistia — appear to be “without man and without beast.” Yet in no country are there such abundant evidences of former dense population. Every available spot on plain, hill, glen, and mountain bears traces of cultivation. It is “a land of ruins.” Everywhere, on plain and mountain, in rocky desert and on beetling cliff, are seen the remains of cities and villages. In Western Palestine they are heaps of stones, or white dust and. rubbish strewn over low tells; in Eastern, the ruins are often, of great extent and magnificence. All this accords with the vast population mentioned alike by the writers of the Old Testament (Jdg 20:17; 1Sa 15:4; 1Ch 27:4-15) and of the New (Mat 5:1; Mat 9:33; Luk 12:1, etc.), and confirmed by the statements of Josephus.

(3.) It has been seen that Palestine has, in reality, only one river — the Jordan; yet it has several perennial streams, such as the Jabbok, the Arnon, and the historic Kishon; and also the Yarmuk, the Belus, and others not mentioned in the Bible. Its mountains also abound with winter torrents. Doubtless these- were all more copious in ancient days, when forests clothed the hills and the soil was fully cultivated. To these Moses referred, when he described Palestine as “a land of brooks of water.” — Fountains abound among the hills — “fountains and depths that spring out of valleys and hills” and throughout the country are vast numbers of wells and cisterns and aqueducts, showing that the supply of water from ordinary sources must have been always limited; and illustrating too the labors of the patriarchs in digging wells, and their hard struggles to defend them, (Gen 26:15; 2Sa 23:15; Joh 4:6; Deu 6:11). SEE RIVER.

(4.) Another of the physical characteristics of Palestine ought not to be overlooked. Its limestone strata abound in caves, especially in the mountains of Judsea. Some are of immense size, as that at Khureitun, near Bethlehem (Murray's Handbook, p. 229). Many of them were evidently used as dwellings by the ancient inhabitants, as those near Eleutheropolis and along the border of Philistia (ibid, p. 256 sq.); many as tombs, examples of which are numerous at Jerusalem, Hebron, and Bethel; many as stores for grain and folds for flocks. These caves are often mentioned in sacred history. Lot and his daughters took refuge in, a cave after the destruction of Sodom (Gen 19:30); in a cave the five kings hid themselves when pursued by Joshua (Jos 10:16), in the caves of Adullam, Maon, and Engedi David found an asylum (1Sa 22:1; 1Sa 24:3); in a cave Obadiah concealed the prophets of the Lord from the fury of Jezebel (1Ki 18:4); in caves and “dens” and “pits” and “holes” the Jews were accustomed to take refuge during times of pressing danger (Jdg 6:2; 1Sa 13:6). Consequently, to enter into “holes of the rock and caves of the earth” was employed by the prophets as an impressive image of terror and impending calamity (Isa 2:19; Rev 6:15-16). The tomb of Abraham at Machpelah was a cave (Gen 23:19); our Lord's tomb was a cave, and so was that of Lazarus (Joh 11:38), and those in which the Gadarene daemoniacs dwelt (Mar 5:3). In later times, caves became strongholds for robbers (Joseph. War, 1 16, 2), and places of refuge for conquered patriots (Life, 74, 75). Caves and grottos have also played an important part in the  traditionary history of Palestine. “Wherever a sacred association had to be fixed, a cave was immediately selected or found as its home” (Stanley, p. 151, 435, 505). SEE CAVE.

(5.) Few things are a more constant source of surprise to the stranger in the Holy Land than the manner in which the hill-tops are, throughout, selected for habitation. A town in a valley is a rare exception. On the other hand, scarcely a single eminence of the multitude always in sight but is crowned with its city or village, inhabited or in ruins, often so placed as if not, accessibility but inaccessibility had been the object of its builders. And indeed such was their object. These groups of naked, forlorn structures piled irregularly one over the other on the curve of the hill-top, their rectangular outline, flat roofs, and blank walls, suggestive to the Western mind rather of fastness than of peaceful habitation, surrounded by filthy heaps of the rubbish of centuries, approached only by the narrow winding path, worn white, on the gray or brown breast of the hill — are the lineal descendants, if indeed they do not sometimes contain the actual remains, of the. “fenced cities, great and walled up to heaven,” which are so frequently mentioned in the records of the Israelitish conquest. They bear witness now, no less surely than they did even in that early age, and as they have done through all the ravages and conquests of thirty centuries, to the insecurity of the country — to the continual risk of sudden plunder and destruction incurred by those rash enough to take up their dwelling in the plain. Another and hardly less valid reason for the practice is furnished in the terms of our Lord's well-known apologue — namely, the treacherous nature of the loose alluvial “sand” of the plain under the sudden rush of the winter torrents from the neighboring hills, as compared with the safety and firm foundation attainable by building on the naked “rock” of the hills themselves (Mat 7:24-27). These hill-towns were not what gave the Israelites their main difficulty in the occupation of the country.

Wherever strength of arm and fleetness of foot availed, there those hardy warriors, fierce as lions, sudden and swift as eagles, sure-footed and fleet as the wild deer on the hills (1Ch 12:8; 2Sa 1:23; 2Sa 2:18), easily conquered. It was in the plains, where the horses and chariots of the Canaanites and Philistines had space to maneuver, that they failed to dislodge the aborigines. Judah “drave out the inhabitants of the mountain, but could not drive out the inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron; .. neither did Manasseh drive out the inhabitants of Bethshean... nor Megiddo,” in the plain of Esdraelon;... “neither did  Ephraim drive out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer,” on the maritime plain near Ramleh;... “neither did Asher drive out the inhabitants of Accho.. And the Amorites forced the children of Dan into the mountain, for they would not suffer them to come down into the valley'“ (Jdg 1:19-34). Thus in this case the ordinary conditions of conquest were reversed — the conquerors took the hills, the conquered kept the plains. To a people so exclusive as the Jews there must have been a constant satisfaction in the elevation and inaccessibility of their highland regions. This is evident in every page of their literature, which is tinged throughout with a highland coloring. The “mountains” were to “bring peace,” the little hills justice to the people:” when plenty came, the corn was to flourish on the “top of the mountains” (Psa 72:3; Psa 72:16). In like manner the mountains were to be joyful before Jehovah when he came to judge his people. What gave its keenest sting to the Babylonian conquest was the consideration that the “mountains of Israel,” the “ancient high places,” had become a “prey and a derision;” while, on the other hand, one of the most joyful circumstances of the restoration is that the mountains “shall yield their fruit as before, and be settled after their old estates”, (Eze 36:1; Eze 36:8; Eze 36:11). But it is needless to multiply instances of this, which pervades the writings of the psalmists and prophets in a truly remarkable manner, and must be familiar to every student of the Bible. (See the citations in Stanley's Sinai and Pal. ch. 2, 8.) Nor was it unacknowledged by the surrounding heathen. We have their own testimony that in their estimation Jehovah was the “God of the mountains” (1Ki 20:28), and they showed their appreciation of the fact by fighting (as already noticed), when possible, in the lowlands. The contrast is strongly brought out in the repeated expression of the psalmists: “Some,” like the Canaanites and Philistines of the lowlands, “put their trust in chariots and some in horses; but we — we mountaineers, from our sanctuary on the heights of Zion, will remember the name of Jehovah our God, the God of Jacob our father, the shepherd-warrior, whose only weapons were sword and bow — the God who is on a high fortress for us — at whose command both chariot and horse are fallen, who burneth the chariots in the fire” (Psa 20:1; Psa 20:7; Psa 46:7-11; Psa 76:2; Psa 76:6).

But the hills were occupied by other edifices besides the “fenced cities.” The tiny white domes which stand perched here and there on the summits of the eminences, and mark the holy ground in which some Mohammedan saint is resting — sometimes standing alone, sometimes near the village, in either case surrounded with a rude enclosure. and overshadowed with the  grateful shade and pleasant color of terebinth or carob — these are the successors of the “high places” or sanctuaries so constantly denounced by the prophets, and which were set up “on every high hill and under every green tree” (Jer 2:20; Eze 6:13). SEE HILL.

(6.) In the preceding description allusion has been made to many of the characteristic features of the Holy Land. But it is impossible to close this account without mentioning a defect which is even more characteristic — its lack of monuments and personal relics of the nation who possessed it for so many centuries, and gave it its claim to our veneration and affection. When compared with other nations of equal antiquity — Egypt, Greece, Assyria — the contrast is truly remarkable. In Egypt and Greece, and also in Assyria, as far as our knowledge at present extends, we find a series of buildings reaching down from the most remote and mysterious antiquity — a chain of which hardly a link is wanting, and which records the progress of the people in civilization, art, and religion as certainly as the buildings of the medieval architects do that of the various nations of modern Europe. We possess also a multitude of objects of use and ornament, belonging to those nations, truly astonishing in number, and pertaining to every station, office, and act in their official, religious, and domestic life . But in Palestine it is not too much to say that there does not exist a single edifice, or part of an edifice, of which we can be sure that it is of a date anterior to the Christian era. Excavated tombs, cisterns, flights of stairs, which are encountered everywhere, are of course out of the question. They may be — some of them, such as the tombs of Hinnom and Shiloh, probably are — of very great age, older than anything else in the country. But there is no evidence either way, and as far as the history of art is concerned nothing would be gained if their age were ascertained. The only ancient buildings of which we can speak with certainty are those that were erected by the Greeks or Romans during their occupation of the country. Not that these buildings have not a certain individuality which separates them from any mere Greek or Roman building in Greece or Rome; but the fact is certain that not one of them was built while the Israelites were masters of the country, and before the date at which Western nations began to get a footing in Palestine. As with the buildings, so with other memorials. With one exception, the museums of Europe do not possess a single piece of pottery or metal-work, a single weapon or household utensil, an ornament or a piece of armor, of Israelitish make, which can give us the least conception of the manners or outward appliances of the nation before the  date of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. The coins form the single exception. A few rare specimens still exist, the oldest of them attributed — though even that is matter of dispute — to the Maccabees, and their rudeness and insignificance furnish a stronger evidence than even their absence could imply of the total want of art among the Israelites.

It may be said that Palestine is now only in the same condition as Assyria before the recent researches brought so much to light. But the two cases are not parallel. The soil of Babylonia is a loose loam or sand, of the description best fitted for covering up and preserving the relics of former ages. On the other hand, the greater part of the Holy Land is hard and rocky, and the soil lies in the valleys and lowlands, where the cities were very rarely built. If any store of Jewish relics were remaining embedded or hidden in suitable ground — as, for example, in the loose mass of debris which coats the slopes around Jerusalem — we should expect occasionally to find articles which might be recognised as Jewish. This was the case in Assyria. Long before the mounds were explored, Rich brought home many fragments of inscriptions, bricks, and engraved stones, which were picked up on the surface, and were evidently the productions of some nation whose art was not then known. But in Palestine the only objects hitherto discovered have all belonged to the West — coins or arms of the Greeks or Romans.

The buildings already mentioned as being Jewish in character, though carried out with foreign details, are the following: The tombs of the kings and of the judges; the buildings known as the tombs of Absalom, Zechariah, St. James, and Jehoshaphat; the monolith at Siloam — all in the neighborhood of Jerusalem; the ruined synagogues at Meiron and Kefr Birim. But there are two edifices which seem to bear a character of their own, and do not so clearly betray the style of the West. These are the enclosure round the sacred cave at Hebron, and portions of the western, southern, and eastern walls of the Haram at Jerusalem, with the vaulted passage below the Aksa. Of the former it is impossible to speak in the present state of our knowledge. The latter will be more fully noticed under the head of TEMPLE; it is sufficient here to name one or two considerations which seem to bear against their being of older date than Herod.

(1.) Herod is distinctly said by Josephus to have removed the old foundations, and laid others in their stead, enclosing double the original area (Ant. 15:11, 3; War, 1, 21, 1).

(2.) The part of the wall which all acknowledge to be the oldest contains the springing of an arch. This and the vaulted passage can hardly be assigned to builders earlier than the time of the Romans.

(3.) The masonry of these magnificent stones (absurdly called the “bevel”), on which so much stress has been laid, is not exclusively Jewish or even Eastern. It is found at Persepolis; it is also found at Cnidus and throughout Asia Minor, and at Athens — not on stones of such enormous size as those at Jerusalem, but similar in their workmanship.

M. Renan, in his recent report of his proceedings in Phoenicia, has named two circumstances which must receive have had a great effect in suppressing art or architecture among the ancient Israelites, while their very existence proves that the people had no genius in that direction. These are (1) the prohibition of sculptured representations of living creatures, and (2) the command not to build a temple anywhere but at Jerusalem. The hewing or polishing of building-stones was even forbidden. “What,” he asks, “would Greece have been, if it had been illegal to build any temples but at Delphi or Eleusis? In ten centuries the Jews had only three temples to build, and of these certainly two were erected under the guidance of foreigners. The existence of synagogues dates from the time of the Maccabees, and the Jews then naturally employed the Greek style of architecture, which at that time reigned universally.”

In fact the Israelites never lost the feeling or the traditions of their early pastoral nomad life. Long after the nation had been settled in the country, the cry of those earlier days, “To your tents, O Israel!” was heard in periods of excitement. The prophets, sick of the luxury of the cities, are constantly recalling the “tents” of that simpler, less artificial life; and the Temple of Solomon — nay, even perhaps of Zerubbabel — was spoken of to the last as the “tent of the Lord of hosts,” the “place where David had pitched his tent.” It is a remarkable fact that, eminent as Jews have been in other departments of art, science, and affairs, no Jewish architect, painter, or sculptor has ever achieved any signal success. SEE ARCHITECTURE; SEE ARTIFICER.

VI. Climate, etc. —

1. Temperature. — Probably there is no country in the world of the same extent which embraces a greater variety in this respect than Palestine. On Mount Hermon, at its northern border, we approach a region of perpetual snow. From this we descend successively by the peaks of Bashan and Upper Galilee, where the oak and pine flourish, to the hills of Judah and Samaria, where the vine and fig-tree are at home, to the plains of the seaboard, where the palm and banana produce their fruit, down to the sultry shores of the Dead Sea, on which we find tropical heat and tropical vegetation. To determine with scientific accuracy the various shades of climate, and to arrange throughout the country exact isothermal lines, would require a long series of observations made at a number of distinct points now scarcely ever visited by scientific men. Sufficient data exist, however, to afford a good general view of the climate — a view sufficiently accurate for the illustration of the Bible.

Along the summits of the central ridge of Palestine, and over the table-land east of the Jordan, the temperature is pretty nearly equal. The cold in winter is sometimes severe. The thermometer has been known to fall as low as 28° Fahr., and frost hardens the ground — more, however, on the eastern plains than on the Judaean hills. Snow falls nearly every winter; it seldom lies longer than a day or two; but in the winter of 1857 it was eight inches deep, and it covered the eastern plains for a fortnight. The results were disastrous. Nearly a fourth of the houses of Damascus were injured, and some of the flat-roofed bazaars and mosques were left heaps of ruin. South of Hebron snow is rare, and frost less intense. Along the seaboard of Philistia and Sharon, and in the Jordan valley, snow and frost are unknown; but on the coast farther north very slight frost is sometimes felt. Snow is rarely seen whitening the ground below an elevation of 2000 feet.

The summer heat varies greatly in different localities. It is most intense along the shores of the Dead Sea, owing in part to the depression, and in part to the reflection of the sun's rays from the white mountains. The temperature at Engedi is probably as high as that of Thebes. The heat, the evaporation, and the fetid atmosphere render the whole of this plain dangerous to Europeans during the summer months. Tiberias is not so hot as Jericho, but it is sensibly hotter than the coast plain, where, owing to the influence of the sea-breeze which sets in at ten o'clock in the forenoon and continues till two hours after sunset, the heat is not oppressive. The dry  soil and dry atmosphere make the greater part of the coast salubrious. Palms flourish luxuriantly and produce their fruit at Gaza, Joppa, Haifa, and as far north as Sidon and Beyrut; they also bear fruit in favorable positions on the plain of Damascus. At Hebron, Jerusalem, along the summit of the central ridge, and on the eastern plateau, the heat is never intense, the thermometer rarely rising to 90° in the shade; though the bright, cloudless sun and white soil make open-air labor and travel exhausting and dangerous. The following results of Dr. Barclay's observations at Jerusalem, extending over five years (1851-1855), are important:

“The greatest range of the thermometer on any year was 52° Fahr. The highest elevation of the mercury was 92°. Under favorable exposure, immediately before sunrise, on one occasion, it fell to 28°. The mean annual average of temperature is 66.5°; July and August are the hottest months, January the coldest; The coldest time is about sunrise; the warmest noon: sunset is about the mean. The average temperature of January, the coldest month, during five years, was 49.4°; of August, the warmest month, 79.3°.”

The temperature of Damascus is lower than that of Jerusalem. The highest range of the thermometer noted was 88°, the lowest 29°. The mercury rarely rises above 84° during the heat of the day. At Shumlan, on Lebanon, the highest range of the thermometer was 82° (Aug. 22); and the average of that month was 76°. According to the estimates of Dr. Forbes (Edinburgh New Philos. Jour. April, 1862), the mean annual temperature of Beyrut is 69°, of Jerusalem 62.6°, and of Jericho 72°. That of Jerusalem differs widely from Dr. Barclay's average; and Jericho appears to be too low.

2. Rain. — In Palestine the autumnal rains commence about the end of October. In Lebanon they are a month earlier. They are usually accompanied by thunder and lightning (Jer 10:13). They continue during two or three days at a time, not constantly, but falling chiefly in the night; then there is an interval of sunny weather. The quantity of rain in October is small. The next four months may be called the rainy season, but even then the fall is not continuous for any lengthened period. The showers are often extremely heavy. In April rain falls at intervals; in May the showers are less frequent and lighter, and at the close of that month they cease altogether. No rain falls in Palestine in June, July, August, or  September, except on occasions so rare as to cause not merely surprise, but alarm; and not a cloud is seen in the heavens as large as a man's hand (1Sa 12:17 sq.; Son 2:11). In Lebanon the climate in this respect is somewhat different. In 1850 rain fell at Shumlan on June 27 and 28, and on Aug. 8, 9, and 12; and in Damascus, on rare occasions, rain is seen in the month of June. In Lebanon also clouds are occasionally, though not frequently, seen during the summer months. Dr. Barclay gives the following average of the rainfall at Jerusalem during seven seasons: 1846-47, 59 inches; 1847-48, 55 inches; 1848-49, 60.6 inches; 1850-51, 85 inches; 1851-52, 65 inches; 185253, 44 inches; 1853- 54, 26.9 inches. This gives a general yearly average of 56.5 inches. which is 25 inches above the mean annual rainfall in England, and within one inch of that in Keswick, Cumberland, the wettest part of England (City of the Great King, p. 417, 428; Whitty, Water Supply of Jerusalem, p. 194). SEE RAIN.

3. Seasons. — Only two seasons are expressly mentioned in the Bible; but the rabbins (Talmud) make six, apparently founding their division upon Gen 8:22. They are as follows:

(1.) Seed-time: October to December.

(2.) Winter: December to February.

(3.) Cold: February to April.

(4.) Harvest: April to June.

(5.) Heat: June to August.

(6.) Summer:

August to October. These divisions are arbitrary. Seed-time now commences in October after the first rains, and continues till January. Harvest in the lower valley of the Jordan sometimes begins at the close of March; in the hill country of Judaea it is nearly a month later, and in Lebanon it rarely begins before June; and is not completed in the higher regions till the end of July. After the heavy falls of rain in November the young grass shoots up, and the ground is covered with verdure in December. In January, oranges, lemons, and citrons are ripe; and at its close, in favorable seasons, the almond-tree puts out its blossoms. In February and March the apricot, pear, apple, and plum are in flower, in May, apricots are ripe; and during the same month melons are produced in the warm plains around the Sea of Galilee. In June, figs, cherries, and plums ripen; and the roses of the “Valley of Roses,” near Jerusalem, and of  the gardens of Damascus, are gathered for the manufacture of rose-water. August is the crowning month of the fruit season, during which the grape, fig, peach, and pomegranate are in perfection. The vintage extends on through September. In August vegetation languishes. The cloudless sky and burning sun dry up .all moisture. The grass withers, the flowers fade, the bushes and shrubs take a hard gray look, the soil becomes dust, and the country assumes the aspect of a parched, barren desert. The only exception to this general bareness are the orange-groves of Joppa and those few portions of the soil which are irrigated. SEE AGRICULTURE.

The following are the principal works from which information may be obtained regarding the climate of Palestine and Syria:

(1.) An Economical Calendar of Palestine, by Buhle, translated by Taylor, and inserted among the fragments appended to Calmet's Dict. of the Bible.

(2.) Walchii Calendarium Palcestince, ei. J. D. Michaelis, 1755.

(3.) Volney, Voyage en Syrie, etc., 1787.

(4.) Schubert, Reise nach dem Morgenlande, vol. 3, 1838.

(5.) Russegger, Reisen etc.

(6.) Robinson, Bib. Res. passim.

(7.) Kitto, Physical History of Palestine, ch. 7.

(8.) Barclay, City of the Great King, p. 49 sq., 414 sq.

(9.) Von Vildenbruch and Petermann, in Journal of R.G.S. vol. 20; and Poole, in vol. 26.

(10.) Forbes, in Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal, April, 1862.

(11.), Russell's Natural History of Aleppo gives full information regarding the climate and products of Northern Syria. SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH.

VII. Natural History. —

1. Plants. — The various plants mentioned in the Bible are fully treated of in this work under their proper names. It is not necessary here to repeat what is said elsewhere, nor is it intended to give anything like a resume of  the botany of Palestine. All that is aimed at is to give some of the leading features of the vegetation of the country — to mention some of the principal plants now existing, and the localities in which they abound. The diversity of climate in Palestine has already been noticed. There is a regular gradation from the cold of Northern Europe to the heat of the tropics. This produces a corresponding variety of vegetation. Many of the plants of Europe, Asia, and Africa are found in the respective departments. of Palestine. On the mountain-tops of Hermon, Bashan, and Galilee the products of the cold regions of the north grow luxuriantly; on the coast plain are some peculiar to Eastern Asia; and in the deep valley of the Jordan and African flora abounds.

(1.) On the northern mountain-ridges, and in Bashan, the oak and pine are the principal natural or forest trees; the former sometimes forming dense woods, and growing to a great size. The cedar is now, and was probably always, confined to the higher regions of Lebanon. Among smaller trees and bushes are the juniper, dwarf elder, sumac (Rhus), and hawthorn; the ivy, honeysuckle, and some species of rose are met with, but not in great abundance. The celebrated “oak of Basban” appears to be the Quercus AEgilops; it has a massive trunk, short gnarled arms, and a round, compact top. It also abounds in Gilead, all over Jebel el-Heish, and Galilee. An oak of another and smaller variety (Quercus Coccifera), growing in bushes, not unlike English hawthorn in form, and having a leaf resembling holly, but smaller, spreads over Carmel, the ridge of Samaria, and the western slopes of the mountains of Judsea, sometimes forming impenetrable jungles. .Intermixed with it in some places are found the arbutus, hawthorn, pistachio, and carob or locust-tree. Common brambles are abundant, as well as the styrax, the bay, the wild olive, and more rarely the thorny Paliurus Aculeatus, or “Christ's thorn.” In the lowlands are the plane-tree, sycamore, and palm; but none of them abundant. Along the sandy downs of Sharon and Philistia grows the maritime pine; and on the banks of streams are the willow, oleander, and gigantic reeds. In the Jordan valley and along the Dead Sea are found the nubk (Zizyphus Spina Christi), papyrus, tamarisk, acacia, retama (a kind of broom), sea-pink, Dead-Sea apple (Solanum Sodomneunmi), the Balanites .Egyptiaca, and on the banks of the river several species of willow and reed.

(2.) The hills and plains of Palestine abound in flowers. In early spring large sections of the country are covered with them, looking like a vast natural parterre. The most conspicuous among them are the lily, tulip, anemone,  poppy, hyacinth, cyclamen, star of Bethlehem, crocus, and mallow. Thistles are seen on plain and mountain in infinite number and great variety — some small and creeping, with bright blue spines, others large and formidable, with heads like the “flails” of the ancient Britons. On the hills are also found vast quantities of aromatic shrubs, which fill the air-with fragrance; among them are the sage, thyme, and sweet marjoram.

(3.) The cultivated trees and plants in Palestine. include most of those common in Europe, with many others peculiar to warmer climates. The vine may be regarded as the staple product of the hills and mountains. It is still extensively cultivated; and those terraces now seen on the sides of valley, hill, and mountain were doubtless clothed with vines in ancient times. The olive is scarcely less abundant. It is found at almost every village in Western Palestine. But its greatest groves are at Gaza, Nabulus, and on the western declivities of Galilee. It is not met with. in the Jordan valley, and it is extremely rare in Gilead and Bashan. Some of the trees grow to a great size, though the branches are low and sparse. An olive tree may be seen in the plain of Damascus — upwards of forty feet in girth. The fig is abundant, especially among the hills of Judah and Samaria. Other fruit trees less common are the pomegranate, apricot, walnut, almond, apple, quince, and mulberry. Date palms are found at various places along the maritime plain; there are very few in the mountains, and they have altogether disappeared from Jericho, the “city of palm-trees;” though dwarf palms grow at various places along the Jordan valley, as at Gennesaret. In the orchards of Joppa are the orange, lemon, citron, and banana; and the prickly pear in great abundance formed into hedges. The principal cereals are wheat, barley, rye, millet, Indian-corn, and rice in the marshy plain of the upper Jordan. Of pulse we find the pea of several varieties, the bean, large and small, and the lentil. Among esculent vegetables are the potato, recently introduced, carrots, lettuce, beets, turnips, and cabbages. In the sandy plains and in the Jordan valley cucumbers, melons, gourds, and pumpkins are grown in immense quantities. Hemp is common, flax less so, and cotton is produced in large quantities. Mr. Poole states that indigo and sesame are grown in the valley of Nabulus (Journal R. G. S. 26:57). The sugar-cane was formerly extensively cultivated in the Jordan valley, especially around Jericho. Indigo is still grown in the gardens of Jericho and in the plain of Gennesaret. The tobacco-plant is common in Lebanon, and among the villages of Western Palestine. Silk is extensively produced. . Mulberry groves are rapidly increasing along the seaboard, and everywhere  among the mountains of Western Palestine. At present silk is the most valuable of the exports. The growth of cotton is also increasing. But the heavy exactions of the government, and the insecurity of life and property, prevent capitalists from planting trees and cultivating the great plains. See each of these trees, fruits, and vegetables in its alphabetical place.

On the botany of Palestine the following works may be consulted: Shaw, Travels in Barbary and the Levant, 1808; Hasselquist; Voyages and Travels, in the Levant, 1766; Schubert, Reise, 1840; Kitto, Physical Hist. of Pal.; Russell, Natural. Hist. of Aleppo;, also papers in Transactions of Linn. Society, vol. 22; mid Natural Hist. Rev. No. 5. SEE BOTANY.

2. Animals. — The zoology of the Bible, like the botany, is fully treated in this work under the names of the several animals. All that is needed in this place therefore, is to group together the principal animals at present found in the different parts of Palestine, referring the reader for fuller particulars to the separate articles, and to the works mentioned at the close. It may be remarked that comparatively little is known as yet of the fauna of Palestine. The great majority of travellers who visit the country have not time, and even if they had they do not possess the scientific knowledge necessary to minute researches in natural history.

(1.) The domestic animals of Palestine are, with one or two exceptions, those common in this country. The horse is small, hardy, and sure-footed, but not famed either for speed or strength. The best kinds are bought from the Bedawin of the Arabian desert. Asses are numerous; some small and poor; others large and of great strength; and others, especially the white kinds, prized for their beauty and easy motion (comp. Jdg 5:10). Mules are chiefly used as beasts of burden. As. there are no roads and no wheel carriages, the mules are the carriers of the country, and are met on all the leading thoroughfares in immense files, garnished profusely with little bells and cowries. The camel is also employed for carrying heavier burdens, for performing more lengthened journeys, and for traversing the neighboring deserts. The best camels are bought from the wandering Arabs. The ox of Western Palestine is mostly small and poor, owing doubtless to hard work and insufficient food; but travellers have seen great droves of fine fat cattle upon the rich pastures of Jaulan. There is a very tall, lank species in the plain of Damascus and in parts of the Hauran. Oxen are now very rarely slaughtered for food in the interior. They are mainly kept for field-labor and for “treading out the corn.” The buffalo is found in  the valley of the upper Jordan; but few if any specimens are met with elsewhere in Palestine. Large-tailed sheep abound, and form the principal article of animal food. Flocks of the long-eared Syrian goat cover the mountains in all parts of the land. They are the chief producers of milk and butter. The common street dog infests the towns, villages, and encampments, belonging to no one, though tolerated by all as a public servant-the only sanitary officer existing in Palestine. There is another variety employed by shepherds. Cats, like dogs, are common property, and are rarely seen domesticated like our own.

(2.) The wild animals include the brown Syrian bear, found in the upper regions of Galilee and in Jabel el-Heish; the panther in the hills of Judaea and Samaria, .and in the thickets of the Jordan; jackals in immense numbers everywhere; wolves, hyenas, foxes; wild swine in the marshes of the Jordan, and in the thickets of Bashan and Gilead; gazelles and fallow deer on the plain; the ibex or wild goat in the wilderness of Judea the hare and the coney (called by natives weber); the squirrel, mole, rat, mouse; and bat. Porcupines and hedgehogs are rare; Mr. Poole says badgers abound at Hebron (Journal R. G. S. 26:58).

(3.) Reptiles exist in great variety. Some parts of the country swarm with them. The most common are lizards, which may be seen basking on every rock, and bobbing their hideous heads up and down on every ruin. Serpents of various kinds are numerous — the scorpion, tarantula, and chameleon are not so abundant. Frogs in vast numbers crowd the marshes and moist districts, and fill the air with their roar on the still summer evenings; the tree-frog and toad are also found; and little tortoises crawl over dry plains, and along the banks of pond and stream. The crocodile is said to exist in the Crocodile River, now called Nahr Zerka, in the plain of Sharon. Of this Dr. Thomson writes: “You will be surprised to hear that there are now living crocodiles in the marsh, but such is the fact. These millers say they have seen them often; and the government agent, a respectable Christian, assures me that they recently killed one eighteen spans long, and as thick as his body. I suspect that, long ages ago, some Egyptians accustomed to worship this ugly creature settled here, and brought their gods with them!” (Land and Book, 2, 244). The creature seen at this place (if indeed the whole story was not a pure fiction on the part of the Arabs) was doubtless the Monitor Niloticus.

(4.) Birds of prey are very numerous, including eagles and vultures — in the neighborhood of Lebanon; hawks in great variety, and ravens all over the land; and owls, which hoot and scream during the still night. Storks pay passing visits, and occasionally the white ibis is met with; the heron, gull, and lapwing are also found. The rocky hill-sides abound with partridges and quails; the cliffs in the glens with pigeons; the bushes with turtledoves and the lakes and marshes with ducks, teal, and other water-fowl. We also find the jay in some beautiful varieties; the kingfisher, the woodpecker, the sparrow, the swallow, the, the cuckoo, and many others. Domestic fowls are not numerous in Palestine. A few barn-door fowls may be seen in the villages, but ducks, geese, and turkeys are extremely rare.

(5.) Insects are so numerous in some parts of the land as:almost to be a plague. They include the common fly and mosquito; the bee, wasp, and hornet; great numbers of horse-flies; many species of butterflies; ants, spiders, grasshoppers, beetles, earwigs, and the beautiful glowworm and firefly. The most formidable of the insects which infest Palestine is the locust. Some few are seen every year, but great flights are fortunately rare. One such occurred in the summer of 1853 which nearly desolated Eastern Syria. In many places they completely covered the ground; and for several days the air was so filled with them that the light of then sun was obscured as if by a mist. See each of the above named animals in its alphabetical place.

Writers on the zoology of Palestine, or rather on Biblical zoology, are numerous. The following are the most important: Bochart, Hierozoicon, ed. Rosenmuller, 1793-1796; Hasselquist, Travels; Russell, Nat. Hist. of Aleppo; Description de l'Egypte, tom. 20-22; Schubert, Reise; Kitto, Physical Hist. of Palestine; Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible; Wood, Bible Animals. SEE ZOOLOGY.

VIII. Geology. — Although several eminent geologists have passed through Palestine, we have as yet no full scientific delineation — not even a satisfactory outline of its geology. (See the brief sketch in Tristram's Nat. Hist. of the Bible, ch. ii.) The country ought in many respects to be the most interesting in the world to the geologist. It possesses some unique features. It bears marks of tremendous volcanic convulsions, extending over a vast period. Its wonderful history has been considerably affected by these agencies.  The general geological formation of Palestine is simple. The basis of the country — the great body of its hills and plains — is Jura limestone, the same which extends over Lebanon, the desert of Arabia, and the plateau southward to the mountains of Sinai. Russegger says it may “be classed with the Upper Jura formation, the oolite, and the Jura dolomite.” The rock is not uniform in character, composition, or color. Most of it is compact, regularly stratified, of a dark cream or gray color, and abounding in fossils. As a general rule it becomes softer towards the south. At Bethel are “large masses of blue limestone with shells,” and on the sides of Gerizim “is nummulitic limestone; in some parts the rocks had been in a liquid state, for one kind had overflowed and encased the other” (Poole, in Journal of R. G. S. 26:56). Around Jerusalem dolomite prevails. The ancient buildings of the city appear to have been chiefly constructed of it. It is veine, with red and white like marble, compact, partially crystallized, and takes a high polish. Traces of an upper cretaceous formation of a more recent period are visible over the whole mountains. In many places the action of the atmosphere and the washing of winter rainishave stripped it from the firmer strata. It was filled with masses and nodules of flint; and these are now strewn over the surface where the soft chalk, in which they were originally embedded, has entirely disappeared.

Between Nabulus and Samaria the ground is covered with flints (Poole, p. 57); they abound in the wilderness of Judaea. On the road from Bethany to Jericho, Poole says white nodules with black flint in the centre were thickly strewed about (ibid.). In some places less exposed the upper crust remains; and thin layers of sandstone, soft and friable, alternate occasionally with the chalk (ibid.). Towards the borders of the Dead Sea some important changes are observed in the strata. Of the mountain of Neby Musa, Poole says, “The soil smelt very strong of sulphur, and I got specimens of limestone of an oolitic structure, also of a seam of bituminous and calcareous limestone, with pictens about six inches thick” (p. 58). On the northern shore of the Dead Sea he got a specimen of bituminous stone. In the mountain along the south-west coast, “the chalk showed in several places overlaid by limestone,” probably owing to the tilting of the strata, or some other volcanic agency. In Eastern Palestine the limestone is found in Hermon, and throughout Gilead and Moab; but at Kerak it gives place to the ruddy sandstone strata which constitute the mountains of Edom, and which also appear beneath the limestone along the eastern shore of the: Dead Sea. This eastern region has not been visited by any practical geologist, and the notices of it are brief and unsatisfactory.  This field of limestone, which thus extends over all Palestine, has been interrupted and broken in several places, and in a very remarkable manner, by volcanic agency — an agency, however, which operated at a very remote geological period. In Eastern Palestine lava ejected from the earth in a state of fusion has flowed over the limestone, covering the whole area of the kingdom of Bashan. The centre of eruption appears to have been in Jebel Hauran, at the now extinct craters Tell Abu Tumeis and Ktuleib. From these two craters lava streams flowed westward to the Lejah; and the Lejah itself is filled with smaller craters. The little conical and cup-shaped tells which stud the surface of Haurin were all at one time active volcanoes. The basalt thus emitted from numerous openings spread over the whole region, forming the lofty peaks of Jebel Hauran, and sweeping across the plain to the Jordan. Neither the breadth nor the exact limits of this lava- field are yet known. On the north-west it runs up the sides of Jebel el- Heish; on the north it is bounded by the river Awaj (Pharpar), which separates it from the limestone in the plain of Damascus. On the south it runs to the banks of the Yarmuk, and in places across the ravine to Northern Gilead. The Lejah is geologically the most remarkable province in Palestine. The hard black rock covers the entire surface to a depth of from thirty to one hundred feet — now stretching out in broad wavy reaches, divided by fissures of great depth, now thrown up in vast heaps of jagged fragments, now partially crystallized, and extending in long ridges like the Giant's Causeway. The rock is very hard, gives a metallic sound when struck, and is filled with air-bubbles. Spherical boulders of the same material are strewn over portions of the western declivity of the plain (Porter, Damascus, 2, 241 sq.; Wetzstein, Reisebenrict uber Hauran, p. 27 sq.; Wilson, Lands of the Bible, 2, 318 sq.; Burckhardt, Travels, p. 111 sq.).

On the west side of the Jordan, opposite Bashan, are two other lava-fields. The northern has its centre about three miles north-west of Safed, near the village of Jish. Dr. Robinson thus describes it: “We soon came out upon a high open plain; and the volcanic stones increased as we advanced, until they took the place of every other; and, besides covering the surface of the ground, seemed also to compose the solid formation of the tract. In the midst of this plain we came upon heaps of black stones and lava, surrounding what had evidently once been the crater of a volcano. It is an oval. basili, sunk in the plain . . . between three and four hundred feet in length, and about one hundred and twenty feet in breadth. The depth is  perhaps forty feet. The sides are shelving, but steep and ragged, obviously composed of lava; of which our friend Mr. Hebard had been able to distinguish three different kinds or ages. All around it are the traces of its former action, exhibited in the strata of lava and the vast masses of volcanic stones. It may not improbably have been the central point. or Ableiter, of the earthquake of 1837” (B. R. 2, 444). From this place the lava-streams and boulders radiate to a considerable distance. The high terrace which projects from the eastern side of this ridge to the Jordan below Merom is chiefly basalt; but it seems to be connected with the Hauran field, as it is of a hard, firm texture, while that of Jish is soft and porous.

Another centre of volcanic action in former ages is on the high plain south- west of Tiberias, called Ard el-Hamma. The whole plain is a lava-field; and the double peak of Kurinl Hattin, on its north side, is basalt. and so also is the ridge which bounds the Sea of Galilee on the south. The rock is similar to that of Bashan. The thickness of the bed may be seen in the cliffs on the mountain-side behind the warm baths of Tiberias. The base of these cliffs is limestone, while the whole superincumbent mass is black or dark-gray basalt. This field extends northward to the plain of Gennesaret, westward to Seffirieh, and southward to Esdraelon. The soil covering it is thick black mould like that of Bashan. It appears that the greater portion of the substratum of Esdraelon is basalt hidden beneath the soil (Wilson, 2, 304). But Jebel ed-Duhy (Little Hermon), and all the hills south of the plain, are limestone; and volcanic rock is not again seen in Western Palestine (Anderson, Geological Reconnaissance in Lynch's Official Report, p. 124 sq.). On the east of the: Dead Sea basalt appears in boulders dotting the plateau between the rivers Arnon and Kerak; and Burckhardt says it is more- porous than any specimens he had found farther northward (Travels, p. 375; Anderson, p. 191).

But the grand geological feature of Palestine is the central valley or chasm. Hugh Miller has said, “The natural boundaries of the geographer are rarely described by straight lines. Whenever these occur, the geologist may look for something remarkable” (Old Red Sandstone, p. 120). No better proof of this could be found than the Jordan valley. It runs in a straight line through the centre of Palestine. Its formation was probably simultaneous with those volcanic agencies that created the eastern and western lava- fields. It is a tremendous rent or fissure a hundred and fifty miles in length, rending asunder the whole limestone strata from top to bottom. Its extreme  depth from the lips of the fissure to the bed of the Dead Sea is above 4000 feet, no less than 2624 of which is beneath the level of the ocean. Such a cleft in the earth's crust is without a parallel. It is singular that, though the rent was doubtless effected by a volcanic convulsion, and though volcanic rock covers such a large area on both sides of the northern part of the valley, there are no traces of it in the southern and deepest part, except at one or two points to be afterwards noticed. The sides of the valley, and the rock in its bed, so far as visible, are limestone, ranged occasionally in horizontal strata, but usually upheaved and tossed into wild confusion. Along the eastern shore of the Dead Sea the limestone strata give place to sandstone. The sides of the valley, and the general conformation of the adjoining ridges, would seem to indicate that the limestone crust had been heaved up by some tremendous volcanic agency running from south due north, and causing that huge rent which forms the basin of the Dead Sea and the Jordan valley. The evidences and often fearful results of recent as well as remote volcanic agelicy are visible along the whole Jordan valley, and over a large section of the adjoining districts. Beginning at the north we have the crater of Jish, extinct indeed at the surface, but giving palpable proof in tremendous throes of earthquakes that internal fires are still raging. Next follow the copious saline springs of Tabighah, on the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee; then the sulfurous springs of Tiberias, where the water gushes from the rock at a temperature of 144° Fahr. On the eastern side of the Jordan, in the glen of the Yarmuk, are the still hotter and more copious springs of Amatha, issuing from beneath lofty cliffs of igneous rock (Burckhardt, p. 376; Porter, Handbook for S. and P. p. 320, 423). It is deserving of special note that at the time of the great earthquake of 1837, and on every recurrence of an earthquake in the region, these springs well out in much greater abundance, and their waters increase in warmth. There is thus evidently a subterranean connection between them.

The towns and villages which have been most severely shaken by earthquakes in this region are those situated on the trapfields; while villages between them built upon the limestone strata have in many cases escaped almost without injury. Proceeding still farther south, we find the “copious salt-springs” of Wady Malih, where the water is 980 Fahr., and emits “a fetid odor” (Robinson, 3, 308). Next come the springs of Callirrhoe, near the mouth of Wady Zurka ‘Main, which opens into the north-eastern part of the Dead Sea. They rise in the bottom of a sublime gorge. The base of the cliffs on each side is ruddy ferruginous sandstone, above and through which black and dark-gray trap appears, while the great body of the  mountain behind is limestone. “In one place a considerable stream of hot water is seen precipitating itself from a high and perpendicular shelf of rock, which is strongly tinted with the brilliant yellow of sulphur deposited upon it. On reaching the bottom we find ourselves at what may be termed a hot river, so copious and rapid is it, and its heat so little abated; this continues as it passes downwards, by its receiving constant supplies of water of the same temperature. We passed four abundant springs, all within the distance of half a mile, discharging themselves into the stream. We had no thermometer, but the degree of heat in the water seemed very great; near the source it scalds the hand, which cannot be kept in for the space of half a minute” (Irby and Mangles, p. 468). Lynch found the temperature of the stream to be 95° Fahr. The temperature must be much higher at the source. Along the shores of the Dead Sea are numerous saline springs and salt-marshes. At its southern end is the remarkable ridge of hills called Khashm Usduim, composed in a great measure of pure salt. Large quantities of bitumen are often found floating on the Dead Sea, especially, it is said, after earthquakes, as if thrown up by the action of subterranean fires. Away at the northern extremity of the valley, at the western base of Hermon, are pits of bitumen (Handbook. p.453).

All these things indicate volcanic agencies still in action beneath the surface, and tend to illustrate some of the most remarkable events in the long history of Palestine, from the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah down to the earthquake of 1837. Palestine has in all ages been a country of earthquakes. The sacred writers show that they were familiar with them. The Scriptures abound in allusions to them and figures drawn from them. From earthquakes the Psalmist borrows his figures, when he speaks of “mountains being carried into the midst of the sea” (Psa 46:2); of their “skipping like rams, and the little hills like lambs” (Psa 114:4-6). To earthquakes the prophet alludes in his striking. language — “The earth shall reel to and fro like a drunkard, and be removed like a cottage” (Isa 24:20; comp. Psa 104:32; 1Ch 16:30; Jer 10:10; Hab 3:6-8, etc.). There are, however, only two earthquakes expressly named in Scripture. The first was of such serious importance as to form a kind of epoch. Amos dates his vision “two years before the earthquake” (Amo 1:1). It took place “in the days of Uzziah” (Zec 14:5). The other instance of an earthquake mentioned in Scripture is that of the.quakilng of the earth and rending of the rocks at the crucifixion (Mat 27:51). In the seventh year of  Herod the Great Palestine was visited by a tremendous earthquake (Joseph. Ant. 15:5, 2). We read of numerous others since that period (see Kitto, Physical Hist. of Palestine, chap. 4). SEE EARTHQUAKE.

The present bed of the Jordan valley is of a much later formation than either the limestone of the adjoining mountains or the rock of the trap- fields. The crust varies from 100 to 200 feet in depth, and through this the river has hollowed out for itself a deep tortuous channel, showing along its banks vertical sections. The lower parts consist mainly of tertiary deposits of indurated marl and conglomerate; while the upper stratum, now composing the surface of the plain, appears to be made up to a large extent of the washings and detritus of the chalk crust which originally covered the neighboring highlands, enriched here and there with vegetable mould. The coast-plains, Sharon and Philistia, are coated with a light soil — in some places chalky, in others sandy — with a large admixture of red alluvial clay, and on the top rich vegetable mould. The plain of Esdraelon, Ard el- Hamma, Gennesaret, and Hauran are coated with deep black clay of extraordinary fertility. It is composed in a great degree of disintegrated lava, and perhaps, to some extent, volcanic ashes, together with a large quantity of decomposed vegetable matter — the residue of the forests that appear to have at one period extended overall Palestine.

Besides the incidental notices in the travels of Burckhardt, and Drs. Wilson, Robinson, Thomson, and Tristram, the following works contain the fullest information we possess on the geology of the different parts of Palestine:

(1.) Anderson's Geological Reconnaissance, in Lynch's Official Report (Baltimore, 1852, 4to, p. 75207). His researches were confined to the Jordan valley and the regions immediately adjoining.

(2.) Russegger, Reisen, vol. 3. This work embraces an account of the environs of Jerusalem, Hebron, and Joppa, and parts of Galilee around Nazareth and Tiberias (Stuttgard, 1841-1849, 4 vols. with Atlas).

(3.) Poole's short paper in the Journal of R. G. vol. 26, giving brief notes of his journey from Joppa to Jerusalem and the Dead Sea, and then along the western shore and around the southern end to the promontory of Lisal.

(4.) Wetzstein, Reisebericht iber Hauran- und die Trachonen, giving some account of the remarkable trap-fields of the Lejah, Jebel Hauran, the Safah, etc.

(5.) Porter, Five Years in Damascus, containing a full description of the physical geography of Bashan. SEE GEOLOGY.

IX. Political and Historical Geography. — It now only remains to give a brief sketch of the political divisions of Palestine under the rule of the tribes and nations which have in succession occupied it. These divisions are sometimes minutely described, frequently directly mentioned, and more frequently incidentally alluded to, by the sacred writers. It is mainly with the view of illustrating these Scripture references that the present sketch is given. All that is aimed at, however, is a brief general and connected view. Nothing more is needed in this place, for all the ancient tribes and more important provinces and districts are fully treated of in separate articles.

1. The Patriarchal Period. — This period extends from the earliest ages to the conquest of Palestine by the Israelites. The first notices we have of the land are contained in the 10th chapter of Genesis, where the sacred writer describes the country colonized by Canaan, the grandson of Noah. From this patriarch Palestine got its first name-a name which clings to it still. In that most remarkable chapter the borders of the Canaanitish territory are defined. They extended from Sidon on the north along the coast to Gaza on the south. Thence the border ran eastward, apparently in the line of Wady Gerar, to the plain of Sodom, now the. southern section of the Dead Sea. Thence it was drawn to Lasha (q.v.), .the site of which is not known, but it probably stood at the north-eastern end of the Dead Sea. It would seem that ancient Canaan corresponded almost exactly with Western Palestine.

The families and tribes which sprung from Canaan are mentioned; and it appears from their subsequent history, as given in the Pentateuch, that each of them settled down permanently in a territory of its own. SEE CANAANITE. The boundaries of these territories are not given, but the locality of each is indicated either by direct statement or indirect allusion. Sidon was the first-born of Canaan, and he colonized Phoenicia on thee  coast. His capital, to which he gave his name, was outside the boundary of Palestine, but a section of his territory, which extended as far south as Carmel, was included in the land. The Hittites were a powerful tribe, who settled among the mountains in the south, with Hebron apparently for their capital (Gen 15:20; Gen 23:16). The Jebusites had their stronghold on Zion; and they held it and the surrounding territory down to the time of David Jos 15:63; 2Sa 5:6). The Amotries, probably the most, powerful of all the Canaanitish tribes, were widely spread (Jos 24:18). They had settlements in the mountains of Judah (Gen 14:7; Gen 14:13; Num 13:29), but their main possessions were on the east of the Jordan, where they occupied the whole country from Arnon on the south to Hermon (Num 21:13; Num 21:26; Num 32:33; Deu 3:8). The Girgashites appear to have been located among the mountains of Central Palestine, but there is no description of their exact territory in the Bible, and the theories of geographers are not satisfactory. The Hivites founded Shechem in Central Palestine; Gibeon, Beeroth, Chephirah, and Kirjath- jearim, farther south; and a little principality under Hermon. on the northern border (Gen 34:2; Jos 9:3; Jos 9:7; Jos 11:3; Jos 11:19; 2Sa 24:7). Canaan's other sons settled beyond the bounds of Palestine; the Arkites and Sinites in Lebanon; the Arvadites in an island off the coast of Phoenicia; and the Hamathites in Hamath.

But besides the Canaanitish tribes there are traces of other races — or perhaps another race — of aborigines in Palestine. The Rephaimn are frequently mentioned. We find traces of them in widely different parts of the country. They gave their name to a little upland plain beside Jerusalem (Jos 15:8), and to a section of Mount Ephraim (Jos 17:15). Bashan seems to have been occupied by them long previous, to its conquest by the Amorites (Gen 14:5; Deu 3:11). At the same remote period the Zuzim dwelt in Gilead, and the Emim held the plateau of Moab. These are all spoken of as men of huge stature, and they appear to have been different sections of one great family. Of their history we know nothing except a few isolated facts; but it is remarkable that traditions of these giants cling to various localities in Palestine. Their marvellous exploits are recorded, their tombs of huge dimensions are pointed out, and the colossal houses they built and occupied are still shown in the ancient cities of Bashan. The race either died out or was extirpated in Bashani by  the warlike hordes of Amorites. The Moabites and Ammonites conquered the giant tribes south of Bashan, and long occupied their territory; and the ruins of Rabbath-Ammon and Rabbath-Moab still remain as memorials of their rule (Deu 2:20-21). On the south-west of Palestine, along the coast of the Mediterranean, the Avim, another primeval tribe of giants, had their abode; but they were conquered by the Caphtorim, or Philistines; and the giant warriors Goliath, Sippai, and Lahmi were probably among the last of the race (1Sa 17:4; 2Sa 21:16-20; 1Ch 20:4-8). The Amalekites were nomads, who roamed over the scanty pastures of the southern desert, scarcely crossing the border of Palestine.

At the time of the Exodus, all Western Palestine was held by these Canaanitish and Philistine tribes; and the country east of the Jordan was divided into three kingdoms. On the north lay the kingdom of the giant Og, the last of the Rephaim, which extended over Bashan and the section of Gilead north of the Jabbok. Between the Jabbok and the Arnon was the kingdom of Sihon; while the region south of the Arnon was possessed by the Moabites.

In addition to the tribes now enumerated, Moses mentions the Kenites, Kenizzites, and Kadmonites; but these, though included in the land promised to Abraham, had their territories in Arabia, beyond the boundaries of Palestine (Gen 15:18-21). The Perizzites are also mentioned as a tribe distinct from the Canaanites residing in some part of Western Palestine. Little is known either of their origin or their possessions. SEE CANAAN.

2. The Period from Joshua to Solomon. — At the commencement of this period an entire change was wrought in the political geography of Palestine. The country was divided among the twelve tribes of Israel. The eastern section was first apportioned. Moab's territory south of the Arnon was left untouched. A very clear and full account of the allotment of all the rest-is given in Numbers 32. The table-land (Mishor) extending from the Arnon to Heshbon was given to the tribe of Reuben (comp. Jos 13:15 sq.). Gad received the region between Heshbon and the river Jabbok, together with an additional strip along the east bank of the Jordan, extending up to the Sea of Chinnereth (Jos 13:24-28). The rest of Gilead and  all Bashan were allotted to Manasseh, and this was at once the largest, and the richest allotment made to any of the tribes (Jos 13:29-31).

Western Palestine was divided by Joshua among the remaining tribes. Judah received the country lying between the parallel of Jerusalem and the southern border; but subsequently a section on the south was given to Simeon; and another section was taken off its western side and allotted to Dan. These two tribes were thus, as regards their possessions, amalgamated with Judah (Joshua 15; Jos 19:1; Jos 19:40-47). North of Judah lay Benjamin, confined to a narrow strip stretching across the country from the Jordan to Beth-horon, between the parallels of Jerusalem and Bethel (18:11-25). Next to Benjamin came the children of Joseph, grouped close together — Ephraim on the south and Manasseh on the north. Their united portion reached from the Jordan to the sea, and from Bethel to the border of Esdraelon (ch. 16, 17). In addition to this large mountain territory, the cities of Beth-shean, Taanach, Megiddo, and a few others situated in Esdraelon, were allotted to them. To Issachar was given the noble plain of Esdraelon — a territory, however, whose fertility was more than overbalanced by its exposed situation (19:17-23). Zebulun received his lot amid the picturesque hills and plains of Lower Galilee, having Tabor on. the east, and the Great Sea, at the base of Carmel, on the west (Jos 19:10-16). Asher got the fertile plain of Acre and the coast of Phoenicia up to Sidon (Jos 19:24-31). In the mountains on the northern border Naphtali found a beautiful highland home (Jos 19:32-39). The lot of Dan was too small, and the Philistines hemmed the tribe in so that they were unable to cultivate the rich soil of the Shephelah. They consequently made an expedition to the far north, and established an important colony on the plain of the upper Jordan (Jos 19:47; comp. Judges 18). SEE TRIBE.

But though the whole land was thus allotted — it was not conquered. The Philistines still held their plain; and the mercantile Canaanites, whom the Greeks called Phoenicians, remained in their great seaports. Many cities, also, in different parts of the country, were retained by their Canaanitish founders (Jdg 1:21 sq.).

3. From the Death of Solomon to the Captivity. — On the death of Solomon, the tyranny and folly of his son rent the nation of Israel. Long before that time there had been rivalry between the powerful families of Judah and Ephraim; Rehoboam's folly was the occasion of its breaking out into open hostility. The boundaries of the tribes were not disturbed by the  rupture in the nation. Benjamin clung to Judah, and its northern border became the line of demarcation between the two kingdoms. Dan and Simeon occupied portions of the allotted territory of Judah, and were therefore reckoned parts of that tribe (1Ki 12:17); hence the southern kingdom is usually said to have consisted of only the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, while in reality it included four (1Ki 19:3; 2Ch 11:10; with Jos 19:41-42). The remaining tribes east and west of the Jordan chose Jeroboam as their king; but Bethel (2Ch 13:19) and some other cities farther north were afterwards added to Judah (2Ch 15:8). The next change in the political geography of the land was brought about by the conquests of Assyria. The northern kingdom was invaded, Samaria its capital taken, and the whole people of the land carried away captive. Foreign colonists were placed in their room; and these, adopting the Jewish law, and conforming to some extent to the Jewish ritual, were the founders of the nation and sect of the Samaritans (q.v.). A great part of Palestine — nearly the whole of the kingdom of Israel — now became a province of the Assyrian empire, and afterwards passed with it into the hands of the Babylonians. About a century and a half later Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, took Jerusalem, and led the other section of the Jewish nation captive. Thus all Palestine lost its nationality, and was ruled by a provincial satrap.

4. From the Captivity to the Destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. — This was the most eventful period of Jewish history, and the most remarkable for the changes which it brought about in the political geography of Palestine. The division of the land into tribes was now completely broken up, and was never again established. Many of the ancient nations which the Israelites had driven from their borders wholly or partially returned to their possessions. The Moabites reoccupied the Misior immediately after the first, captivity; and hence “the burden of Moab,” written by Isaiah (ch. 15, 16), and the terrible prophetic curse pronounced by Jeremiah (ch. 48), include that country which the Moabites originally possessed before the conquests of Sihon (Num 21:26-30), and which they reoccupied after the captivity of the tribes of Reuben and Gad, to whom Moses had allotted it. It appears also that the ancient tribes of Bashan regained their old territories, and re-established the old names — Bashan, Argob, Flauran, Golan — which were subsequently better known as the Greek provinces of Batuancea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and Gaulonitis (Porter, Damascus, vol. 2). The Idumaeans or Edomites, having been driven out of  their own mountain homes by the Nabathieans, established themselves along and within the borders of Southern Palestine, to which they gave the name Idumcea (q.v.). The neighboring nations and tribes also seem to have encroached upon the territories of the northern tribes of Israel; and a large Gentile element was then and afterwards introduced into Galilee, which produced important effects upon the subsequent history of the Jews in that province. SEE GALILEE:

Under the mild rule of Cyrus the captive Jews were permitted to return to their own land. Ezra and Nehemiah re-established the ancient worship and rebuilt the Temple; but, politically, the country remained a province of the Babylonian and Persian empires till the time of Alexander the Great, when it fell under Greek rule. On the death of Alexander the kingdom of the Seleucidae was established in Syria, an that of the Ptolemies in Egypt. Palestine became at first a part of the former; but the rival dynasty soon attacked and captured it, and it remained for more than half a century, nominally at least, under the rule of the Egyptian monarchs. Then war broke out between Syria and Egypt, and the maritime plain of Palestine became the battle-field. Aided by the Seleucidae, the Jews threw off the yoke of the Ptolemies (B.C. 198), and became subject to the former. During all these troubles the Jews had an ecclesiastical government of their own, the high-priest being chief. But when Antiochus Epiphanes ascended the throne of Syria, he captured Jerusalem, put thousands of the inhabitants to death, and attempted to abolish their worship. These acts of barbarity roused the spirit of the whole nation. The priestly family of the Maccabees (q.v.) headed a noble band of patriots, and after a long and heroic struggle succeeded in establishing the independence of their country. The Maccabees gradually extended their conquests over Samaria, Galilee, and a part of the country beyond Jordan. But internal dissensions and civil wars sprang up, and gave occasion for the interference of Rome; and Pompey invaded Palestine and captured Jerusalem in the year B.C. 63. A heavy tribute was levied, but the people were still permitted to retain their own rulers. In the year B.C. 39 Herod the Great received the title of “King of Judaea” from the Roman emperor) and two years afterwards he succeeded in establishing himself on the throne. SEE HERODIAN FAMILY.

At his death Herod bequeathed his kingdom to his three sons, Archelaus; Antipas, and Philip; but the supreme authority was in the hands of the Roman prefect and procurators. In the N. T, and in the writings of Greek and Roman geographers of that age, Palestine is usually spoken of as  divided into a number of provinces. Those on the west of the Jordan were Judaea on the south, Samaria in the centre, and Galilee on the north, and the latter was divided into Upper and Lower. The provinces east of the Jordan were Percea, embracing Gilead and the Mishor of Moab, and the four subdivisions of Bashan already mentioned — Gaulonitis, Auranitis, Batanoea, and Trachonitis.

5. From the Destruction of Jerusalem to the Present Time. — On the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire a new ecclesiastical division of Palestine appears to have been made, into Prima, Secunda, and Tertia; but the boundaries are not defined, the lists of their cities are confused, and the territory embraced extended far beyond Palestine proper (see Reland, p. 204-214).

After the Mohammedan conquest Palestine became a province of the empire of the Caliphs, and on the dismemberment of the empire this unhappy country was the theatre of fierce struggles between rival dynasties. About the middle of the 10th century the Fatimites seized it; and a century later it was overrun by the Seljukian Turks, whose cruelty to Christian pilgrims roused the nations of Western Europe to the first Crusad. — Jerusalem was taken by the Franks in the year 1099, and Palestine was made a Christian kingdom. But the rule of the Crusaders was brief. Defeated by Saladin, they took refuge in a few of their strongholds. At length, in the year 1291, Acre was stormed by the Mameluke sultan of Egypt, and thus terminated the dominion, of the Crusaders in Palestine.

For more than two centuries after this period Palestine was the theatre of fierce contests between the shepherd hordes of Tartary and the Mamelukes of Egypt. In 1517 it was conquered by sultan Selim, and from that time till the present it has formed part of the Ottoman empire. SEE SYRIA.

6. Present Status. — Palestine now forms part of two great pashalics: (1) Sidon, embracing the whole of Western Palestine; and (2) Damascus, embracing all east of the Jordan. That part of Palestine lying within the pashalic of Sidon is divided into the subpashalics of Jerusalem and Akka. The official residence of the pasha of Sidon is now in Beirut, and hence his province is sometimes called the Pashalic of Beirut. The pashas of Jerusalem and Akka are subject to the pasha of Sidon, whose province extends from Latikea on the north to Gaza on the south.  The modern inhabitants, of Palestine are a mixed race, made up of the descendants of the ancient Syrians, and of the Arabs who came in with the armies of the Caliphs. The number of the latter being small, the mixture of blood did not visibly change the type. This is seen by a comparison of the Christians with the Mohammedans — the former are of pure Syrian descent, while the latter are more or less mixed; yet there is no visible distinction, save that which dress makes. In addition to these there are a few Jews, Armenians, and Turks; all of whom are easily recognised as foreigners. The Druses who live in Hauran, and occupy a few villages in Galilee and on Carmel, are converts from Mohammedanism.

No census has been taken of the country, and the number of the inhabitants it is impossible to ascertain with any near approach to accuracy. One thing is manifest to every observer — the greater part of the country is desolate. Jerusalem, its capital city, has but 20,000 inhabitants; and the only other places of any note are Gaza, Hebron, Joppa, Acre, Nablis, Beirut, and Damascus. Even villages are few, and separated by long reaches of desolate country. The following is the nearest approach which can now be made to the population of the country:

Pashalic of Jerusalem (Ritter, Pal. und Syr. iii, 833)602,000Pashalic of Acre (Robinson, 3, 628)72,000Remaining part of the pashalic of Sidon, in Palestine (estimate)50,000Eastern Palestine (estimate)200,000Total924,000Of these about 80,000 are Christians, 12,000 Jews, and the rest Mohammedans. The following general observations are by Dr. Olin (Travels, 2, 438, 439): “The inhabitants of Palestine are Arabs; that is, they speak the Arabic, though, with slight exceptions, they are probably all descendants of the old inhabitants of Syria. They are a fine, spirited race of men, and have given Mohammed Ali much trouble in subduing them, and still more in retaining them in subjection. They are said to be industrious for Orientals, and to have the right elements for becoming, under better auspices, a civilized, intellectual nation. I believe, however, it will be found impracticable to raise any people to a respectable social and moral state under a Turkish or Egyptian, or any other Mohammedan government. The inherent vices of the religious system enter, and, from their unavoidable  connections, must enter so deeply into the political administration, that any reform in government or improvement in the people beyond temporary alleviations of evils too pressing to be endured, cannot reasonably be expected. The Turks and Syrians are about at the maximum of the civilization possible to Mohammedans of the present time. The mercantile class is said to be little respected and generally to lack integrity. Veracity is held very lightly by all classes. The people are commonly temperate and frugal, which may be denominated Oriental virtues. Their situation, with regard to the physical means of comfort and subsistence, is, in many respects, favorable, and under a tolerable government would be almost unequalled. As it is, the Syrian peasant and his family fare much better than the laboring classes of Europe. The mildness of the climate, the abundance of land and its fertility, with the free and luxuriant pasturage that covers the mountains and the plains, render it nearly impossible that the peasant should not be well supplied with bread, fruit, meat, and milk. The people almost always appear well clothed. Their houses, too, though often of a slight construction and mean appearance, must be pronounced commodious when compared with the dark, crowded apartments usually occupied by the corresponding classes in Europe. Agricultural wages vary a good deal in different parts of the country, but I had reason to conclude that the average was not less than three or four piastres per day. With all these advantages population is on the decline, arising from polygamy, military conscription, unequal and oppressive taxation, forced labor, general insecurity of property, the discouragement of industry, and the plague.”

IX. Authorities. — The list of works on the Holy Land is of prodigious extent. Of course every traveller sees some things which none of his predecessors saw, and therefore none should be neglected by the student anxious thoroughly to investigate the nature and customs of the Holy Land. A select list has already been presented in the article SEE GEOGRAPHY, to which the student is referred; and fuller catalogues may be seen in the works of Ritter, Robinson, Van de Velde, and Bonar, An almost exhaustive list, accompanied by critical notices, is given by Tobler (Bibliographia Geographica Palestine, in German, Leips. 1867), with a supplement on the earlier works — from A.D. 333 to 1000 (in Latin, Dresd. 1875). The most important of these and of later ones we note below.

(1.) Josephus is invaluable, both for its own sake and as an accompaniment and elucidation of the Bible narrative. Josephus had a very intimate knowledge of the country. He possessed both the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, and knew them well; and there are many places in his works which show that he knew how to compare the various books together, and combine their scattered notices into one narrative, in a manner more like the processes of modern criticism than of ancient record. He possessed also the works of several ancient historians. who survive only through the fragments he has preserved. It is evident that he had in addition other nameless sources of information now lost to us, which often supplement the Scripture history in a very important manner. These and other things in the writings of Josephus have yet to be investigated. Two tracts by Tuch (Qucestiones de F. Josephi libris, etc., Leips. 1859), of geographical points, are worth attention.

(2.) The Onomasticon (usually so called) of Eusebins and Jerome, a tract of Eusebius († 340), “concerning the names of places in the sacred Scriptures;” translated, freely and with many additions, by Jerome (t 420); and' included in his works as Liber de Situ et Nominibus Locorum Hebraicorum. The original arrangement is according to the books of Scripture, but it was thrown into one general alphabetical order by Bonfrere (1631, etc.), and finally edited by J. Clericus (Amst. 1707, etc.). This tract contains notices (often very valuable, often absolutely absurd) of the situation of many ancient places of Palestine, so far as they were known to the two men who in their day were probably best acquainted with the subject. In connection with it, see Jerome's Ep. ad' Eustochium de Virginitate — an itinerary through a large part of the Holy Land. Others of Jerome's Epistles, and his Commentaries, are full of information about the country.

(3.) The most important of the early travellers from Arculf (A.D. 700) to Maundrell (1697) — are contained in Early Travels in Palestine, a volume published by Bohn. The shape is convenient, but the translation is not always to be implicitly relied on.

(4.) Reland, Paloestina ex Monumentis Veteribus IIlustrata (1714). This is still the best work on the ancient geography of Palestine. It is in three books: I, the country; 2, the distances; 3, the places; with maps (excellent for their date), prints of coins, and inscriptions. Reland exhausts all the information obtainable on his subject down to his own date (he often  quotes Maundrell, published in 1703). His learning is immense; he is extremely accurate, always ingenious, and not wanting in humor. But honesty and strong sound sense are his characteristics. He has combined and classified his materials with great ability.

(5.) Benjamin of Tudela, Travels (in Europe, Asia, and Africa) from 1160- 73. The best edition is that of A. Asher (1840-1), 2 vols. The part relating to Palestine is contained in p. 61-87. The editor's notes contain some curious information; but their most valuable part (ii, 397-445) is a translation of extracts from the work of Esthori ben-Mosehap-Parchi on Palestine (A.D. 1314-22). The originalwork, Kaphtor va-Pherach, “knop and flower,” has been reprinted, in Hebrew, by Edelmann (Berlin, 1852). Other Itineraries of Jews have been translated and published by Carmoly (Brux. 1847), but they are of less value than the two already named.

(6.) Abulfeda. — The chief Moslem accounts of the Holy Land are those of Edrisi (cir. 1150) and Abulfeda (cir. 1300), and translated under the titles of Tabula Syrice and Descr. Arabice. Extracts from these and from the great work of Yakut are given by Schultens in an Index. Geographicus appended to his edition of Bohaeddin's Life of Saladin (1755, fol.). Yakut has yet to be explored, and no doubt he contains a mass of valuable information.

(7.) Quaresmius, Terree Sancte Elucidatio, etc. (Ant. 1639, 2 vols. fol.), the work of a Latin monk who lived in the Holy Land for more than twelve years, and rose to be principal and commissary apostolic of the country. It is divided into eight books: the first three, general dissertations; the remainder, “peregrinations” through the Holy Land, with historical accounts and identifications (often incorrect), and elaborate accounts of the Latin traditions attached to each spot, and of the ecclesiastical establishments, military orders, etc., of the time. It has a copious index. Similar information is given by the abbe Mislin (Les Saints Lieux. Paris, 1858, 3 vols. 8vo), but with less elaboration than Quaresmius, and in too hostile a vein towards Lamartine and other travellers.

(8.) The great burst of modern travel in the Holy Land began with Seetzen, who resided in Palestine from 1805 to 1807, during which time he travelled on both the east and the west of Jordan. He was the first to visit the Hauran, the Ghor, and the mountains of Ajlun: he travelled completely round the Dead Sea, besides exploring the east side a second time. As an  experienced man of science, Seetzen was commissioned to collect antiquities and natural objects for the Oriental Museum at Gotha; and his diaries contain inscriptions, notices of flora and fauna, etc. The' have been published in three volumes, with a fourth volume of notes (but without an index), by Kruse (Berlin, 1854-59). The Palestine journeys are contained in vols. 1 and 2. His letters, founded on these diaries, and giving their results, are in Zach's Monatl. Corresp. vols. 17, 18, 26, 27.

(9.) Burckhardt, Travels in Syria and the Holy Land (1822, 4to). With the exception of an excursion of twelve days to Safed and Nazareth, Burckhardt's journeys south of Damascus were confined to the east of the Jordan. These regions he explored and described more completely than Seetzen, or any traveller till Wetstein (1861), and even their researches do not extend over so wide an area. Burckhardt made two tours in the Hauran, in one of which he penetrated — first of Europeans — into the mysterious Lejah. The southern portions of the transjordanic, country he traversed in, his journey from Damascus to Petra and Sinai. The fulness of the notes which he contrived to keep under the very difficult circumstances in which he travelled is astonishing. They contain a multitude of inscriptions, long catalogues of names, plans of sites, etc. The strength of his memory is shown not only by these notes, but by his constant references to books, from which he was completely cut off. His diaries are interspersed with lengthened accounts of the various districts, and the manners and customs, commerce, etc., of their inhabitants. Burckhardt's accuracy is universally praised; no doubt justly. But it should be remembered that on the east of Jordan no means of testing him as yet exist; while in other places his descriptions have been found imperfect or at variance with facts. The volume contains an excellent preface by Col. Leake, but is very defective from the want of an index. This is partially supplied in the German translation (Weimar, 1823-4, 2 vols. 8vo), which has the advantage of having been edited and annotated by Gesenius.

(10.) Irby and Mangles, Travels in Egypt and Nubia, Syria and the Holy Land (in 1817-18). This is hardly worth special notice except for the portions which relate their route on the east of Jordan, especially about Kerak and the country of Moab and Ammon, which are very well told, and with an air of simple faithfulness. These portions are contained in. ch. 6 and 8. The work is published in the Home and Col. Library, 1847.

(11.) Robinson, (a) Biblical Researches in Palestine, etc., in 1838: 1st ed. 1841, 3 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1856, 2 vols. 8vo. (b) Later Bib. Res. i 1852,1856, 8vo. Dr. Robinson's is the most important work on the Holy Land since Reland's. His knowledge of the subject and its literature was very great, his common-sense excellent, his qualifications as an investigator and a describer remarkable. He had the rare advantage of being accompanied on both occasions by Dr. Eli Smith, long resident in Syria, and perfectly versed in both classical and vernacular Arabic. Thus he was enabled to identify a host of ancient sites, which are mostly discussed at great length, and with full references to the authorities. The drawbacks to his work are a want of knowledge of architectural art and a certain dogmatism, which occasionally passes into contempt for those who differ with him. He too uniformly disregards tradition, an extreme nearly as bad as its opposite in a country like the East. The first edition has a most valuable appendix, containing lists of the Arabic names of modern places in the country, which in the second edition are omitted.

Both series are furnished with indexes, but those of geography and antiquities might be extended with advantage. Dr. Robinson's latest contribution to Biblical geography appeared after his death, Phys. Geog. of the Holy Land (Bost. 1865).

(12.) Ritter, Palistina und Syrien, embracing part of his great Erdkunde. 1848-55. These six volumes relate to the peninsula of Sinai, the Holy Land, and Syria, and form together Band viii. They may be conveniently designated by the following names, which the writer has adopted in his other articles:

1, Sinai;

2, Jordan;

3, Syria (Index);

4, Palestine;

5, Lebanon;

6, Damascus (Index).

Ritter has to some extent followed the plan of Reland. He has collected with wonderful labor and patience nearly everything that has been written upon Palestine — in book, article, or missionary letter — down to his own time. The work is often confused, and the statements contradictory; and the learned writer, not having himself visited the country, cannot always  separate fact from fancy in those he quotes. This portion of Ritter's work has been translated, with some condensation and addition, by Wo L. Gage (N. Y. 1866, 4 vols. 8vo).

(13.) Wilson, The Lands of the Bible Visited, etc. (1847, 2 vols. 8vo). Dr. Wilson traversed the Holy Land twice, but without going out of the usual routes. He paid much attention to the topography, and keeps a constant eye on his predecessor, Dr. Robinson. His book cannot be neglected with safety by any student of the country; but it is ‘chiefly valuable for its careful and detailed accounts of the religious bodies of the East, especially the Jews and Samaritans. His Indian labors having accustomed him to Arabic, he was, able to converse freely with all the people he met, and his inquiries were generally made in the direction just named. His notice of the Samaritans is unusually full and accurate, and illustrated by copies and translations of documents, and information not elsewhere given.

(14.) Schwarz, A Descriptive Geography, etc., of Palestine (Philad. 1850, 8vo). — This is a translation of a work originally published in Hebrew (Sepher Tebuoth, Jerusalem, 5605, A.D. 1845) by rabbi Joseph Schwarz. Taking as his basis the catalogues of Joshua, Chronicles, etc., and the numerous topographical notices of the Rabbinical books, he proceeds systematically through the country, suggesting identifications, and often giving curious and valuable information. The American translation is almost useless for want of an index. This is in a measure supplied in the German version, Das heilige Land, etc. (Frankfurt A. M. 1852).

(15.) De Saulcy, Vogage antour de la Mer Morte, etc. (1853, 2 vols. 8vo, with Atlas of Maps and Plates, and Lists of Plants and Insects), interesting rather from the unusual route taken by the author, the boldness of his theories, and the atlas of admirably engraved maps and plates which accompanies the text, than for its own merits. Like many French works, it has no index translated:— Narrative of a Journey, etc. (1854, 2 vols. 8vo). See The Dead Sea, by the Rev. A. A. Isaacs (1857). Also a valuable letter by “A Pilgrim,” in the Athenaeum, Sept. 9, 1854. Of a more critical character are his Voyage en-Terre. Sainte (Paris, 1865), and Derniers Jours de Jerusalem (ibid. 1866).

(16.) Lynch, Official Report of the United States Expedition to Explore the Dead Sea and the Jordan. (Baltimore, 1852, 4to), contains the daily record of the expedition, and separate reports on the ornithology, botany,  and geology. An unofficial Narrative had been published at Philadelphia in 1844; 2d ed. 1853. This contains the fullest account yet published of the River Jordan and its valley, and of the Dead Sea.

(17.) Stanley, Sinai and Palestine in Connection with their History (Lond. 1853; reprinted N. Y.). This is deservedly one of the most popular works on Palestine. Its author is an accomplished scholar and a graceful writer. But his great object seems to have been not so much to make fresh discoveries, as to apply those already made, especially the surface of the country and the peculiarities of the scenery, to the elucidation of history. He has more imagination than Robinson, but his pictures, though clear and beautiful, are frequently overdrawn. He labors too much after minute details; and in his attempts to make each picture perfect he is sometimes obliged to peril, and even to sacrifice, strict truthfulness. His peculiar views on prophecy also occasionally manifest themselves, and do not accord well with his own observations. The chief value of the book consists in the skill and vividness with which many of the leading events of Bible history are grouped upon their old scenies. The work contains an appendix on the topographical terms of the Bible, of importance to students of. the English version of the Scriptures. See also a paper on “Sacred Geography” by Prof. Stanley in the Quarterly Review, No. 188.

(18.) Tobler, Bethlehem (1849), Topographie von Jerusalems u. seinen Umgebungen (1854). These works are models of patient industry and research. They contain everything that has been said by everybody on the subject, and are truly valuable storehouses for those who are unable to refer to the originals. His Dritte Wanderung (1859) describes a district but little known, viz. part of Philistia and the country between Hebron and Ramleh, and thus possesses, in addition to the merits above named, that of novelty. It contains a sketch map of the latter district, which corrects former maps in some important points. His fourth journey is described in his Nazareth u. Palestina (1860).

(19.) Van de Velde, Syria and Palestine (1854, 2 vols. 8vo), contains the narrative of the author's journeys while engaged in preparing his large Map of the Holy Land (1858). Van de Velde's Memoir (1858, 8vo) gives elevations, latitudes, longitudes, routes, and much very excellent information. His Pays d'Israel contains 100 colored lithographs from original sketches, accurately and admirably executed, and many of the views are unique.  Of more recent works the following may be noticed: Porter, Five Years in Damascus, the Hauran, etc. (Lond. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo); Handbook for Syria and Palestine (last ed. Lond. 1875); Bonar, The Land of Promise (Lond. 1858); Thomson, The Land and the Book (N.Y. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo), the fruit of twenty-five years' residence in the Holy Land, by a shrewd and intelligent observer; Wetstein, Reisebericht Uber Hauran und die beiden Trachonen (Berlin, 1860, with wood-cuts, a plate of inscriptions, and a map of the district by Kiepert), the first attempt at a real exploration of those extraordinary regions east of the Jordan, which were partially visited by Burckhardt, and recently by Cyril Graham (Cambridge Essays, 1858; Trans. R. S. Lit. 1860, etc.); Drew, Scripture Lands in Connection with their History (Lond. 1860); Tristram, Land of Israel (Lond. 1865); Manning, Those Holy Fields (Lond. 1874); Ridgaway, The Lord's Land (N.Y. 1876).

Two works by ladies claim especial notice.

[1.] Egyptian Sepulchres and Syrian Shrines, by Miss E. A. Beaufort (1861, 2 vols. 8vo). The second volume contains the record of six months' travel and residence in the Holy Land, and is full of keen and delicate observation caught with the eye of an artist, and characteristically recorded.

[2.] Domestic Life in Palestine, by Miss Rogers (Lond. 1862), is what its name purports, an account of a visit of several years to the Holy Land, during which, owing to her brothers position, the author had opportunities of seeing at leisure the interiors of many unsophisticated Arab and Jewish households, in places out of the ordinary track, such as few Englishwomen ever before enjoyed, and certainly none have recorded. These she has described with great skill and fidelity, and with an abstinence from descriptions of matters out of her proper path or at second-hand, which is truly admirable.

It still remains, however, for some one to do for Syria what Mr. Lane has so faithfully accomplished for Egypt, the. more to be desired because the time is fast passing and Syria is becoming every day more leavened by the West.

Views. — Two extensive collections of Views of the Holy Land exist — those of Bartlett and of Roberts. Pictorially beautiful as these plates are, they are not so useful to the student as the very accurate views of William  Tipping, Esq., published in Traill's Josephus. There are some instructive views taken from photographs in the last edition of Keith's Land of Israel. Photographs have been published by Frith (London), Robertson (Cairo), Bonfils, (Beirit), Bergheim (Jerusalem), Martin (Lond.), the English and American Exploration societies, the editor of this Cyclopcedia, and others.

Maps. — Mr. Van de Velde's map has superseded all its predecessors; but much still remains to be done in districts out of the track usually pursued by travellers. On the east of Jordan, Kiepert's map (in Wetstein's Hauran) is as yet the only trustworthy document, the substance of which is embraced in his new Wandkdarte (Berl. 1875). Osborn and Coleman's large wall-map of Palestine (last ed. Phila. 1876) is good for bold relief, but lacking in details. The surveys of the British and American engineers are yet incomplete, and the results will not be published, in all probability, for some time to come. Of Atlases, Menke's Bibel-Atlas (Gotha, 1868) is the best for ancient details; Clark's Bible Atlas (Lond. 1868) for popular use, and Smith and Grove's two sheets in Murray's Class. and Bibl. Atlas for modern particulars. A carefully drawn and distinctively colored series of maps, designed either for general or minute use, and embracing in great detail Lower Egypt, the Sinaitic Peninsula, and Palestine, with the latest and most authentic researches on both the ancient and the modern topography, by the editor of this Cyclopoedia and Mr. C, D. Ward, C. E., who accompanied him on his late tour, is embodied in this and the following volumes.

## Palestine, Colonists In[[@Headword:Palestine, Colonists In]]

             On this subject we present an extract from Lieut. Conder's-Tent Work in. Palestine, 2:305 sq.:

"The German colonists belong to a religious society known as the 'Temple,' which originated among the Pietists of Wiirtemburg, who, without leaving the Lutheran Church, separated themselves from the world, and engaged in Sunday meetings for prayer and  edification. The Pietists accept as their standard the explanation given by Dr. J.A. Beugel (in his Gnomon of the New Test.) of the prophecies in the Revelation. Among the friends and disciples of Bengel was a certain Dr. Hoffmarin, who obtained from Frederick, the eccentric king of Wurtemburg, a tract of barren land at Kornthal, where his disciples established a Pietist colony, which he intended to transplant later to Palestine. Hoffmannu, however, died, and his followers remained contentedly on their lands; but Hoffmann's soul was not forgetful of his father's designs, and instituted a new colony at Kirschenhardthof, with a special view to its final removal to the Holy Land. Among his earliest disciples was Herr G.D. Hardegg, who became in time a leader among the Temple Pietists.

"The younger Hoffmann (Christopher)'visited Palestine about 1858, and, in 1867, a small trial expedition of twelve men was sent. out. They settled in reed huts near Semfinieh, on the edge of the Plain of Esdraelon, west of Nazareth; and in spite of the warning, of friends who knew the unhealthy climate of that place, they remained in the malarious atmosphere of the low ground near the springs, until they all died of fever.

"On August 6, 1868, Christopher Hoffmann and G.D. Hardegg left Kirschenhardthof, and in October they reached Palestine; after visiting various places, they resolved on settling at Ihaifa and Jaffa, and bought land in both places. The Haifa colony was the first founded, that at Jaffa being some six months younger. Hardegg became president of the former, and Hoffmann of the latter.

I. The religious views of the colonists are not easily understood, and I believe that most of them have rather vague ideas of their own intentions. Their main motive for establishing colonies in Palestine is the promotion of conditions favorable to the fulfillment (which they expect to occur shortly) of the prophecies of the Revelation and of Zechariah. They suppose it to be a duty to separate themselves from the world, and to set an example of a communt living, as closely as possible, on the model of the apostolic age. The spread of infidelity in Germany appears to be the main cause of this separative tendency among the Pietists  "The tenets of the Temple Society are probably best summarized in the 'Profession of Faith of the Temple, published by Herr Hoffmann, and including five articles as below:

1 To prepare for the great and terrible day of the second Coming Of Jesus Christ, which, from the signs of the times, is near. This preparation is made by the building of a spiritual temple in all lands, specially in Jerusalem.

"2. This temple is composed of the gifts of the Spirit (1Co 12:4), which make the true Church, and every one should strive to possess them.

"3. The means to obtain these is to seek the kingdom of God, as described by the prophets (Isa 2:2; Isa 19:25; Eze 40:48).

"4. The temple of Jerusalem is not a building of dead, but of lively stones; of men of every nation (1Pe 2:4-10) united in the worship of God in spirit and truth.

"5. The Temple service consists of sacrifices such as are described in the New Test. (Rom 12:1; Heb 13:15-16; Jam 1:27).

"The writings of Hardegg are far more diffuse and mystic. The main peculiarity which I have been able to extract from them is the belief that it is not to the Jews, but to the true Israel (by which he apparently understands the Temple Society to be intended), that prophecies of a return to Palestine are to be supposed to refer.

"I have stated as far as possible the apparent religions beliefs of the community, but there seem to be many shades of doctrine among them; all, however, agree in an expectancy of some immediate change in the world's affairs, in the arrival of Armageddon and the Millennium, and in the fulfilment of all prophecy.

"In 1875 I had the opportunity of attending one of the Sunday services, in the colony at Haifai. The congregation was devout and earnest; the service was simple and free from extravagance of any kind. The president offered up a long prayer in German, a hymn was sung with the usual musical good taste of Germans, and a chapter of the prophecy of Zechariah read. The president then  delivered an exhortation, announcing the immediate advent of the Savior, who would 'suddenly come to his temple.' Other elders followed, speaking with much earnestness, and another hymn 'was sung, after which the congregation quietly dispersed from the bare schoolroom in which they had assembled. A discussion of the affairs of the colony often immediately succeeds the regions services.

"Of the history of the Jaffa colony we gathered comparatively little. They have two settlements — one called Sarona, about two and a half miles north of the town, consisting, in 1872 of ten houses; the second, nearer the walls of Jaffa, was bought from the surviving members of an American colony which came to grief, and this settlement included thirteen houses, with a school and a hotel, the latter kept by Hardegg's son, who also represents the German government in Jaffa.

"'In 1872 the Jaffa colony numbered one hundred men, seventy women, and thirty-five children: two of the colonists were doctors, and some twenty were mechanics, the rest being farmers. They employed a few natives, and cultivated four hundred acres of corn- land, paying the ordinary taxes to the Turks. The children are taught Arabic, and European languages, also Latin and Greek. The houses are clean, airy, and well built, and the colony wears an aspect of industry and enterprise, which contrasts with the squalor and decay of the native villages.

"With the Haifa colony we became more intimately acquainted, by living in one of the houses for three months, during the winter of 1872-73, and again in the hotel of the colony, for about two mouths, during 1875, when. we saw a good deal of the working of the community.

"In 1872 the colonists numbered two hundred and fifty-four-forty single and forty-seven married men, thirty-two single and fifty-one married women (four widows), and eighty-four children. There were about fifty mechanics, and the settlement consisted of thirty- one dwelling-houses. The land was four hundred and fifty acres of arable ground, with one hundred and forty olive-trees, and seventeen acres of vineyard.  "In the first three years of its existence only seven deaths occurred in the colony, but the mortality increased later; in 1872 there were eighteen deaths among the two hundred and five colonists at Jaffa, which were due principally to fever, but such a death-rate has never yet occurred at Haifa.

“The little village of well-built stone houses is situated west of the walled town of Haifa, under the shadow of the Carmel range. A broad street runs up from the shore towards the mountain, and the greater number of the buildings stand, in their gardens, on either side. Close to the beach is the Carmel Hotel, kept by a most obliging and moderate landlord, and a little farther up are the school and meeting-house, in one building. Mr. Hardegg's dwelling, farther east, is the largest house in the colony. The total number is stated at eighty-five, including buildings for agricultural purposes.

"In 1875 the colonists numbered three hundred and eleven, having been reinforced principally by new arrivals from Germany; the increase of accommodation since 1872 was thus fair greater than that of settlers. The land had also increased, in the same period, to six hundred acres, with one hundred acres of vineyards and gardens but the soil of the newly-acquired property near Tireh, in the plain west of Carmel, is of very poor quality, and the Germans have not yet succeeded in their favorite scheme of obtaining grounds on the top of the mountain, where the climate and soil are both good.

"The live-stock consisted of seventy-five head of cattle, two hundred and fifty sheep, goats, and pigs and eight teams of horses. A superior American threshing machine had been imported. The trades followed are stone-cutting and masons' work, carpentry and wagon-making. Blacksmiths, coppersmiths, tinsmiths, joiners' shoemakers, tailors, butchers, harness-makers, trainers, soap- makers, vintners, and quarrymen are also found. among the colonists. There has been an attempt to trade in soap, olive-oil, and olive-wood articles, but, for these undertakings, more capital is required than Germans at present possess. A good windmill and an olive-press have been brought from England. A tannery was also being put up in 1875, and a general shop exists, which the natives, as well the Germans, frequent.  "The colonists were many of them employed on the English orphanage at Nazareth, which Mr. Shumacher designed and built; and all the masons' and carpenters' work was executed by the Germans. The colonists also. have done much to clear the road from Haifa to Nazareth, though they have not made it, considering that, from a professional point of view, it is not yet a made road at all. Their wagons are now driven between the two. places, and the natives employ them for moving grain.

"The schools in the colony, for the children and younger men, are two in number. In the upper school, Arabic, English, French, and German, arithmetic, drawing, geography, history, mathematics, and music are taught; in the lower, Arabic and German, writing, arithmetic, and singing; in both religious instruction is given; and the girls are taught knitting, sewing, and embroidery,

"The colony has thus been sketched in its religious and practical aspects. Though much talk has been expended on the question of colonizing the Holy Land, there is no other practical attempt which can compare in importance with that of the Temple Society. It remains to be seen what the success of the undertaking will be.

"The colonists belong entirely to the peasant and mechanical classes, and even their leaders are men comparatively uneducated. As a rule they are hard-working, sober, honest, and sturdy; and, however mystic their religious notions may be, they are essentially shrewd and practical in their dealings with the world. They are a pious and God-fearing people, and their natural domesticity renders it highly improbable that they will ever split on the rock which wrecked the former American colony, whose president, it appears, endeavored to follow the example of Brigham Young by introducing polygamy. The German colonists have also a fine field for enterprise, in the introduction into Palestine of European, improvements, which are more or less appreciated by the natives: and, as they have no other community to compete with, they might be able to make capital of their civilized education. The wine which they sell is comparatively excellent, and finds a ready market, as do also many of their manufactured articles.  "Such is one side of the picture, but when we turn to the other we find elements of weakness, which seem to threaten the existence of the colony.

"In the first place, there is apparently no man in the community of sufficiently superior talent or education, or with the energy and force of character, which would be required to control and develop the enterprise. Thegenius of Brigham Young triumphed over the almost insuperable difficulties of his audacious undertaking, despite even the prejudice which the establishment of polygamy naturally raised against his disciples. However superior in piety and purity of motive the leader of the Haifa colony may be, they cannot compare with the Mormon chief in the qualities to which his success was due.

"In the second place, the colonists are divided among themselves. In 1875 we found that Herr Hardegg had been deposed (temporarily, I understood, till he changed his views) from the leadership of the colony, and he had been succeeded by Herr Shumacher, a master-stonemason and architect, who is, moreover, the representative of the American government at Haifa. This deposition of the original leader had caused dissensions among the Germans, and several of the influential members did not attend the Sunday meetings.

"To internal troubles external ones were added. The colonists are not favorites either with natives or with Europeans, with Moslems or with Christians. The Turkish government is quite incapable of appreciating their real motives in colonization, and cannot see any reason, beyond a political one, for the settlement of Europeans in the country. The colonists, therefore, have never obtained title- deeds to the lands they have bought, and there can be little doubt that should the Turks deem it expedient, they would entirely deny the right of the Germans to hold their property. Not only do they extend no favor to the colony, though its presence has been most beneficial to the neighborhood, but the inferior officials, indignant. at the attempts of the Germans: to obtain justice in the courts, without any regard to the 'custom of the country' (that is, to bribery), have thrown every obstacle they can devise in the way of the community, both individually and collectively.  "The difficulties of the colonists are also increased by the jealousy of the Carmelite monks. The fathers possess good lands, gradually extending along Carmel round their fortress monastery; they look with disfavor on the encroachments of the Germans, and all the subtlety of Italians is directed against the German interests.

"The peculiar views of the colonists, moreover, cause them to be regarded with disfavor by influential Europeans in the country, who might do much to help them. They are avoided as religious visionaries, whose want of worldly wisdom might, at any time, embroil their protectors in difficulties not easily smoothed over.

"The community has thus to struggle with a positively hostile government, while it receives no very vigorous support from any one. The difficulties are perfectly well known to the native peasantry, who, with the characteristic meanness of the Syrians, take the opportunity to treat with insolence people whom they believe they can insult with impunity. The property of the colonists is disregarded, the native goatherds drive their beasts into the corn, and several riots have occurred, which resulted in trials from which the colonists got no satisfaction.

"The indiscretion of the younger men has brought greater difficulties on the community; they have repaid insolence with summary punishment, and finding no help from the government, have in many instances taken the law into their own hands. Thus the colony finds itself at feud with the surrounding villages, and the hostile feeling is not unlikely to lead to very serious difficulties on some occasion of popular excitement.

"There are other reasons which militate against the idea of the final success of the colony. The Syrian climate is not adapted to Europeans, and year by year it must infallibly tell on the Germans, exposed as they are to sun and miasma. It is true that Haifa is, perhaps, the healthiest place in Palestine, yet even here they suffer from fever and dysentery, and if they should attempt to spread inland they will find their difficulties from climate increase tenfold.

"The children of the present generation will, probably, like those of the Crusading settlers in Palestine, be inferior in physique and power of endurance to their fathers. Cases of intermarriage with marriages are not unlikely to combine the bad qualities of both nations, and may be compared to the Pullani of Crusading times. It seems to me that it is only by constant reinforcements from Germany that the original character of the colony can be maintained; and the whole community, in Palestine and in Germany, is said not to number more than five thousand persons.

"The expectation of the immediate fulfilment of prophecy has also resulted in the ruin of many of the poorer members of the community, who, living on their capital, have exhausted it before that fulfilment has occurred. The. colony is thus in danger of dissolution, by the gradnial absorption of the property into the hands of those who originally possessed the most capital; and in any case it is very likely to lose its original character of apostolic simplicity, some of the members becoming the servants and hired laborers of others.

"The natural desire of those members who find themselves without money is to make a livelihood by any means in their power. Where every man is thus working separately for himself, the progress of the colony, as a whole, is not unlikely to be forgotten, and the members may very probably be dispersed over Palestine, following their various trades where best they can make money."

## Palestine, Mission In[[@Headword:Palestine, Mission In]]

             The honor of having sent the first missionaries to Palestine belongs to America. On Oct. 31, 1819, the “Instructions from the Prudential Committee of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions” were delivered in the Old South Church, Boston, to the Rev. Levi Parsons and the Rev. Pliny Fisk (q.v.), missionaries designated for Palestine. On Feb. 17.1821, Mr. Parsons arrived at Jerusalem, while Mr. Fisk stayed at Smyrna. In the following year Mr. Fisk lost his companion, who on Feb. 10, 1822, left his earthly abode for the heavenly Jerusalem. The vacancy was soon filled in the person of the Rev. Jonas King, who, in company with Mr. Fisk and the famous missionary Joseph Wolff (q.v.), entered Jerusalem in the year 1823. Meanwhile another undertaking was started. The encouraging news sent to England by the Rev. Joseph Wolff induced the noble man Lewis Waye to undertake a journey to the East with  the view of forming a mission there. In this undertaking he was accompanied by the Rev. W. B. Lewis. Mr. Waye rented a convent at Antunra, intending to make it a place where missionaries might prepare themselves, but ill-health forced him. to return home. In 1824 Dr. Dalton, a medical man, was sent out to aid Mr. Lewis in forming a settlement in Jerusalem, but the latter returned home that same autumn. Upon this Dr. Dalton made an arrangement with the two American missionaries, King and Pliny Fisk, to rent one of the small convents-for their establishment. Pliny Fisk, however, died in November, 1825, before the arrangement was completed, and Dr. Dalton was again left alone. It was to aid him that the Rev. Mr. Nicolayson († 1856) was sent to Palestine in December, 1825. But very soon after his arrival Dr. Dalton died, in January, 1826, of an illness caught on a tour to Bethlehem. Mr. Nicolayson returned to Beiruit, and studied the language more thoroughly during that winter. In the summer of the same year (1826) a rebellion broke out. and Mr. Nicolayson retired to Safed, and lived there till June, 1827, having much intercourse with the Jews.

The troubles that ensued in the following years made it necessary for Mr. Nicolayson to leave the country until the year 1832, when he returned and went to Beirut with his family, at the time when the pasha had nearly taken Acre. The country was now quite open. In company, with Mr. Calman, a converted Jew, Mr. Nicolayson undertook some journeys through the country, and on returning to Beirut they found that two American missionaries, Dr. Dodge and the Rev. W. M. Thomson, had arrived on their way to Jerusalem to labor among the native Christians. They also resolved to attempt the renting of a house in the Holy City. Accordingly, in the autumn of 1833, Mr. Nicolayson and family removed to Jerusalem, to a house on Mount Zion. In the spring of 1834 Mr. Thomson arrived, and about the same time the rebellion broke out. Mrs. Thomson died of brain fever, July 22, 1834, produced by the alarm and other circumstances. Mrs. Nicolason was ill for some weeks, and soon after Mr. Nicolayson fell ill, so that they had to leave for Beirut. In the spring of 1835 Dr. Dodge and Mr. Whiting, from the American Mission, arrived, but Dr. Dodge died in the same year he went out, June 28,1835. Other missionaries were sent by the American Board, but that particular field was soon abandoned by them. For an account of the American mission schools at Beirut and its vicinity, the Presbyterian missions at Damascus, the German colony at Jaffa, the Edinburgh dispensary at Nazareth, etc., SEE SYRIA, MISSIONS IN.

In 1835 the subject of a Hebrew church on Mount Zion was agitated in England, and in 1836 Mr. Nicolayson was called to England to consult regarding it. He returned in July, 1837. and labored alone in Jerusalem for a year. In the following year the purchase of mission premises was effected, and, to aid Mr. Nicolayson, Dr. Gerstmann, a medical missionary, was sent out. In the same year the plague visited Jerusalem, and this circumstance was the first germ of that most useful institution, the hospital at Jerusalem. The missionary work was meanwhile carried on with good results. In December, 1839, the digging of the foundations for the: church was commenced, and on Feb. 10, 1840, the foundation of the new buildings was laid. In the same year the famous, or infamous, Damascus persecution was inaugurated, and Mr. Pieritz, a converted Jew, went to Damascus, sent by Mr. Nicolayson to intercede in behalf of the persecuted Israelites (see his Statement respecting the Persecution of the Jews at Damascus, Lond. 1840). Passing over the troublesome political incidents of the year 1840, we come to the year 1841, which was signalized by an event in many respects the most remarkable in the annals of Jewish Missions. We allude to the establishment of the Jerusalem bishopric, an account of which is given in this Cyclopoedia, s.v. JERUSALEM, THE NEW SEE OF ST. JAMES IN. On Jan. 21, 1841, the newly elected bishop arrived at Jerusalem, accompanied by the Rev. G. Williams, his chaplain, the Rev. F. C. Ewald, a convert from Judaism († 1874), and Dr. Macgowan, a medical missionary. In the following year a college, or house for the reception of converts, was opened in the month of May (which, however, was closed in 1844), and on Dec. 12, 1844, a hospital was opened. In November, 1845, the mission was severely tried by the sudden removal from the scene of his earthly career of bishop Alexander. The sad event occurred in the wilderness between Canaan and Egypt, on the morning of Sunday, Nov. 23. Bishop Alexander was succeeded by the present bishop Gobat, formerly vice-president of the Malta Protestant College, who still occupies the see of St. James, and who arrived at Jerusalem Dec. 23, 1846. In 1847 the Palestine mission was enabled to record a public act of considerable consequence to the Church and mission at Jerusalem. The British ambassador at Constantinople, lord Cowley, had succeeded in obtaining a firman recognising the Protestant subjects of the Porte as a separate Church and community.

In the year 1848, Dec. 21, the House of Industry was opened, which, up to the present day, is found an excellent adjunct to the mission. The seventh anniversary of the entry. of the first Protestant bishop into the Holy City was selected for the consecration of the first  Protestant church ever built there the first church, after many centuries, dedicated to the pure and scriptural service of almighty God. The sermon preached on this occasion by the bishop was on the text, “Mine house shall be called a house of prayer for all people.” This took place Jan. 21,1849. In the year 1851 it ‘was thought necessary to examine afresh into the wants and condition of the mission. It was resolved to invite Mr. Nicolayson to visit England for personal conference, the Rev. J. C. Reichardt having kindly undertaken temporarily to supply his place. The latter accordingly left England in the month of October, intrusted with a special mission, partly, as has been said, to act for Mr. Nicolayson, and partly to co-operate with the local committee on the spot, which it had been deemed expedient to form in the year 1849, “in order to place the mission on a more effective and satisfactory footing, with such assistance as might be found available.” Such plans were greatly facilitated when the committee was afterwards providentially enabled to accomplish what it had often desired, viz. to associate with the work on Mount Zion an English clergyman of some experience and standing at home. This was brought about when the Rev. H. C. Crawford offered his services to the society for missionary labor in Syria. He arrived in the Holy City on Feb. 21, 1852. The cause of Christ's Gospel in Palestine was not only strengthened from this, but from other sources also. The Church Missionary Society deemed it expedient to send a laborer to Palestine, and the late king of Prussia also appointed a minister whose cure was to comprise the German members of the Protestant community. For this latter office the Rev. F. P. Valentiner was selected, who at once expressed his earnest desire to co-operate with those who had preceded him in the work for the salvation of souls, and who has since proved of the utmost value to the cause. Another valuable addition was in the same year made to the medical department by the establishment of the Deaconesses' Institution. During a period of sickness the want of proper nurses had been severely felt. In order to remedy this evil, bishop Gobat wrote to the Rev. Theodor Fliedner, asking him to send two of the pious deaconesses of Kaiserswerth. In April, 1851, Mr. Fliedner himself brought four deaconesses. In the year 1854 a movement of a general character was set on foot in order to counteract the growing influence of the mission. Mr. Cohen was deputed by baron Rothschild and other Jews of influence to visit the Israelites in the East, especially in Jerusalem, with a view to the improvement of their circumstances. But what was intended to be a blow to the mission only proved a means of making it better known. In the year 1856 it pleased God to call to his rest the Rev. Mr. Nicolayson, and the  Rev. H. C. Crawford was placed at the head of the mission. On Feb. 5, 1860, Dr. Macgowan was called to his rest, and a few months previously, Nov. 22, 1859. Miss Cooper, who at her own cost had established the Institution for Jewesses, was also called away. Ill health soon after compelled Mr. Crawford to leave Jerusalem permanently, and his place was occupied by the Rev. J. Barclay.

Looking at the present status of the mission at Jerusalem, we may record the following from the latest report. Besides the bishop, there are employed twenty-one persons: viz. three ordained missionaries, two unordained missionaries and superior lay agents, eight colporteurs, Scripture readers, depositaries, and assistants, and eight school masters and mistresses, all employed by the London Jews' Society, partly engaged in direct missionary work, the Hospital, House of Industry, Jewess's Institution, and Boys' School. It is also a fact worthy to be noticed that until the arrival of bishop Gobat there was not one school. Now there are more than thirteen schools, with more than 500 children, under his care. All denominations are represented there — Mohammedans, Greeks, Latins, Armenians, Druses, Abyssinians, etc. We may also notice the Orphan Asylum of the bishop before the Jaffa gate, under the care of two Germans, Palmer and Baldensperger. At Nablus, the ancient Sichem, the missionary Fallscheer works in the service of the bishop; Gruhler at Jaffa, and others in other places. To defray the expenses of all these institutions, the Bishop Gobat's Fund for Missions in Abyssinia, Egypt, Syria, and Chaldcea, has' been formted. The Common Church Missionary Society has also a station in Jerusalem, Nazareth, etc. In the latter place there exists a small Arabic congregation, where Dr. Zeller, son-in-law of the bishop, is building an evangelical church, which promises to be one of the handsomest evangelical churches in the country. The centre of all missionary operation is and will be Jerusalem, and from this centre, under the indefatigable bishop, a net of stations, schools, and institutions is laid out throughout Palestine, which promises great things for the future. Comp. the Annual Reports and Monthly Proceedings of the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews; Narrative of a Mission of Inquiry to the Jews from the Church of Scotland (Edinb. 1859); Anderson, Oriental Churches (Boston, 1873), vol. 1; Dalton, Reisebilder aus dem Orient (St. Petersburg, 1871); Kalkar, Israel und die Kirche (Hamburg, 1869), p. 164 sq.; Steger, Die evangelische M.ission unter Heiden und Juden (Halle, 1857). (B. P.)

## Palestrina, Giovanni Perluigi Da[[@Headword:Palestrina, Giovanni Perluigi Da]]

             one of the most distinguished musical composers of the world, flourished in Italy in the 16th century. He derived his surname from the town of Palestrina, in the Roman states, where he was born in 1524 of very humble parentage. At the age of sixteen he went to Rome, and studied music under Claude Goudimel, afterwards one of the victims of the St. Bartholomew massacre. In 1551 Palestrina was made maestro di capella of the Julian Chapel, and in 1554 he published a collection of masses, so highly approved by pope Julius III, to whom they were dedicated, that he appointed their author one of the singers of the pontifical chapel. On the accession to the pontificate of Paul IV, in whose eyes celibacy was a necessary qualification for the duties of the higher appointments in the pontifical chapel, Palestrina was dismissed. For some time he felt severely his straitened circumstances, and not even the appointment as choir-master of St. Maria Maggiore brought much relief .to him. In 1571, however, his services to musical art were rewarded by his restoration to the office at St. Peter's. Up to the year 1560 Palestrina composed many works for the Church, among which Baini especially mentions those improvised, “so remarkable for depth of science and perfect adaptation of music to the sense of the word.” In 1563, the Council of Trent having undertaken to reform the music of the Church, and condemned the profane words and music introduced into masses, some compositions by Palestrina were pointed to as models, and their author was intrusted with the task of remodeling this part of religious worship. He composed three masses on the reformed plan; one of them, known as the Mass of Pope Marcellus (to whose memory it is dedicated), may be considered to have saved, music to the Church by establishing a type infinitely beyond anything that had preceded it, and, amid all the improvements which music has since undergone, continues to be prized and admired. The number and quality of his productions during the remaining years of his life, are equally remarkable. His published works consist of thirteen books of Masses, six books of Motets, one book of Lamentations, one book of Hymns, one book of Offertories, one book of Magnificats, one book of Litanies, one book of Spiritual Madrigals, and three books of Madrigals. Equally estimable in private life, and talented as a musician, Palestrina struggled through a life of poverty during eight pontificates; his appointments for the most of his days of activity were meagre, and his publications unremunerative. He died in 1594. Palestrina's music is learned and grave;  and that written for the Church, when heard in the kind of place for which it is adapted, and attended by pomp and pageantry, is very impressive, and acts with irresistible force on sensitive minds. But in the concertroom or chamber his compositions, whether sacred or secular, have, with few exceptions, no charms for hearers who have not cultivated a taste for simple, solid, airless harmony, or for the intricacies of fugal points well woven with a skill that owes more to study than genius. Though Palestrina's compositions are not above criticism, it must be conceded that he ranks head and shoulders above all his predecessors and contemporaries, and must be considered the first musician who reconciled musical science with musical art; in short his works form a most important epoch in the history of music. His memoir has been written by the abbe Baini (1828) and by Winterfeld (1832).

## Palet[[@Headword:Palet]]

             SEE BETH-PALET.

## Paletz, Stephen[[@Headword:Paletz, Stephen]]

             a noted Bohemian divine, flourished during the ante-Reformation movement of the 15th century. He was at first a friend of Huss, but finally turned, and became his most violent accuser and persecutor. Of the early personal history of Paletz we have nothing at command. We first encounter him as the friend and bosom companion of the great Bohemian Reformer. We are told that they shared bed and table together. Paletz sided not only with Huss, but most enthusiastically he commended, too, the writings and opinions of Wickliffe, and frequently spoke in their defence. Thus on a public debate before the university at Prague, when he had finished one of his speeches for the good cause by exhibiting and explaining the views of Wickliffe, he threw the book from which he had quoted into the midst of his audience, exclaiming, “Let who will impugn a single word, I will defend it.” About 1409 several of Huss's most faithful adherents, then called “Wickliffites.” were imprisoned by king Wenzel. Among these persecuted ones was Paletz; and when at last released after an eighteen months' incarceration, he came out much quieted and greatly in fear of the papists. Huss had remained all this time unmoved, and proved his fitness for leadership; Paletz had been thoroughly frightened, and with equal force proved his incapacity. True, he still remained an adherent of the ante- Reformer; and when the papal bull came out for the crusade (Sept. 9,  1411), Paletz admitted that there were “palpable errors” in it (Mon. Hussi, i, 265); but early in 1412; when the university held a conference to consider in how far it was wise to sustain Huss against pope and king, Paletz withdrew from Huss and endorsed the papists again (ibid. i, 175), in so tame and cowardly a manner that Huss said of Paletz, “he walked and turned backwards like a crab.” The truth is, Paletz was governed by worldly prudence. He saw that the Reformer's cause was a desperate one. Few in numbers, Huss; and his adherents had to encounter the royal and papal power, and there was not much likelihood of success. A timely retreat would cover all past offences and soon restore him to papal favor. He found, however, that he had counted without his host. The papists demanded that he should not only reject Huss, but oppose him; and, rather than lose his game, Paletz went into the conflict, and became a most violent accuser and persecutor.

Huss had made his special point the supreme and sole authority of the Scriptures, Paletz replied by a defence of the papal supremacy in the Church visible. But Huss was more than a match for his former friend, and he dealt his blows freely and harshly. At last Huss went before the Council of Constance with his case. Thither, too, Paletz followed Huss, the bitter zeal of the papal defender having in the mean time been greatly aggravated by the unpleasant memories of frequent defeats under the heavy fire of the Reformer's sound logic. When the cardinals in council assembled for private session were hesitating how to dispose of Huss, Paletz secured admission, and urged and insisted that the heretic should not be set at liberty again, and they finally adopted Paletz's policy. When word of this was taken to Huss, and he insisted upon a public hearing before the council, Paletz again made use of artifices and intrigues, and prevented a favorable reply to Huss's request. Paletz knew the power of Huss's eloquence, and he, as well as the other papists who were allied with him in these intrigues, did not wish to have the experiment of it tried upon the council. He as well as his coadjutors failed, however, in securing his condemnation unheard. King Sigismund saw the injustice of such an act, and prevented the plot; but even in the audiences granted, Paletz always carefully watched his opportunities to worst his rival in argument. His course at this time was in many respects contemptible, yet it may be palliated on the ground that Paletz, probably, with all his animosity, merely sought the humiliation and not the life of Huss, and that it was a partisan spirit which at ‘this time controlled Paletz. Certainly, when Huss had been condemned, and efforts were making to secure his abjuration of heresy, Paletz was among those who visited Huss in prison; and the gentle manner  in which he treated his former friend evinces that he was not altogether void of feeling, and that, great as he was himself by native talent and untiring industry, he' was in the presence of one greater, because he allied with all these distinctions the virtue of honor and truthfulness. Paletz had been selected by Huss as his confessor in his dying hour, but the papal servant felt too keenly the sad ending of this persecution to have complied with Huss's request. When Jerome was persecuted, Paletz again accused, but with less acrimony and persistency. Paletz died about the middle of the 15th century; of his writings none are now accessible. See Gillett, Life and Times of John Huss, vol. i and ii; Mon. Hussi, as referred to above; Jenkins, Life and Times of Cardinal Julian, p. 46; Ep. Huss. i, in his Opp. vol. i; Palacky, Bohmische Geschichte, iii, 161 sq.

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

             an eminent English divine and philosopher, and one of the most noted characters of the 18th century, was born at Peterborough, July, 1743. He was descended from an old and respectable family in Craven, in the West Riding of Yorkshire. During his infancy his father removed to Giggleswick, in Yorkshire, near the family property, having been appointed head-master of King Edward's School in that place. William was educated under the paternal roof, and speedily distinguished himself by great abilities, a studious disposition, and a ripeness and discrimination of intellect. In his seventeenth year he was entered a sizar of Christ's College, Cambridge. But unhappily, seduced by the influence of a few gay and dissolute companions, the first two years of his college life were entirely lost or misspent. The bad fruits of this vagabond life made him a sadder and a wiser man, and with his wisdom there came that fortitude which helped him to disentangle himself from this disgraceful connection, and he resolved on a course of devoted study. So rapid was his progress that in 1763 he took the bachelor's degree with the highest honors. He then taught for three years in an academy at Greenwich. In 1765 he obtained the first prize for a prose Latin dissertation — the subject being A Comparison between the Stoic and Epicurean Philosophy with respect to the Influence of each on the Morals of a People, in which he characteristically argued in favor of the latter. Next year he was elected a fellow of his alma mater; Christ's College, and soon after colleague to Dr. Law in his public lectures on moral and political philosophy, as well as on the New Testament. This early occupation directed Paley's mind to subjects which, when more  maturely studied, he gave to the public in works that have obtained him extensive fame as an author. Both as a college lecturer and a preacher, he was greatly admired for his sound sense and discretion, especially for his extraordinary skill in simplifying the most abstruse and difficult subjects, and bringing them down to the level of the humblest capacity. He had entered the priesthood in 1767, and in 1776, on his marriage. had of course been obliged to yield up his fellowship. His early patron. Law, who had become bishop of Carlisle, and who was well aware of Paley's merits, now promoted him in the Church by presenting him first to the vicarage of Dalston, Cumberland, then to Appleby, Westmoreland, till, in the course of years, he rose to be archdeacon of Carlisle (1782), and chancellor of the diocese (1785). He was a great friend to the abolition of the slave-trade; and in 1789, when the first great discussion in the House of Commons was expected, he drew up a short but appropriate and judicious treatise, entitled Comments against the Unjust Pretensions of Slave-dealers and Holders to be indemnified by pecuniary Allowances at the public Expense, in case the Slave-trade should be abolished, and sent it to the committee. The bishop of Durham, entertaining great respect for him, and recognising the valuable service which Paley had rendered to the abolition cause, presented him with the valuable rectory of Bishop Wearmouth, worth twelve hundred pounds a year. His last years, largely given to literary labors, were extremely .trying because of his impaired physical condition, but he bore his bodily pain meekly, ever trusting in the kind dispositions of a loving heavenly Father. Paley's piety with becoming progress became more fervent, elevated, and established as he advanced in life.

He lingered, notwithstanding the malignity of his disease, until May 25, 1805, when he suddenly died. Dr. Paley was inclined to corpulency, and his countenance was no index of the intellectual and moral attributes — the suavity, benevolence, strong good sense, and clear judgment that distinguished him. Among his friends no man was more highly or more justly esteemed than Dr. Paley; his literary attainments were exceeded only by his many amiable traits of frankness and good-humor. In matters of opinion he was liberal- minded and charitable. He was a friend to free inquiry and an able supporter of the principles of civil liberty, as we have seen above in his position on the slave-trade. In his theology he was suspected of heterodoxy, having manifested a strong inclination to Arian sentiments. As a writer, he is distinguished not so much for originality as for that power of intellect by which he grasps a subject in all its bearings, and handles it in a manner entirely his own; for the consummate skill with which he disposes  and follows out his argument, and for a style peculiarly suited to philosophical investigations strong, exact, and clear, and abounding in words and phrases which, though sometimes homely, express and illustrate his meaning most forcibly and most distinctly. Sir James Mackintosh, who is not always ready to endorse Paley's philosophical teachings, gives this enthusiastic commendation of Paley as an author: “This excellent writer, who, after Clarke and Butler, ought to be ranked among the brightest ornaments of the English Church in the 18th century, is in the history of philosophy naturally placed after Tucker, to whom, with praiseworthy liberality, he owns his extensive obligations.

His style is as near perfection in its kind as any in our language” (Works [1854], 1, 183). The greatest and most important of Paley's works is The Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy (1785; with Dissertations and Notes by Alexander Bain, 1853; annotated by Richard Whately, 1859). The general outlines of it had been delivered as lectures to: his pupils when he was a tutor in the university. In the first part of the “Principles,” which treats of moral philosophy only (after giving some account of the law of honor, the law of the land, and the Scriptures, as rules of action; rejecting, after Locke, the notion of a moral sense, or an innate. capacity of moral judgment; and defining what he means by human happiness and virtue), Paley proceeds to explain the principles and to lay down the foundation of his system. His desire of introducing into the foundation of his system too much of the exactness of demonstrative science, has occasionally led him to define things which in their nature are indeterminate and cannot be brought within the limits of a precise and formal definition. His account of the law of honor and of virtue is of this character. He is also too fond of putting forward disjunctive propositions, and reasoning upon them as if they were exhaustive, as in the instance of the methods of administering justice. Hence his applications are sometimes fettered and his conclusions, defective. The gist of his views on these topics is found in book 2, “On Moral Obligation.” A man is said to be obliged when he is urged by a violent motive resulting from the command of another. In moral matters, the motive is the expectation of future reward or punishment, and the command is from God. Hence private happiness is the motive, and the will of God the rule. But how is the will of God known? From two sources — the declarations of Scripture, and the light of nature; and the, method of coming at the divine will concerning any action by the light of nature is to inquire into the tendency of the action to promote or diminish the general  happiness. Here, then, Paley arrives at his principle that “whatever is expedient is right. It is the utility of any moral rule alone which constitutes the obligation of it.”

Its utility is to be determined by a consideration of general consequences; it must be expedient upon the whole, in the long run, in all its effects collateral and remote, as well as in those which are immediate and direct. Having settled his principle, he proceeds to apply it to the determination of moral duties. He makes a threefold division of duties: namely, those which a man owes to his neighbor, or relative duties; those which he owes to himself; and those which he owes to God. The first set are determinate or indeterminate — determinate, such as promises, contracts, oaths. The obligation to keep a promise, according to the principle of expediency, arises from the circumstance that “confidence in promises is essential to the intercourse of human life;” and the sense in which a promise is to be interpreted is that which the promiser knowingly and willingly conveys to the mind. of the person to whom it is made. Contracts are mutual promises, and therefore governed by the same principles; consequently, whatever is expected by one side, and known to be so expected by the other, is to be deemed a part or condition of the contract. Oaths are to be interpreted according to the “animus imponentis,” that is, in the sense which the imposer intends by them. Indeterminate duties are charity, gratitude, and the like. They are called indeterminate because no precise and formal limits can be assigned to their exercise. Another class belonging to this first set of duties originate from the constitution of the sexes. The second set of duties are those which a man owes to himself. As there are few duties or crimes whose effects are confined to the individual, little is said about them. A man's duty to himself consists in the care of his faculties and the preservation of his person, and the guarding against those practices which tend to injure the one or the other. ‘he third division of duties are those which are due to God. In one sense, every duty is a duty to God; but there are some of which God is the object as well as the author: these are worship and reverence. The second part, which is devoted to the elements of political knowledge, is pervaded, in determining the grounds of civil government, and the reasons of obedience to it, by the same. principle as that which constitutes the foundation of his moral system — “Utility.” Public utility is the foundation of all government. Hence, whatever irregularity or violations of equity, or fraud and violence may have been perpetrated in the acquisition of supreme power, when the state is once peaceably settled, and the good of its subjects promoted, obedience to it becomes duty. On the other hand,  whatever may have been the original legitimacy of the ruling .authority, if it become corrupt, negligent of the public welfare, and cease to satisfy the expectations of the governed, it is right to put it down and establish another in its place. Writing under a government which holds to the union of Church and State, Paley of course prominently treated of religious establishments, and here also he allows the doctrine of expediency to have a controlling influence in his views and conclusions.

He teaches that, as no form of Church government is laid down in the New Testament, a religious establishment is no part of Christianity; it is only the means of inculcating it. But the means must be judged of according to their efficiency; this is the only standard; consequently the authority of a Church establishment is founded in its utility. For the same reason tests and subscriptions ought to be made as simple and easy as possible; but when no present necessity requires unusual strictness, confessions of faith ought to be converted into articles of peace. In establishing a religion, where unanimity cannot be. maintained, the will of the majority should be consulted, because less evil and inconvenience must attend this than any other plan. On the same principle persecution is condemned and toleration justified; because the former never produced any real change of opinion, while the latter encourages inquiry and advances the progress of truth. Objection has frequently been taken to the principles on which Paley rests his system (comp. Dug. Stewart, Elements, vol. 2, and his Philos. of the Active and Moral Powers; Robert Hall, sermon on Infidelity; Fr.Wayland, Elem. of Moral Philos.; and the defence byWainwright, Paley's Theory of Morals, etc. [1830]), but the lucidity and appositeness of his illustrations are beyond all praise. If his treatise cannot be regarded as a profoundly philosophical work, it is at any rate one of the clearest and most sensible ever written, even by an Englishman; and at least it brushed off into oblivion the shallow and muddy mysticism that had long enveloped the philosophy of politics. If it failed to- sound the depths of “moral obligation,” there are excuses for this failure. Says Dr. Blackie, “Paley's definition of virtue: the doing good to mankind in obedience to the will of God, for the sake of everlasting happiness, characterizes the man, the book, the age, the country, and the profession to which he belonged, admirably. It is a definition that, taken as a matter of fact, in all likelihood expressed the feelings of 999 out of every 1000 British Christians living in the generation immediately preceding the French Revolution” (Four Phases of Morals, p. 308). In 1790 appeared Paley's most original and valuable work, the Horce Paulince, or the Truth of the Scripture History  of St. Paul evinced by a Comparison of the Epistles which bear his Name with the Acts of the Apostles, and with one another. The aim of this admirable work is to prove, by a great variety of “undesigned coincidences,” the improbability, if not impossibility, of the usual infidel hypothesis of his time, viz. that the New Testament is a “cunningly devised fable.” It was dedicated to his friend John Law, then bishop of Killala, in Ireland, to whose favor. he had been indebted for most of his preferments.

In 1794 was published Paley's next important work, entitled A View of the Evidences of Christianity (republished seventeen times in twenty-seven years, and frequently edited and widely circulated, latest by Whately [N.Y. 1865. 12mo]). It is not equal in originality to its predecessor, but the use made of the labors of such eminent scholars as Lardner and bishop Douglas is generally reckoned most dexterous and effective, as the materials are wrought up with so much address and disposed with so much skill, and the argument is laid before the reader in so clear and convincing a form, that it must be pronounced one of the most valuable and important books of the kind. The argument, which is opened and illustrated with singular ability, is briefly this: A revelation can be made only by means of miraculous interference. To work a miracle is the sole prerogative of the Supreme Being. If therefore miracles have been wrought in confirmation of a religion, they are the visible testimony of God to the divine authority of that religion. Consequently, if the miracles alleged in behalf of Christianity were actually performed, the Christian religion must be the true one. Whether the miracles were actually performed or not depends upon the credibility of those who professed to be witnesses of them, that is, the apostles and first disciples of Jesus Christ; and their credibility is demonstrated from this consideration — “that they passed their lives in labors, dangers, and sufferings voluntarily undergone in attestation of the accounts which they delivered, and solely in consequence of their belief in those accounts; and that they also submitted, from the same motive, to new rules of conduct.” They could not have been deceived; they must have known whether Christ was an impostor or not; they must have known whether the miracles he did were real or pretended. Neither could they have been deceivers; they had no intelligible purpose to accomplish by deception; they had everything to lose by it. On the other hand, by being still — by letting the subject rest they might have escaped the sufferings they endured. It is perfectly inconceivable, and entirely out of all the principles of human action, that men should set about propagating what they know to be a lie, and yet not only gain nothing by it, but expose  themselves to the manifest consequences — enmity and hatred, danger and death. In 1802 Paley published perhaps the most widely popular of all his works, Natural Theology, or Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity, which, however, is based, and to a large extent borrowed from the Religious Philosopher, the work of a Dutch philosopher named Nieuwelntyt, an English translation of which appeared in 1718-1719.

The plagiarisms are most palpable, but have been accounted for by Paley's own method of composition. The Natural Theology was “made up” from his loose papers and notes written while he was a college tutor, and in the course of such a long time as elapsed since its first compilation, Paley had forgotten the sources from whence he derived them. It is also but fair to state that he has taken nothing which he has not greatly improved — “nihil tetigit, quod non ornavit.” Paley has made that clear, impressive, and convincing which in the original was confused, illogical, and tiresome. He has added, too, more than he has borrowed; and, as in all the rest of his productions, the matter is arranged and the argument followed out with consummate judgment. His object is to establish the fact of benevolent design in the works of the visible creation. Hence the existence of a Supreme Designing Intelligence is inferred; and his personality, unity, ahd goodness demonstrated. It is not only one of the most convincing, but one of the most delightful books in the English language. “In the character of a defender of the faith,” says the Quarterly Review, “we would hold up Paley to almost unmingled admiration; in any other character his praise must be more qualified. The department of theology with which alone Paley was thoroughly conversant was the Evidences. He had not the necessary qualifications for a complete investigation of the doctrines. But see him how we will, we always find the good sense of a plain, shrewd, practical Yorkshireman displayed on these branches of religion. We think it next to impossible for an unbeliever to read the Evidences, in the order of his arrangement; unshaken. His Natural Theology is philosophy in its highest and noblest sense, scientific without the jargon of science; profound, but so clear that its depth is disguised. He cares not whence he fetches his illustrations, provided they are to the purpose.” A valuable edition of this work, with notes and scientific illustrations, was published (1.836-39) by lord Brougham and Sir C. Bell, the former furnishing a preliminary discourse on natural theology. This discourse is divided into two parts: the first contains an exposition of the nature and character of the evidence on which natural theology rests, with the intention of proving that it is as much a science of induction as either physical or mental philosophy; and  the second is devoted to a consideration of the advantages and pleasures which the study is calculated to afford. Subjoined to the volume are some notes on various metaphysical points connected with the subject. Besides the above works, Paley was the author of various sermons and tracts. Several editions of his entire works have also been published. One in four volumes, containing also posthumous sermons, and published by his son, the Rev. Edmund Paley, in 1838, may be regarded as the standard edition. There is also an American edition, with Life (Phila. 1851, 8vo). See, in addition to the authorities already quoted, Memoirs of Wm. Paley, by W. Meadley (Sunderl. 1809, 8vo, and often); Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. ii, 91, 391; McCosh, Scotch Philos. p. 301; Morell, Hist. Philos. 19th Century, p. 103, 267 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doct. vol. ii (see Index); The Quart. Rev. (Lond.), ii, 83 sq.; 9:388 sq.; Encyclop. Brit. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Palgrave, Francis, Sir[[@Headword:Palgrave, Francis, Sir]]

             an English knight, distinguished alike as a zealous and intelligent antiquary and as a historian, was born of Jewish parentage, named Cohen, at London in 1788. Of his early childhood nothing is known beyond the fact that at the age of eight years he translated the Batrachomyomachia of Homer from a Latin version into French (1797, 4to). When Cohen joined the Christian Church we are not able to state, probably long before he was called to the bar of the Inner Temple (1827), and before having received the honor of knighthood (1832). Sir F. Palgrave was for many years deputy keeper of the Public Records of Britain (from about 1836). He died July 6, 1861. Of his many writings we will only mention the following: The Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth; Anglo-Saxon Period, containing the AngloSaxon Policy and the Institutions arising out of Laws and Usages which prevailed before the Conquest (1832, 2 vols.): — The History of England; Anglo-Saxon Period (1831, 1850, 1868; vol. 21 of Murray's “Family Library”): — Documents and Records illustrating the History of Scotland and the Transactions between the Crowns of Scotland and England (1837): — Truths and Fictions of the Middle Ages: — The Merchant and the Friar (1837, 1844): — The History of Normandy and of England (1851, 1857, 1864, 4 vols.). Besides many other works, he wrote articles to the Lond. Quar. Rev. and other periodicals. His great merit, in his historic writings, consists in the extensive use made by him of original documents, by aid of which he not only himself very much enlarged our  acquaintance with the history and social aspects of the Middle Ages, but pointed out to others the advantage to be derived from. a careful study of the original sources of information. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Edinb. Rev. July, 1832; January, 1852, p. 153; Hallam, Middle Ages, Preface to Sup. Notes, 1, 11 (New York, 1872); Smyth, Lectures on Modern History, lect. 8; Einb. Rev. 66, 36; Westminster Rev. July, 1857; (Lonldon) Athenceun, 1857, Feb. 28; North Amer. Rev. April, 1858; Margaliouth, Vestiges of the Historic Anglo-Hebrews in East Anglia (London, 1870), p. 105 sq.; Pick, in the Evangel. (Lutheran) Quar. Rev. July, 1876, p. 373.

## Pali[[@Headword:Pali]]

             (a corruption of the Sanscrit Prakrit, q.v.) is the name of the sacred language of the Buddhists. Its origin must be sought for in one or several of the popular dialects of ancient India, which are comprised under the general name of Prakrit, and stand in a similar relation to Sanscrit as the Romance languages, in their earlier period, to Latin. SEE SANSCRIT.

## Pali Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Pali Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Pali, though no longer a vernacular language in any country, has for ages been established as the religious and learned language of the Buddhists in the island of Ceylon, in the Burman empire, in Siam, Laos, Pegu, Ava, and throughout almost the whole of the eastern peninsula of India. As a language it is immediately derived from the Sanscrit, and was probably the native language of Magadha, the birthplace of Buddha. A version into the Pali was commenced in 1813, under the auspices of the Colombo Bible Society, by Mr. Tolfrey, assisted by two learned Buddhist priests. The version had advanced as far as the end of the epistle to Philemon, when Mr. Tolfrey died, in 1817. In 1825 the Reverend Benjamin Clough resumed the work, and finally, in 1835, the whole New Test. was printed in Pali. One of the Buddhist priests who assisted Mr. Tolfrey in the translation became a sincere convert to Christianity, and subsequently important work. See Bible of Every Land, page 91 sq. (B.P.)

## Palici[[@Headword:Palici]]

             (i.e. daemons), deities anciently worshipped in the neighborhood of Mount AEtna, in Sicily. They were said to be twin sons of Zeus and Taleia, daughter of Hephaestus. In remote ages they were propitiated by human sacrifices. The temple of the Palici was resorted to as ali asylum by runaway slaves.

## Palilia[[@Headword:Palilia]]

             an ancient Roman festival which was celebrated annually on April 21 in honor of Pales, the god of shepherds. On the same day afterwards this festival was kept as a memorial of the first founding of the city by Romulus. A minute description of the ceremonies practiced on this day occurs in the Fasti of Ovid. The first object to which the festival was directed was a public lustration by fire and smoke. For this purpose they burned the blood of the October-horse (q.v.), the ashes of the calves sacrificed at the festival of Ceres, and the shells of beans. The people were also ‘sprinkled with water; they washed their hands in springwater, and drank milk, mixed with must. In the evening the stables were cleansed with water, sprinkled by, means of laurel branches, which were also hung up as ornaments. To produce purifying smoke for the sheep and their folds, the  shepherds burned sulphur, rosemary, ‘fir-wood, and incense.' Sacrifices besides were offered, consisting of cakes, millet, milk, and other eatables, after which a prayer was offered by the shepherds to Pales, their presiding deity. Fires were then kindled, made of heaps of straw, and, amid cheerful strains of music, the sheep were purified by being made to pass through the smoke three times. The whole ceremonies were wound up with a feast in the open air. In latter times .the Palilia lost its character as a shepherd festival, and dame to be held exclusively in commemoration of the day on which the building of Rome commenced. Caligula ordered the day of his accession to the throne to be celebrated as a festival under the name of Palilia. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, p. 589, 590.

## Palimpsest[[@Headword:Palimpsest]]

             (παλίμψηστος, rubbed out again), a term applied to ancient manuscripts, of which the older writing has been erased in order to use the parchment or paper for writing on them again. A good specimen is the Wolfenblittel MS. (q.v.).

## Palingenesia[[@Headword:Palingenesia]]

             (Gr. πάλιν, again, and γένεσις birth) is a term that appears to have originated among .the Stoics, who employed it to denote the act of the Demiurgus, or Creator, by which, having absorbed all being into himself, he reproduced it in a new creation. The occurrence of the word in the New Testament (Mat 19:28, where it is used in allusion to the judgment of this world, and. the αἰῶν μέλλων; and Tit 3:5, where it is used in reference to baptismal regeneration, λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσαίς) has given it a place in Christian theology, and divines have variously used it to express the resurrection of men, the new birth of the individual soul, and the restoration of the world to that perfect state that it lost by the Fall the new heavens and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.” The term is also applied to designate both the great geological changes which the earth has undergone and the transformations in the insect kingdom, such as of caterpillars into butterflies, etc. SEE NEW BIRTH; SEE RESURRECTION.

## Palingenius, Marcellus[[@Headword:Palingenius, Marcellus]]

             an Italian poet of the 16th century, was a native of Stellada, in Ferrara. He is chiefly known by his Zodiacus Vitae, which brought him into trouble, as  it contains many sarcastic attacks on monks and Church abuses. His name is therefore in the Index Librorum Prohibitorsum as a Lutheran heretic. The book is entitled Zodiacus Vitae, id est de hominis vita, studio ac moribus optinze instituendis libri 12 nunc demuns ad exemplaria prinaria sedule castigati (Rott. 1722, small 8vo).

## Palissy, Bernard[[@Headword:Palissy, Bernard]]

             a Huguenot artisan, noted for his faithful adherence to the Reformation movement, and also one of the most illustrious of the Gospellers (q.v.), was eminent as a natural philosopher, chemist. geologist, and artist. He is generally known as “Palissy, the great Potter.” He was born about 1510 at La Chapelle Biron, a poor village in Perigord, where his father brought him up to his own trade of a glazier. The boy was by nature quick and ingenious, with a taste for drawing, designing, and decoration, and he made himself useful to the village churches of his neighborhood whenever such skill was required. When his term of apprenticeship was past he set out upon his “wanderschaft,” and travelled extensively, as is the custom of Continental European artisans. Spanish, French, Swiss, Dutch, and German territory he thus visited at a time when the people were most deeply moved by the recent revolt of Luther from Rome. Of course, the thoughtful young man belonging to a class of mechanics somewhat cultured, and besides by nature a shrewd observer and independent thinker, he could not fail to be influenced by the popular agitation. A Bible which fell into his hands he read, notwithstanding the papal ban against this liberty in a layman. It did not fail to make a deep impression upon the inquiring and thoughtful Palissy, and at thirty he was a convert to the side which advocated the free circulation of the Scriptures, and justification by faith, without the agency of the priesthood. He was now in his native country; but aware of the danger those were subject to who advocated these views, he shunned Paris, and resided at Saintenge, in the south-west of France. Palissy was born to lead others. He had not lived long here before the townspeople were by him guided religiously, as if their pastor. At first a little congregation had formed, and to these he dispensed spiritual food not only on Sundays but weekdays. They came to be specially designated as “the Religionists,” and were known throughout the town to be persons of blameless life, peaceable, well-disposed, and industrious. As their number rapidly increased the Romanists felt impelled to a like devotion and holy profession, and soon, to use the words of Palissy, “there were prayers daily  in this town, both on one side and the other.” That both were in earnest was evidenced by the charitable feeling which governed all.

They used the same churches by turnis, and there was no disposition to persecution. But though Palissy devoted so large a share of his time to religion, he did not fail to make progress too as an artisan. Indeed, in many respects this period of his life is one of the most memorable. In it falls one of his most important discoveries, which we are told came about as follows: “An enameled cup of ‘Faience,' which he saw by chance, inspired him with the resolution to discover the mode of producing white enamel. Neglecting all other labors; he devoted himself to investigations and experiments for the long period of sixteen years. He at last exhausted all his resources, and for want of money to buy fuel was reduced to the necessity of burning his household furniture piece by piece; his neighbors laughed at him, his wife overwhelmed him with reproaches, and his starving family surrounded him crying for food; ‘but in spite of all these discouragements the persisted in the search, and was in the end rewarded by success.” A few vessels adorned with figures of animals, colored to represent nature, sold for high prices, and he was then enabled to complete those investigations by which he became famous; and, though a Huguenot, he was protected and encouraged, in 1559, by the king and the nobility, who employed him to embellish their mansions with specimens of his art. In 1560 he was lodged in the Tuileries, and was specially exempted by queen Catharine from the massacre of St. Bartholomew, more from a regard to her own benefit than from kindness. In March, 1575, he began a course of lectures on natural history and physics, and was the first in France to substitute positive facts and rigorous demonstrations for the fanciful interpretations of philosophers. In the course of these lectures he gave (1584) the first right notions of the origin of springs, and the formation of stones and fossil shells, and strongly advocated the importance of marl as a fertilizing agent. These, along with his theories regarding the best means of purifying water, have been fully supported by recent discovery and investigation. In 1588 he was arrested, thrown into the Bastile as a heretic, and threatened with death unless he recanted. But though he was feeble and trembling on the verge of the grave, his spirit was as brave as in his youth, and he resolutely held to his religion. There were many who insisted that he should be burned; but he died in 1590 before his sentence was pronounced, courageously remaining faithful to the cause until the end, and glorying in having been called to lay down his life for the true faith. Palissy left a collection of objects of natural history, the first that had been formed in  France. His works are at the present day almost beyond price, and his ornaments and arabesques are among the most beautiful of the Renaissance. See Smiles, Huguenots, p. 35-44; Cap, (Euvres Completes de Bernard Palissy (Paris, 1844); Dumesnil, B. Pilissy, Le. Potier de Terre (ibid. 1851); Morley, TheLife of B. Palissy, his Labors and his Discoveries (Lond. 1852, 2 vols.); Duplessis, Etude sur Palissy (Paris. 1855); Free- Will Baptist Quar. 7:354 sq.

## Pall[[@Headword:Pall]]

             in heraldry, the upper part of a saltire conjoined to the lower part of a pale. It appears much in the arms of ecclesiastical sees.

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

             is the name given in English to, different portions of ecclesiastical vesture, employed by the Romish and other churches.

1. It is applied (Lat. pallium; Gr. Ειλητον) to a part of the ponifical dress worn only by the pope, archbishops, and patriarchs, and is a scarf of honor symbolic of “the plenitude of the pontifical office.” It is a white woollen band of about three fingers' breadth, made round, and worn over the shoulders, crossed in frown with one end hanging down over the breast; the other behind it is ornamented with purple crosses, and fastened by three golden needles or pins, the number signifying charity, or the nails of the cross. It is made of the wool of perfectly white sheep, which are yearly, on the festival of St. Agnes, offered and blessed at the celebration of the holy eucharist, in the church dedicated ,to her in the Nomentan Way in Rome. The sheep are received by two canons of the church of St. John Lateran, who deliver them into the charge of the subdeacons of the apostolic college, and by them they are kept and fed until the time for sheep-shearing arrives. The palliums are always. made of this wool, and when completed .they are brought to the church of St. Peter and St. Paul, and are placed upon the altar over those saints' tomb on the eve of their festival, and are left there the whole night, and on the following day are delivered to the subdeacons whose office it is to take charge of them. The pope alone always wears the pallium, wherever he officiates, to signify his assumed authority over all other particular churches.  Archbishops and patriarchs receive the pall from the pope, and cannot wear it except on certain occasions, such as councils, ordinations, and on great festivals in;the celebration of the mass. The Council of Macon (A. D. 581) forbade archbishops saying mass without the pall. An archbishop in the Romish Church, although he be consecrated as bishop, and have taken possession, cannot before he has petitioned for, and received and paid for the pallium, either call himself archbishop or perform such acts as belong to the “greater jurisdiction” — those, namely, which he exercises not as a bishop, but as archbishop, such as to summon a council or to visit his province, etc. He can, however, when his election has been confirmed, and before he receives the pallium, depute his functions, in the matter of ordaining bishops, to his suffragans, who may lawfully exercise them by-his command. If, however, any archbishop in the Romish Church, before he receives the pallium, perform those offices which result immediately from the possession of it, such as, for instance, those relating to orders and to the chrism, etc., the acts themselves are valid, but the archbishop offends against the canons and laws of the Church.

The pall was part of the imperial habit, and was originally granted by the emperors to the patriarchs. Thus Constantine gave the use of the pall to the bishop of Rome, probably Linus or Sylvester; and Anthimus, patriarch of Constantinople, when expelled from his see, is said to have returned the pall to the emperor Justinian. In 336 it was for the first time given to a bishop of thesee of Ostia, who was then officiating at the consecration of the pope, because the pontiff was not a bishop at the time of his election. The bishopric of Arles had the pall from a very early period. The bishopric of Autun was given it about A. D. 600. Isidore of Seville says that it was once common to all bishops, but in time it certainly was given to bishops only as an exceptional honor, as when St. Boniface received it from pope Gregory II, the bishop of Bamberg in 1046, and the bishop of Lucca from Alexander II in 1057. Pelagius or Damasus required all metropolitans to fetch theor pall within three months after consecration; pope Gregory I forbade the reception of money by any official at its delivery, but the journey and fees in time became a sore tax, which cost the archbishop of Mayence 30.000 gold pieces. Pope Gregory sent a pall to St. Augustine of Canterbury, and in 734 Egbright of York, after great difficulty, procured the same distinction, which had been withheld since 644. In 1472 the archbishops of St. Andrew's became independent of York and metropolitans of Scotland in right of the pall. Four palls were given for the  first time at the Council of Kells, 1152, to the Irish archbishops by the papal legate, this being their earliest acknowledgment of the pope's supremacy. When the see of Rome had carried its authority to the highest pitch, under Innocent II, that pontiff decreed the pall to be a mark of such distinction as is attached to it to this day. Neither the functions or title of archbishop, as we have seen above, can be assumed without it; and in order to make it a source of profit to the papal exchequer, every archbishop is buried in his pall, so that his successor may be obliged to apply to the pope for another and pay for the privilege.

The pall represents the lamb borne on the Good Shepherd's shoulders, and also humility, zeal, a chain of honor, and pastoral vigilance. Its other names were anaphorion, supernumerale, and in Theodoret and St. Gregory Nazianzen-ἱερὰ στολή. Before the 8th century it was ornamented with two or four red or purple, but now with six black crosses, fastened with gold pins which superseded an earlier ornament, the Good Shepherd, or one cross, of the 4th century. It has been supposed to be the last relic of an abbreviated toga, reduced to its laticlave by degrees. In the time of Gregory the Great it was made of white linen cloth without seam or needlework, hanging down from the shoulders. It has pendants hanging down behind and before to represent the double burden of the pope.

2. Pall (Gr. ἐνδυτόν, τραπεζοφόρον, ἃπλωμα) is also the name of the cloth hanging in front of an altar; the modern antependium, like the blue cloth of the golden altar (Num 4:11). In 1630, at Worcester cathedral, the upper and lower fronts, and the pall or middle covering, are mentioned. There is one with the acts of saints of the 15th century at Steeple Aston, Oxford; besides wall hangings, according to Rupert, betokening the future glory of the Church triumphant.

3. In a strictly liturgical sense the word pall is applied to the linen cloth covering the table or slab of the altar used in the celebration of the mass. It was ordered by the councils of Lateran and Rheims, and by pope Boniface III. In the Greek Church, on the four corners of the holy table are fixed four pieces of cloth called the Evangelists, because stamped with their effigies, symbolizing the Church, which calls the faithful to Christ from every quarter of the world. Over these are laid the linen cloth, called the body cloth, representing the winding-sheet of the Lord in the tomb (Joh 20:7); a second of finer material, symbolizing the glory of the Son of God seated on the altar as his throne; and a third the corporal proper.  The use of three cloths in the Latin Church is. said to have existed in the time of Pius I. St. Optatus of Milevi mentions an altar cloth. In the 6th century silk and precious stuffs were used, as St. Gregory of Tours informs us. Constantine gave a pall of cloth of gold to St. Peter's; and Zachary presented one wrought with the Nativity and studded with pearls. The modern Roman pall is a square piece of linen cloth — sometimes limber, sometimes made stiff by inserting pasteboard sufficiently large to cover the mouth of the chalice. The upper service is often of silk embroidered, or of cloth of gold. The surface in contact with the chalice must always be of linen. A fair white linen cloth and a carpet of silk or decent stuff are required in the English Church. The form is the ancient pall, and should be fair, that is damasked or ornamented, and so beautiful (Isa 4:2; Eze 16:17); it is white (Rev 15:6; Rev 19:14), like Christ's raiment, exceeding white as snow (Mar 9:3). It ought to hang, slightly over the front of the altar, but at the end nearly to the ground (Walcott, Sacred Archaeology s.v.).

4. Besides all these there is the funeral pall, an ample covering, of black velvet or other stuff, which is cast over the coffin while borne to burial. The ends of the pall are held during. the funeral procession by the most distinguished among the friends of the deceased, generally selected from among those not connected by blood. See Siegel, Christl. Alterthumer, iii, 48 sq.; Bingham, Orig. Eccles.; Walcott, Sacred Archceol. s.v.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities. (see Index); Hefele, Conciliengesch. vol. i, iii, and iv; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism (see Index).

## Palladino, Filippo[[@Headword:Palladino, Filippo]]

             an Italian painter, was born in Florence about 1544. It is not known by whom he was instructed, but Lanzi says he seems to have studied the Lombard more than the native artists, and to have been acquainted with Baroccio. After acquiring considerable reputation by his picture of the Decollation of St. John in the church of that saint at Florence, and an altar- piece in S. Jacopo a' Corbolini at Milan, he was obliged to fly from that city on account of some disturbance. He sought refuge at Rome, where he was received by the prince Colonna; but being pursued he went to Sicily, and resided at Mazzarino, on an estate belonging to the Colonna family. There, as well as at Syracuse, Palermo, Catania, and other places, he executed works for the churches, which Lanzi says are elegantly designed  and finely colored, though they are not free from mannerism. He died at Mazzarino in 1614.

## Palladio, Andrea[[@Headword:Palladio, Andrea]]

             a famous Italian architect, was born at Vicenza Nov. 30, 1518. After having critically studied the writings of Vitruvius, and the monuments, of antiquity at Rome, he settled in his native city, and first acquired a reputation by his restoration of the Basilica of Vicenza. Pope Paul III next invited him to Rome, designing to intrust him with the execution of the works then going on at St. Peter's, but unfortunately Paul died' before Palladio's arrival. He was employed for many years in the construction of numerous buildings in Vicenza and the neighborhood, in all of which he displayed the most exquisite taste combined with the most ingenious and imaginative ornamentation. His style, known as “the Palladian,” is composite, and is characterized by great splendor of execution and justness of proportion. It exercised an immense influence on the architecture of Northern Italy. His principal works in ecclesiastical architecture are the churches of San Giorgio Maggiore and II Santissimo Redentore at Venice, the atriuns and cloister at the convent Della Carith, and the fagade of San Francesco della Vigna in the same city. Palladio died at Vicenza Aug. 6, 1580. He wrote a work on architecture which is highly prized. The best edition is that published at Vicenza in 4 vols. (1776). See Quatremere de Quincy, Histoire des plus celebres architectes; Temanza, Vite degli architetti Teneziani; Ticozzi, Dizionario, s.v.

## Palladium[[@Headword:Palladium]]

             a name among the ancient Greeks and Romans of an image of Pallas (q.v.), upon the careful keeping of which in a sanctuary the public welfare was believed to depend. The Palladium of Troy is particularly celebrated. According to the current myth, it was thrown down from heaven by Zeus, and fell on the plain of Troy, where it was picked up by Ilus, the founder of that city, as a favorable omen. In the course of time the belief spread that the loss of it would be followed by the fall of the city; it was therefore stolen by Ulysses and Diomede. Several cities afterwards boasted of possessing it, particularly Argos and Athens. Other accounts, however, affirm that it was not stolen by the Greek chiefs, but carried to Italy by AEneas, and the Romans said that it was preserved in the temple of Vesta,  but so secretly that even the Pontifex Maximus might not behold it. All images of this name were somewhat coarsely hewn out of wood.

## Palladius Of Helenopolis[[@Headword:Palladius Of Helenopolis]]

             an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished in the 5th century. His name occurs repeatedly in the ecclesiastical and literary history of the early part of the 5th century. Very little is known of him except from his own records in the Lausiac History, of which he is the reputed author. He was probably born in or about 367. He seems to have been a Galatian, and a companion or disciple of Evagrius of Pontus. In two places of his history he refers to his being a long time in Galatia and at Ancyra, but these passages do not prove that he was born there. He embraced a solitary life at the age of twenty, which, if his birth was in 367, would be in 387. The places of his residence at successive periods can only be conjectured from incidental notices in the Lausiac History. Tillemont places at the commencement of his ascetic career his abode with Elpidius of Cappadocia, in some caverns of Mount Lucas, near the banks of the Jordan, and his residence at Bethlehem, and other places in Palestine. Tillemont supposes that it was at this time that he saw several other saints who dwelt in that country, and among them perhaps St. Jerome, of whom his impressions, derived chiefly if not wholly from, the representations of Posidonius, were by no means favorable. Palladius first visited Alexandria in the consulship of the emperor Theodosius the Great, i.e. in 388; and by the advice of Isidorus, a presbyter of that city, placed himself under the instruction of Dorotheus, a solitary, whose mode of life was so austere that Palladius was obliged. by sickness to leave him without completing the three years which he had intended to stay. Having remained a short time near Alexandria, he took up his abode for a year among the solitaries in the mountains of the desert of Nitria, who numbered five thousand, and whose dwelling-place and manner of life he describes. From Nitria he proceeded farther into the wilderness to the district of the cells. where he arrived the year after the death of Macarius the Egyptian (390 or 391). Here he remained nine years, three of which he spent as companion of Macarius the younger, the Alexandrian. He was for a time the companion and disciple of Evagrius of Pontus, who was charged with entertaining Origenistic opinions.

How long he remained with Evagrius is not known. But he did not confine himself to one spot: he visited cities or villages or deserts, for the purpose of conversing with men of eminent holiness, and his history bears incidental testimony to the extent  of his travels. The Thebaid, or Upper Egypt, as far as Tabenna, and Syene, Libya, Syria, Palestine, Mesopotamia, and even Rome and Campania, and, as he vaguely and boastfully states, the whole Roman empire, were visited by him, and that almost entirely on foot. In consequence of severe illness, Palladius was sent by the other solitaries to Alexandria; and from that city, by the advice of his physicians, he went to Palestine, and thence into Bithynia, where he was ordained bishop. He gives neither the date of his appointment nor the name of his bishopric, but intimates that it was the occasion of great trouble to him; so that, “while hidden for eleven months in a gloomy cell,” he remembered a prophecy of Joannis of Lycopolis, who, three years before Palladius was taken ill and sent to Alexandria, had foretold his elevation to the episcopacy and his consequent troubles. As he was present with Evagrius of Pontus about the time of the latter's death, which probably occurred in 399, he could not have left Egypt till that year, nor can we well place his ordination as bishop before 400, when he was present in a synod held by Chrysostom at Constantinople, and was sent into Proconsular Asia to procure evidence on a charge against the bishop of Ephesus. The deposition of Chrysostom (q.v.) involved Palladius in troubles, as we learn from his Lausiac History. Chrysostom, in his exile, frequently wrote to “Palladius the bishop,” exhorting him to continue in prayer, for which his seclusion gave him opportunity. All the foregoing particulars relate to the author of the Lausiac History, from the pages of which the notices of him are gleaned. We learn from Photius that in the “Synod of the Oak,” at which Joannis or John Chrysostom was condemned, and which was held in 403, one of the charges against him related to the ordination of a Palladius, bishop of Helenopolis, in Bithynia, a follower of the opinions of Origen. The province in which the diocese was situated, the Origenistic opinions (imbibed from or cherished by Evagrius of Pontus), and the intimation of something open to objection in his ordination, compared with the ambiguous manner in which the author of the Lausiac History speaks of his elevation, seem conclusive as to the identity of the historian with Palladius of Helenopolis.

He is, doubtless, the Palladius charged by Epiphanius, and by Jerome himself, with Origenism. Tillemont, however, attempts to. show, that Palladius the Origenist was not the bishop of Helenopolis. Through fear of his enemies, Palladius of Helenopolis fled to Rome in 405, where he probably received the letter of encouragement addressed to him and the other fugitive bishops, Cyriacus of Syrmada, Alysius or Eulysius of the Bithynian Apameia; and Demetrius of Pessinus. At this time Palladius probably became acquainted with the  monks of Rome and Campania. When some bishops and presbyters of Italy were delegated by the Western emperor Honorius and pope Innocent I, and the bishops of the Western Church generally, to protest to the Eastern emperor Arcadius against the banishment of Chrysostom, and to demand the assembling of a new council for the consideration of his case, Palladius and his fellow-exiles returned into the East, apparently as members of the delegation. But their return was ill timed and unfortunate: they were both arrested on approaching Constantinople, and both delegates and exiles were confined at Athyra, in Thrace; and then the four returning fugitives were banished to separate and distant places, Palladius to the extremity of Upper Egypt, in the vicinity of the Blemmyes. Tillemont supposes that after the death of Theophilus of Alexandria-the great enemy of Chrysostom in 412, Palladius obtained some relaxation of his punishment, though he was not allowed to return to Helenopolis or to resume his episcopal functions, and says that in the interval between 412 and 420 the Lausiac History was written. Palladius resided for four years at Antinoe, or Antinopolis, in the Thebaid, and three years inn the Mount of Olives, near Jerusalem, and then also made his visits to many parts of the East. After a time he was restored to the bishopric of Helenopolis, from which he was transferred to that of Aspona or Aspuna, in Galatia; but the dates, of his restoration and his transfer cannot be fixed: they probably took place after the healing of the schism occasioned by Chrysostom's affair in 417, and probably after the composition of the Lausiac History, in 419 or 420. Pailadius probably died before 431, when in the third general (first Ephesian) council the see of Aspona was held by another person. He appears to have been bishop of Aspona only a short time, as he is currently designated from Helenopolis.

Palladius's principal, if not his only work, is entitled ῾Η πρὸς Λαύσωνα τὸν πραιπόσιτον ἱστορία περιέχουσα βίους ὁσίων πατέρων-Ad Lausum Prepositum Historia, quce Sanctorumn Patrum vitas complectitur — usually cited as Historia Lausiaca, the Lausiac History. This work, Palladius says, was composed in his fifty-third year, in the thirty-third year of his monastic life, and the twentieth of his episcopate, which last date furnishes the means of determining several others in his personal history. The work contains biographical notices and anecdotes of a number of ascetics whom Palladius knew personally, or of whom he received information through others who knew them. The value of the work is diminished by the author's credulity (characteristic, however, of his age  and class) concerning miracles and other marvels; but it exhibits the prevailing religious tendencies of the age, and is valuable as recording various facts relating to eminent men. The Lausus, or Lauson, to whom the work is addressed, was chamberlain apparently to the emperor Theodosius the younger. The first edition of the Greek text, but a very imperfect one, was that of Meursius (Leyden, 1616). The Greek text and version were reprinted from the Auctarium of Ducaeus, in the editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum (Paris, 1644 and 1654). It is probable that the printed text is still very defective.

Another work ascribed to Palladius is entitled Διάλογος ἰστορικὸς Παλλαδίου ῾Ελενουπόλεως γενόμενος πρὸς Θεόδωρον διάκονον ῾Ρώμης, περὶ βίου καὶ πολιτείας τοῦ μακαρίου Ι᾿ωάννου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινοπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου — Dialogus Historicus Palladii episcopi Helenopolis cunm Theodoro ecclesice Romnance diacono, de vita et conversatione Beati Joannis Chrysostomi, episcopi Constantinopolis. The title of the work misled many into the belief that it was written by Palladius of Helenopolis; but a more attentive examination proves the author of the Dialogus to have been a different person, several years his senior, though Palladius's companion and fellow- sufferer in the delegation from the Western emperor and Church on behalf of Chrysostom, which occasioned the imprisonment and exile of the bishop. Tillemont, assuming that the author of the Dialogus was called Palladius, thinks he may have been the person to whom Athanasius wrote in 371 or 372.

Περὶ τῶν τῆς Ι᾿νδίας ἐθνῶν καὶ τῶν Βραγμάνων— De Gentibus Indice et Bragmanibus — whose authorship is also ascribed to Palladius, is by Oudin and Cave regarded as the work of another writer of that period. Lambecius ascribes the work to Palladius of Methone. All that can be gathered from the work itself is that the author was a Christian, and lived while the Roman empire was still in existence; but this mark of time is of little value, as the Byzantine empire retained to the last the name of Roman. The supposed work of St. Ambrose, published by Blisse, is. repudiated by the Benedictine editors of that father, and has been shown by Kollar to be a free translation of the work ascribed to Palladius. See Cave, Hist. Litter. ad amn. 401, i, 376 (Oxford, 1740-43); Fabricius, Bibl. Grceca, i, 727; 8:456; 10:98, etc.; Oudin, Comnent. de Scriptor. Ecclesiastes 1, col. 908, etc.; Tillemont. Memoires, 11:500, etc.; Ceillier, Hist. des  Auteurs ecclesiast. 7:484-493; Vossins, De Historicis Grcecis, lib. 2, c. 19; Smith, Dic. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Palladius Of Suedra[[@Headword:Palladius Of Suedra]]

             an ecclesiastical writer of whose personal history we know only that he flourished at Suedra, in Pamphylia. Prefixed to the Ancoratus of Epiphanius of Salamis, or Constantia, SEE EPIPHANIUS, is a letter of Palladius to that father. It is headed Ε᾿πιστολὴ γραφεῖσα παρὰ Παλλαδίου τῆς αὐτῆς πόλεως Σουέδρων πολιτευομένου καὶ ἀποσταλεῖσα πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν ἃγιον Ε᾿πιφάνιον αἰτήσαντος καὶ αὐτοῦ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν--Palladii ejusden Suedrorunm urbis civis ad  Sanctum Epiphanium Epistola, qua idem ab eo postulat — i.e., in which he seconds the request made by certain presbyters of Suedra (whose letter precedes that of Palladius) that Epiphanius would answer certain questions respecting the Trinity, of which the Ancoratus contains the solution. See Epiphanius, Opera, 2, 3 (ed. Petav. Paris, 1622, fol.); Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 10:114.

## Palladius, Petrus[[@Headword:Palladius, Petrus]]

             a Danish prelate of note, was the first bishop of Zealand, in Denmark, after the Lutheran Reformation, and distinguished as one of the most learned theologians and most eminent Reformers of his time. The Roman Index names him in the first class of heretic authors. His original name was Peder Plade, but this was, according to the fashion of those days, Latinized into Petrus Palladius. He was born at Ribe in 1504, and was for a short time schoolmaster in Odense; but when twenty-seven years old he repaired to Wittenberg in search of the truth, under the guidance of Luther and Melancthon. He remained there six years, and won the respect and confidence of his teachers to such an extent that his. king, Christian III, at their request, appointed him bishop of Zealand and professor of theology in the University of Copenhagen in 1537, notwithstanding his youth.

He was ordained by Bugenhagen; and after the departure of the latter from Denmark, Palladius was the most influential man in Denmark, and his voice had the greatest weight in deciding all Church questions and in the general arrangement of Church affairs, not only in his own diocese, but also in other parts of the Danish realm of that time. especially in Norway and Iceland; and he is also entitled to great credit for the part he took in the reorganization. of the Copenhagen University. He was a very active man. He made frequent visits to every Church in his large diocese; and when his health broke down and did not permit him to travel, he spent his time in writing a series of books, partly learned and partly popular, by which he aimed to strengthen the foothold of the Reformation in Denmark, to advance the cause of piety, and to combat immorality and drunkenness. He was one of the leading disputants against the Catholic canons of Copenhagen, Lund, and Roskilde (1543-1544). He preached zealously against the worship of saints, pilgrimages, and all other foolish reminiscences of Romanism that still lingered in various parts of the country. Yet was he very clement in his dealings with his opponents; and it is believed that he did not give his consent to the ill treatment of the  reformed fugitives who came to Denmark, headed by John a Lasco. Palladius assisted in the translation of the so called Christian III's Bible, translated Luther's Catechism and Enchiridion, and in 1556 published the first Danish ritual. On account of his many other duties he resigned his theological professorship in 1545, but was prevailed on to resume it again in 1550, the university not being able to get on without him. He resigned again in 1558, and died in 1560. See Helvig, Den danske Kirkes Historie after Reformationen, 2d ed.; Nordisk Conversations lexicon, s.v. Palladius; Barfod, Fortrellinger, p. 434. (R. B. A.).

## Palladius, Scotorum Episcopus[[@Headword:Palladius, Scotorum Episcopus]]

             a noted Irish prelate of the early Church, flourished probably near the middle of the 5th century. In the Chronicon of Prosper Aquitanus, under the consulship of Bassus and Antiochus (A.D. 431), this passage occurs: “Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur a papa Ccelestino Palladiuns, et primus episcopus mittitur.” In another work of the same writer (Contra Collatorem, c. 21 sec. 2), speaking of Coelestine's exertions to repress the doctrines of Pelagius, he says, “Ordinato Scotis episcopo, dum Romanam insulam studet servare Catholicam, facit etiam barbaram Christianam” (Opera, col. 363, ed. Paris, 1711). To: these meagre notices, the only ones found in contemporary writers (unless, with some, we refer to the conversion of the Scoti the lines of Prosper, De Ingratis, vs. 330-332), the chroniclers and historians of the Middle Ages have added a variety of contradictory particulars, so that it is difficult, indeed impossible, to extract the real facts of Palladius's history. It has been a matter of fierce dispute between the Irish and the Scots as to which of them were the objects of Palladius's mission; but the usage of the word Sccoti” in Prosper's time, and the distinction drawn by him between “insulam Romanam” and “insulam barbaram,” seem to determine the question in favor of the Irish. This solution leads, however, to another difficulty. According to Prosper, Palladius converted the Irish — “fecit barbaram (sc. insulam) Christianam,” while the united testimony of ecclesiastical antiquity ascribes the conversion of Ireland to Patricius (St. Patrick), who was a little later than Palladius. But possibly the success of Palladius, though far from bearing out the statement of Prosper, may have been greater than subsequent writers, zealous for the honor of St. Patrick, and seeking to exaggerate his success by extenuating that of his predecessors, were willing to allow.

There is another difficulty, arising from an apparent contradiction, between the two passages in Prosper, one of which ascribes to Palladius the conversion of the island, while the other describes him as being sent “ad Scotos in Christo credentes;” but this seeming contradiction may be reconciled by the supposition that Palladius had visited the island and made some converts, before being consecrated and again sent. out as their bishop. This supposition accounts for a circumstance recorded by Prosper, that (Florentio.et Dionysio Coss., i.e. in A.D. 429) Palladius, while yet only  a deacon, prevailed on pope Coelestine to send out Germanus of Auxerre to stop the progress of Pelagianism in Britain, which indicates on the part of Palladius a knowledge of the state of the British islands, and an interest in them, such as a previous visit would be likely to impart. The various statements of the mediaeval writers have been collected by Usher in his Britanznicar. Ecclesiar. Antiq. c. 16 p. 799 sq. See also Sallerius, De St. Palladio, in the Acta Sanctor. Jul. 2, 286 sq. Palladius is commemorated as a saint by the Irish Romanists on Jan. 27, by those of Scotland on July 6. His shrine, or reputed shrine, at Fordun, in the Mearns, in Scotland, was regarded before the Reformation with the greatest reverence, and various localities in the neighborhood are still pointed out as connected with his history. Jocelin of Furness, a monkish writer of the 12th century, states in his life of St. Patrick (Acta Sanctor. Martii, 2, 545; Julii, 2, 289), that Palladius, disheartened by his little success in Ireland, crossed over into Great Britain, and died in the territory of the Picts — a statement which supported as it is by the local traditions of Fordun, may be received as containing a portion of truth. The mediaeval writers have in some instances strangely confounded Palladius, the apostle of the Scoti, with Palladias of Helenopolis; and Trithemius (De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 133), and even Baronius (Annal. Eccles. ad ann. 429, sec. 8), who is followed by Posseina, make the former to be the author of the Dialogus de Vita Chrysostomi. Baronius also ascribes to him (ibid.) Liber contra Pelagianos, Homiliarum Liber unus, and Ad Ccelestinum Epistolarun Liber unus, with other works written in Greek. For these statements he cites the authority of Trithemius, who, however, mentions only the Dialogue. It is probable that the statement rests on the very untrustworthy authority of Bale. See Bale, Script. Illustr. Maj. Britanun. cent, 14 sec. 6 Usher, l.c.; Sallerius, l.c.; Soames, Hist, of the Anglo-Saxon Church; Hetherington, Hist. of the Church of Scotland; Tillemont, Memoires,14. 154 sq., 737; Fabricius, Bibl. Med. et lnf. Lat. v 191 sq.

## Pallant[[@Headword:Pallant]]

             is the ecclesiastical term for an independent episcopal jurisdiction, like the archbishop of Canterbury's peculiar at Chichester.

## Pallas[[@Headword:Pallas]]

             a surname of Athene (Minerva), is always joined with her name in the writings of Homer, but by later writers is used independently.

## Pallavicini, Batista[[@Headword:Pallavicini, Batista]]

             a learned Italian prelate, was born at Venice towards the close of the 14th century. He was archdean of Turin until 1441, when he was made bishop of Reggio. He died in 1466. He wrote Historia flendoe crucis et funeris Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ad Eugenium IV papam (Parma, 1477, 4to). See Ughelli, Italia Sacra, vol. 2.

## Pallavicini, Niccolo-Maria[[@Headword:Pallavicini, Niccolo-Maria]]

             an Italian theologian, was born at Genoa in 1621, and was related to the preceding. In 1638 he joined the Order of the Jesuits, and was finally made a professor of theology by queen Christina of Sweden. He was a great favorite at Rome, and was employed by the popes in several important undertakings. Innocent XI conferred the purple upon Pallavicini, and otherwise favored him. He died Dec. 15, 1672, at Rome. Among his numerous writings the following are noteworthy: Di Jesa della Provideniza divina conti-o i ‘nemici' di ogni religione (Rome, 1799): — Difesa del pontificato Romano e della Chiesa, Cattolica (ibid. 1686, 3 vols. fol.), both able defences, especially the latter, which is by many considered the most consistent and skilful advocacy of papal supremacy. It  is freely quoted by modern Romish apologists. See Sotwel, De Script. Soc. Jesu; Steinmetz, Hist. of the Jesuits (see Index in vol. 3).

## Pallavicino, Ferrante[[@Headword:Pallavicino, Ferrante]]

             an Italian monastic of questionable repute, was born at Parma in 1615. He entered at an early age the Order of the Canons of St. Augustine, and made his vows; but after a few years he found that he had acted rashly, and that he was totally unsuited for the life which he had embraced. With his superior's permission he then travelled. He first repaired to Venice, where he led a life of licentiousness and wrote obscene books. He afterwards went to Germany as chaplain to a nobleman, and returned to Venice just at the time when war broke out between Edoardo Farnese, duke of Parma, and pope Urban VIII, on the subject of the duchy of Castro. Pallavicino wrote in favor of his sovereign the duke, using violent expressions against the pope and his nephews the Barberini. One of his pamphlets was entitled Il Divorzio Celeste, by which he intimated that a divorce had taken place between the Church and its divine founder. Pallavicino, now thinking he was no longer safe in Italy, resolved to go to France; but, unfortunately for him, he was accompanied by a young Frenchman of insinuating address, who proved to be a spy of the Barberini, and who led him unawares into the papal territory of Avignon, where he was immediately seized arid led to prison. He was tried for apostasy and high-treason, and was condemned and beheaded on March 5, 1644, at the early age of twenty-nine years. See Poggiali, Memorie per la Storia Letteraria di Piacenza.

## Pallavicino, Pietro Sforza[[@Headword:Pallavicino, Pietro Sforza]]

             an Italian prelate of great note, distinguished especially as a historical writer, son of the marquis Alexander Pallavicino and Frances Sforza, was born at Rome Nov. 20, 1607. Much to the disgust of his father he chose the ecclesiastical life. Pietro's conduct was so exemplary that he was early appointed one of those prelates who assist in the assemblies called “congregations” at Rome. He was also received into the famous academy of humorists, among whom he often occupied the position of president He was likewise governor of Jesi, and afterwards of Orvieto and Camerino, under pope Urban VIII. But all these advantages did not hinder him, when the papal displeasure threatened him, from renouncing the world and entering, in 1637, the Society of the Jesuits. As soon as he had completed his novitiate he taught philosophy, and then theology. Innocent X, who felt  kindly disposed towards Pallavicino. and considered it politic for the pontificate to recognise erudition, nominated Pallavicino to examine into divers matters relating to the pontificate, among others into the Jansenistic controversy (1651-1653), and Alexander VII created him a cardinal in 1657. This pontiff was an old friend of Pallavicino, who had been serviceable to him when he first came to Rome as simply Fabio Chigi. Pallavicino had even contributed to advance his temporal fortune, and had received him into the academy of the humorists, in gratitude for which Chigi had addressed to him some verses, printed in his book, entitled “Philomathi Musae Juveniles.” At the same time that Pallavicino obtained a place in the sacred college, which was not until 1659, for he hesitated to accept the proffered honor, he was also appointed examiner of the bishops, and afterwards a member of the congregation of the Holy Office, i.e. the Inquisition, and of that of the Council of Trent, whose history he wrote in a most masterly manner. He died at Rome June 5 1667. The best-known of all his writings is his Historia del Concilio de Trento (Rome, 1656-1657, 2 vols. fol.; 1665, 3 vols. 4to), intended as a reply to the still more celebrated and liberal, although by Romanists deeply suspected, work of Paul Sarpi. Pallavicino wrote, of course, as a Jesuit should write, in defence of the papacy, and with an ultramontane coloring. Hence the classical value of his work, is limited, but its style is excellent, and his learning no one has called in question. Comp. Ranke, Gesch. der rom. Papste, ii, 237 sq.; 3, Appendix; Britschar, Beurtheilunq der Controversen Sarpis u. Pallanicino's — (Tubin. 1844); Buckley, Hist. of the Council of Trent (Lond. 1852), Preface; Danz, Gesch. des Tridentinischen Concils (Jena, 1846, 8vo), Preface. Among his other works may be mentioned Vindicationes Soc. Jes. (Rome, 1649): — .Del Bene, a philosophical treatise: — Arte della Perfezione Cristiana-I Fasti Sacri (the unpublished MS. is in the library of Parma): — Ermengilda, a tragedy (ibid. 1644): — Gli Avvertimenti Gramm(tticali (ibid. 1661): — Trattato dello Stilo e delDialogo (ibid. 1662): — and Lettere (ibid. 1668). See Tiraboschi, Storia della Letter. Ital. 8:132-136; Sotwel, Script Soc. Jesu; Burnet, Hist. of the Reformation; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, vol. iv; Stillingfleet, Works, vol. i; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. iii; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index).

## Pallenis[[@Headword:Pallenis]]

             a surname of Athene (Minerva), under which she was worshipped between Athens and Marathon.

## Palliere, Louis Vincent Leon[[@Headword:Palliere, Louis Vincent Leon]]

             a French painter, was born at Bordeaux in 1787. He went to Paris and studied under Vincent, under whom he evinced uncommon talents. In 1812 he gained the first prize of the Academy for his picture of Ulysses Slaying the Suitors of Penelope, which entitled him to go to Rome on a pension from the government. At Rome he painted several classical subjects, and the Flagellation of Christ, which was especially commended. After his return to Paris, he exhibited, in 1819, in the Louvre. St. Peter Curing the Lame Man; Tobit Restoring Sight to his Father; A Shepherd in Repose; Preaching at Night in Rome, and other subjects, and obtained the gold medal of the first class. He died in 1820, in the strength of his manhood, deeply regretted as an artist of great promise.

## Pallium[[@Headword:Pallium]]

             a piece of pontifical dress. It is the peculiar mark of primates, metropolitans, and archbishops, and a few privileged bishops, to be worn by them at councils, ordinations, and on certain occasions in church. Its other names were anophorion, superhumerale, and, in the writings of Theodoret and St. Gregory Nazianzen, hiera stole. It is a circular scarf of plain lambs' wool, worn like a collar about the neck, and having two falling ends fastened over the chasuble by three gold pins fixed on the left shoulder, the breast, and back, the number three signifying charity, or the nails of the cross. Before the 8th century it was ornamented with two or four red or purple, but now with six black, crosses, fastened with gold pins, which superseded an earlier ornament, the Good Shepherd, or one cross, in the 4th century. It has been supposed to be the last relic of an abbreviated toga, reduced to its laticlave by degrees. In the time of Gregory the Great it was made of white linen cloth, without seam or needlework, hanging down from the shoulders. SEE PALL.

## Pallor[[@Headword:Pallor]]

             a divine personification of paleness or fear, which was regarded by the ancient Romans as a companion of Mars.

## Pallorii[[@Headword:Pallorii]]

             a title of the priests of the deity of pallor (q.v.).

## Pallu[[@Headword:Pallu]]

             (Heb. Pallu', פִּלּוּא, distinguished; Sept. Φαλλός, Φαλλούς), a son of Reuben, the head of a family (Palluites) in his tribe (Gen 46:9 [“Phallu”]; Exo 6:14; Num 26:5; Num 26:8; 1Ch 6:3). B.C. cir. 1870.

## Pallu, Francois[[@Headword:Pallu, Francois]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born at Tours in 1625, and after entering holy orders was called to places of much importance in the Church. He resigned the canonicate of the church at St. Martin to enter the work of foreign missions. The Church recognised his fitness for such labors by making him bishop of Heliopolis, and vicar-apostolic of Fo-Kien, in China. As he  opposed the Jesuits, he encountered much persecution, and was twice obliged to return home. He died in the midst of his work, Oct. 29,1684, holding the position of general administrator of missions. He left a work entitled Relation abregge des Missions et des Voyages des Evdques Frangais envoyes aux Royaumes de la Chine, Cochinchine, Tonquin, et Siam (Paris, 1862, 8vo).

## Pallu, Martin[[@Headword:Pallu, Martin]]

             cousin of the preceding, was a noted member of the Order of the Jesuits, which so rigidly opposed Francois Pallu. Martin was born at Tours in 1661. He took his first vows in 1679, and then began preaching. So successful were his ecclesiastical labors that in 1711 he was made director of the congregation of the Virgin. He died May 20, 1742, at Paris. He wrote, Les Quatre Fins de l'Fomme (Paris, 1739, 1828, 12mo): — Du frequent Usage des Sacrements de Pezitence et d'Eucharistie (1739, 1846, 12mo); besides his Senrmons (1744, 1750, 6 vols. 12mo).

## Palluite[[@Headword:Palluite]]

             (Heb. Pallui'. פִּלֻּאַי, gentile from Pallu [q.v.]; Sept. ὁ δῆμος τοῦ Φαλλουί), a member of the family in the tribe of Reuben, descendants of PALLU (Num 26:5).

## Palm[[@Headword:Palm]]

             is a frequent rendering of the Hebrew כִּ, kaph, properly something curved or hollow, and hence the interior of the hand. It is used as a general word for the hand, both in literal and figurative expressions, e.g. Ezra 21:16; 1Sa 4:3, as well as for the palms only, as Lev 18:26; Dan 10:10. It is also applied, like the Latin palma, to the branches of the palm-tree, from their curved form; as Lev 23:40. But the palm-tree is denoted in Hebrew by the word tamar, תָּמָר, from a root meaning to stand erect (Joe 1:12; Son 7:9; Exo 15:27), and by the word תֹּמֶר, tomer, from the same root. SEE HAND; SEE PALM-TREE.

## Palm Sunday[[@Headword:Palm Sunday]]

             (Lat. Dominica Palmarum, or Dom. in Palmis) is the name usually given to the last Sunday of Lent, after the custom of blessing branches of the palm-tree, or of other trees substituted in those countries in which palm, cannot be procured, and of carrying the blessed branches in procession, in commemoration of Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Joh 12:12-16; Mat 12:1-11; Mar 11:1-11). Palms and the branches of palms were used in this important historic entry because they were then regarded as an emblem of victory, and the carrying and waving of its branches was emblematic of success and in honor of royalty. At the time of this triumphal entry a psalm of rejoicing was chanted by the thousands who recognised the royalty of Christ. No sooner did he enter the city than he proceeded to the Temple, and wrought several miracles for the relief of both maimed and blind who came to him. These things were done on the day when the lamb was separated and devoted for the Paschal service, and other preparations were made for the Passover.

The date of the first observance of Palm-Sunday by the Church is uncertain. The name is as old as the time of Amalarius. I In the Greek Church Palm-Sunday was apparently observed as early as the 4th century. The writings of the Greek fathers contain allusions to the celebration of this day. In the Western Church there are no signs of the observance of it during the first six centuries. The first writer in the West who expressly refers to it is St. Ambrose; but according to Venerable Bede the usage certainly existed in the 7th century. A special service is found in the Roman missal, and also in the Greek euchologies, for the blessing of “branches of palms and olives;” but in many countries other trees, as in England the yew or the willow, and in Brittany the box, are blessed instead. A procession is formed, the members of which issue from the church carrying branches in their hands, and singing a hymn, suited to the occasion, of very ancient origin. In the Greek Church the book of the Gospels is borne in front. In some of the Catholic countries of the West, a priest, or occasionally a lay figure, was led at the head, mounted upon an ass, in commemoration of Christ's entry into the city a usage which still exists in some parts of Spain and Spanish America. Before the party returns to the church the doors have been closed, and certain strophes of the hymn are sung alternately by a choir within the church and by the procession without, when, on the subdeacon's knocking at the door, it is again thrown open, and the procession re-enters. During the singing of the Passion in the solemn mass  which ensues, the congregation hold the palm branches in their hands, and at the conclusion of the service they are carried to their respective homes, where they are preserved during the year.

At Rome, the Procession of the Palms, in which the pope has his place, is among the most striking of the picturesque ceremonies:of the Holy Week. In the “Capelle Pontificie,” the only authorized rubric of the mode in which these high ceremonies are to be conducted, is the following account of the ceremony of the palms: “Before describing the blessing of the palms, it is necessary to remember that the festival, the blessing and the procession of palms, was instituted for the solemn entrance of Jesus Christ into the city of Jerusalem, that by the faithful united it might not only be represented in spirit every year to the Christian multitude, but might also be renewed in some other mode. Besides this the Church wished to signify by this solemn ceremony the glorious entrance into heaven which the divine Redeemer will make with the elect after the general judgment.” Seymour thus describes the ceremony: “The pope, as the vicar of Jesus Christ, and therefore his most suitable representative, is carried into St. Peter's, not indeed meek and lowly, riding upon an ass, but seated in his chair, and carried on the shoulders of eight men. He is arrayed in all possible magnificence, preceded by the long line of bishops and cardinals in their robes of splendor, accompanied by all the high officers of state, and surrounded by the naked swords of his guardsmen. After he descends from the litter, and takes his place upon the throne, and has received the homage of each cardinal, as usual on those state occasions, the ceremonies peculiar to the day commence. Three priests, each carrying aloft a palm, descend from the high-altar, and slowly approach the throne.

The pope receives them, reading over them a prescribed form of prayer, sprinkling them with holy water, and thus blessing them. Each cardinal, archbishop, bishop, prelate, ambassador, etc., then approaches the throne, and on his knees receives a palm from the pope, which he accepts with the usual forms of kissing the hand, or knee, or foot of the pope, according to his rank, and then retires to his place. When every person is thus supplied, the procession of palms is formed; the pope leaving his throne again, mounts his chair on the men's shoulders, and preceded by candles lighted, the choir singing, the incense burning the whole column in their magnificent and many colored robes moves down the aisle by one side of the high-altar, and returns by the other. Borne above all by the height of the litter, his holiness moves, the conspicuous representation of ‘the meek and lowly One.' As the procession moves slowly along, the splendor of the costumes, their brilliant  colors, and their gold and silver brocade-the long array of mitres, and many branches of palms moving among them-the strains of sacred music from the choir, mingling with the heavy tramp of the guardsmen — the long and brilliant lines of military extending the whole length of the church, and the procession itself, with the pope lifted on high above all, and all this in the most magnificent temple in the world, presents to the eye a scene of pageantry most striking and beautiful, but wholly ineffective, because unsuitable as representing the entrance of Jesus Christ into Jerusalem.

When the procession has ended, and the pope has returned to the throne, and the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, etc., have retired to their places, the high mass is celebrated, and an indulgence granted to all present, a special rubric being used on this occasion.” Each member of the congregation carries home his branch, which is regarded as a charm against diseases. Some of these branches are reserved to burn to ashes for the next Ash-Wednesday. In England Palm-Sunday anciently was celebrated with much ceremony; but the blessing and procession of the palms was discontinued in the Church of England, together with the other ceremonies abolished in the reign of Edward VI. (For the different ceremonies anciently observed on Palm-Sunday in England, see Walcott, Sacred Archeology, p. 421-424; Brand, Popular Antiquities of Great Britain [see Index in vol. 3]. See also Collier, Eccles. Hist. 2:241; Wheatley, Commentary on Book of Common Prayer, p. 222.) At a recent observance of Palm-Sunday by Romish churches in the diocese of New York, palms supplied from Charleston, S.C., were used. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v. Palmsonntag.

The ordinary reckoning of the events of Passion-week places this event, as its name imports, on Sunday; but a more careful examination of the Gospel narratives inclines us to locate it on Monday. The indications of date are most explicit in the Gospel of John, which states (Joh 12:1) that the final arrival of Jesus at Bethany was “six days before the Passover.” That this term is inclusive of both extremes is clear not only from the usual method of reckoning such intervals among the Jews (comp. especially Joh 20:26; Mat 26:1), but also from the fact that as Jericho was about one day's journey distant, Jesus would otherwise have been obliged to travel the entire Sabbath, instead of spending that sacred day, as he naturally would and actually seems to have done, at Zacchaeus's house (Luk 19:5). The Passover-day that year was Friday — as all admit the 15th of Nisan (Num 33:3); the Paschal lamb was slain on the  afternoon of the 14th (Exo 12:6), and it was eaten in the evening immediately after (Lev 23:5), i.e. Thursday. (Andrews, in his Life of our Lord, p. 397, misstates this position, as “making the 14th fall on Friday,” and yet “including both extremes” in the six days referred to; which would not “make the arrival on Sunday, the 10th,” but on the 9th, which we compute to have been Saturday.) But it is most natural to regard the evening only when the Passover-meal was eaten — in this case Thursday evening, or that beginning the 15th — as the included terminus ad quem, or the sixth day, and the afternoon of the day when our Lord arrived at Bethany as the included terminus a quo, or the first day of the series. This leaves only four whole days in the interval (precisely as the “three days — and three nights” of Christ's remaining in the tomb, Mat 12:40, are known to have been but one whole day and fractions of the preceding and following days), and brings the arrival at Bethany on Sunday. The triumphal entry into Jerusalem certainly took place the very next morning (Joh 12:12), i.e. on Monday.

Those who place this last event on Sunday must not only reckon the Passover as having fallen that year on Thursday, but they must also exclude both extremes in the computation of the six days in question; or else they will bring — as in fact they do — the arrival at Bethany on either Saturday or Friday afternoon. Either of these days is extremely improbable; Saturday, as requiring the whole Sabbath to have been spent in travelling, and Friday as bringing. the feast — narrated by John as occurring the same evening (12:2 sq.) — with all its bustle and special preparation, on the beginning of the same sacred day (i.e. from sunset; for the δεῖπνον cannot have been any other than an evening “supper”).

This view is confirmed almost to certainty by the order of subsequent events during Passion-week as narrated by each of the evangelists. They allow a space of five days only for all these transactions, beginning with the entry into Jerusalem, and ending with the crucifixion. As the latter is almost universally conceded to have taken place on Friday, the former must have occurred on Monday. Thus Matthew assigns the first day to the triumphal entry and the cleansing of the Temple (Mat 21:1-17, ending with the lodging at Bethany); Mark has the same arrangement (Mar 11:1-11); Luke also, but not so explicitly (Luk 19:29-46); and John likewise, but still less definitely (Joh 12:12-19). The second day was occupied with cursing the barren fig-tree (“in the morning as he returned from Bethany,” Mat 21:18; Mar 11:12), and various  teachings, closing again at Bethany (Mar 11:19), and the third with witnessing the withering of the tree (“in the morning” again, Mar 11:20), and still other teachings. Luke vaguely joins both these two days' proceedings together (“daily,” Luk 19:47; “on one of those days,” Luk 20:1); while John passes them over with but one intimation of time (“at the feast,” Joh 12:20), although we know from all the evangelists that they embraced an extensive series of discourses to various classes, concluding with the remarkable prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, etc. That this closed Christ's public teachings is directly stated (Mat 24:1; Mar 13:1; Joh 12:36). But there is not an intimation that more than three days were consumed up to this time. It was now two days prior to the Passover (Mat 26:1-2; Mar 14:1). These “two days” at the utmost can only make five, when added to the preceding three. They are to be computed of course as before, i.e. inclusively of both extremes, namely, one day for that immediately following the previous discourses, or, on our reckoning, from Wednesday afternoon to Thursday afternoon, and the other from Thursday afternoon onward into the ensuing evening of the Paschal meal with which the Passover was introduced. In this way every note of time is consistently observed. The single intermediate or apparently vacant day (Thursday) was spent by our Lord in private preparation for the coming solemnities, and by Judas in bargaining for the betrayal of his Master. To take two entire days for these purposes is opposed to the requirements of the case, as well as the whole tenor of the Scripture narrative. It was in fact but Thursday morning that remained unoccupied, for in the afternoon the disciples were despatched to prepare the Passover meal (Mat 26:17; Mar 14:12; Luk 22:7). The phrase “after two days,” used by both evangelists here, can only mean, as we would say, day after to-morrow; for it obviously cannot be the same as simply “to-morrow,” nor yet “the second day after to-morrow.” And that it dates from Wednesday is certain from Matthew's expression, “When (ὅτε) Jesus had finished all these sayings.” That its terminus ad quem, “the feast of the Passover” (τὸ πάσχα γίνεται), includes the proper Passover-day on Friday, seems clear from the added clause, “When the Son of Man is betrayed to be crucified.” The betrayal itself must have occurred considerably past midnight or on Friday morning. It is only by neglecting or violating some element of the evangelical history that Palm-day can be brought on Sunday. Even the accurate Dr. Robinson acknowledges in his later edition of his Harmony  that he was misled in the days of Passion-week by following too implicitly the authority of the learned Lightfoot.

## Palm, J. H. Van Der, D.D.[[@Headword:Palm, J. H. Van Der, D.D.]]

             one of the most famous of modern Dutch theologians, was born at Rotterdam, July 17, 1763. He was educated at the university in Leyden,  where he was noted for purity of morals as well as for diligence in study. He was a particular favorite of the learned Schultens. After the completion of his studies he preached for some time, and gained great celebrity in the Low Countries as a pulpit orator. He possessed the Ciceronian polish, and for many years he was the Dutch orator par excellence; men of all professions acknowledged him as at the head of the art. He was also a professor of Oriental languages and antiquities at his alma mater, and as such likewise excelled his fellow-countrymen. He died Sept. 18, 1840. Van der Palm wrote much; but none of his works have been translated into English, and they are now but in limited circulation even in his own country. His biography, with ten of his sermons, has been given an English dress by one of our most valued contributors. the Rev. J. P. Westervelt, D.D., under the title Life and Character of J. H. Van der Palm, D.D., sketched by Nicholas Betts, D.D. (N.Y. 1865,- 12mo). The sermons in this volume exhibit an accuracy of thought and. expression rarely met with, and also contain passages of poetic beauty which one would scarcely expect to find in sermons written amid the fogs of Holland. The style of thought is so thoroughly English that either the work of translation has been done with remarkable skill, or else the character of the Dutch mind must resemble the English much more closely than is generally believed to be the case. (J.H.W.)

## Palm, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Palm, Johann Georg]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hanover, December 7, 1697. He studied at Jena, was for some time court-chaplain at Wolfenbiittel, in 1727 pastor at Hamburg, and died February 17, 1743. He is the author of, Einleitung in die Geschichte der augsburgischen Confession (Hamburg, 1730): — De Codicibus Veteris et Novi Testamenti Quibus Lutherus in Conficienda Intepretatione Germanica usus est (1735): — Geschichte der Bibelbersetzung Dr. Martin Luther's (edited by J.M. Gotze, Halle, 1772). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:167; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Palm-Synod[[@Headword:Palm-Synod]]

             (Palmaris Synodus), an important ecclesiastical council, so called after the building in which it was held (“A porticu beati Petri Apostoli qum appellatur ad Palmaria,” as Anastasius says), was convened by Theodoric in A.D. 50 (Gieseler and others place it in A.D. 503) to consider the charges of simony and adultery brought against Symmachus (q.v.) by his rival Laurentius (q.v.). The verdict of the synod and of the king was in favor of the former. He was acquitted without investigation, on the presumption that it did not behoove the council to pass judgment respecting the successor of St. Peter. SEE PAPACY. Of course the opposition was not satisfied with this decision, and the ecclesiastical strife continued for some time. Among the ablest defenders of the synodic decision is the deacon Ennodius, afterwards bishop of Pavia (died 521), who in his work Libellus apologeticus pro Synodo IV Romana (in Mansi, 8:274) favored the absolutism of the papacy, and claimed that the incumbent of St. Peter's chair should be regarded as above every human tribunal, and as responsible only to God himself. See Hefele, ConcilienGesch. 2:615 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2:324, 325; Gieaeler, Eccles. Hist. 1:338; Nitzsch, De Synodo Palmari (Wittenb. 1775).

## Palm-Tree, Christian Symbolism Of[[@Headword:Palm-Tree, Christian Symbolism Of]]

             1. The palm has been among all nations a symbol of victory: “What is signified by the palm,” says St. Gregory the Great (Homily on Ezechiel 2:17), “except the reward of victory?” The primitive Church used it to express the triumph of the Christian over death through the resurrection. “The just shall flourish as the palm” (Psa 91:13), over the world, the flesh, and the devil, by the general exercise of the Christian virtues. The palm is the symbol of those conflicts which are carried on between the flesh and the spirit (Origen, in Joan. xxi; Ambrose, in Luc. vii).

On the tombs the palm is generally accompanied by the monogram of Christ, signifying that every victory of the Christian is due to this divine name and sign, “By this conquer.” This intention' appears very evident  when, as in the present instance (Bosio, p. 436), the monogram is surrounded by palms. Perhaps the same signification should be given to the palm joined to the figure of the Good Shepherd, or to the crook which is its hieroglyphic sign, to the fish (Perret, IV, 16:3,10, 49), or to any other symbolical figure of the Savior. When engraved upon portable articles, as upon jewels (Perret, ibid. and 13, 25, etc.), the palm seems to express, not only victory already gained, but victory in anticipation; it should therefore serve to encourage the Christain yet battling with the world, as it places before his eyes the reward which awaits the victor.

2. But the palm is especially the symbol of martyrdom; for to the early Christian death was victory; therefore we conquer when we fall, says Tertullian (Apol. 1); and as St. Gregory appositely remarks (l.c.), “it is concerning those who have vanquished the old enemy in the combat of martyrdom, and who now rejoice at their victory over the world, that it is written, ‘They have palms in their hands'” (Rev 7:9). The palm of martyrdom has also become, in the language of the Church, a classical and sacramental expression. In the diptychs, the acts of the martyrs, and the martyrologies, we read: “He has received the palm of martyrdom — he has been crowned with the palm of the martyrs” (Cassiodorus, De Persecut. Vandal. apud Ruin. 15:73). St. Agatha replied to the tyrant, “If you do not rend my body upon the rack, my soul cannot enter the paradise of God with the palm of martyrdom.” Thus it has become the custom to paint martyrs with a palm in their hands; and the symbol is so common that no one can misunderstand it. “To the people the palm signifies that the valiant athletes have gained the victory” (Cassiodorus, Variar. 1:28). Each of them, says Bellarmine (De Eccl. Triumph. 11:10), is represented with the special instrument of his torture; the attribute common to all is the palm. In the mosaic of St. Praxedus (Ciampini, Vet. Mo N.T. xi, tab. xlv), on every side of the great arch are seen, exactly according to the Apocalypse (Rev 7:9), a vast multitude of persons, the great multitude whom no man can number, having palms in their hands. Other mosaics have two palm-trees spanning the whole picture, and bearing fruits which are the emblem of the martyr's rewards. This symbol had previously been used in the Catacombs. On all the monuments representing our Lord between St. Peter and St. Paul, the palm-tree is generally surmounted by a phoenix, a double symbol of the resurrection given to the apostle to the  Gentiles, because he was the first and most zealous preacher of this consoling doctrine.

3. The palm is doubtless often found upon the tombs of faithful ones who were not martyrs; some of these bear dates earlier than those of the persecutions (Aringhi, 2:639). It had become such a common ornament that moulds were made of it in baked clay (D'Agincourt, Terres cuites, 34:5), which were used as an expeditious means of stamping the form of a palm upon the fresh lime of the loculi, a very useful expedient in the extreme haste which, in times of persecution, was necessary in such clandestine burials.

Be this as it may, it was none the less certain that the palm was frequently used as a symbol of martyrdom. There were palms upon the tomb of Caius, both a pope and a martyr. They were also on those of the martyrs Tiburtius, Valerians, Maximianus, found in the confession of Cecil (Aringhi, 2:642); the titulus of the young martyr FILUMENA shows a palm among the instruments of torture (Perret, V, 42:3); there are several other examples found in Boldetti (p. 233). It seems difficult to mistake the indications of martyrdom on one sepulchral stone (Perret, V, 37:120), where the deceased is represented as standing with a palm in the left hand and a crown in the right, a cartouch in front bearing the inscription, (I)NOCENTINA DVLCIS FI(LIA). A similar intention may be found in the palms which are traced upon the stucco enveloping vases of blood (Bottari, tab. cci sq.), and in those which decorate the disk of some lamps which were-burned before the tombs of martyrs (Bartoli, Aut. lucern. pt. 3, tab. 22).

But while it is established that the palm is common to all Christian sepulchres, it follows that it is not a certain sign of martyrdom, at least when it is not joined to other symbols which are recognised as certain, such as inscriptions expressing a violent death, the instruments of martyrdom, — or vases or cloths stained with blood. Papebroch and Mabillon were of the opinion that these two symbols should be taken together, so that the palm alone, without the vase of blood, was not a sufficient proof of martyrdom. Boldetti holds that they should be taken separately, as having the same value. Notwithstanding this declaration, Fabretti excludes the palm, and affirms that, in the recognition of holy bodies, it is founded only upon the vase of blood. After this, Muratori (Antiq. med. oev. dissert. lvii) shows that the palm alone is not sufficient proof of martyrdom. Lastly,  Benedict XIV (De Beatif. et Can. IV, 2:28), while he cites the degree, declares nevertheless “that in the practice of those who superintend the excavation of cemeteries, the only ground on which it rests is, not the palm, but the vase stained with blood.”

## Palm-tree[[@Headword:Palm-tree]]

             (תָּמָר, tamar, so called doubtless from its tall, straight, and slender stem; Arab. tamar likewise; Gr. φοινιξ). Under this generic term many species are botanically included; but we have here only to do with the date-palm, the Phoenix dactylifera of Linnaeus. Travellers, and even Biblical writers, however, not unfrequently figure in its stead the dom-palm of Egypt, which is distinguished by its branching stem and hard, single drupe.

I. Description. — The palms are the princes of the vegetable kingdom. With the cylindrical stem, unbroken by branches, springing high into the air and unfurling a canopy of enormous leaves, fan-shaped or feathery, in the shadow of which are suspended great clusters of fruit, no tree can look more lordly or more bountiful. The areca of the West Indies shoots up to an altitude of one hundred and fifty feet, and a single leaf of the talipot will  give shelter to fifteen or twenty people. On the farinaceous pith of the raphia and sagusa (saco) the Sumatrans and other inhabitants of the Indian Archipelago have long relied for a chief part of their subsistence, just as the cocoa-nut has sustained for centuries the islanders of the Pacific Ocean; and, more inexhaustible than the petroleum springs of the New World, palm-oil promises to supply light to Europe and wealth to Africa through all the coming ages.

The date-palm in height is from 30 or 40 feet to 70 or 80. It seldom bears fruit till six, eight, or even ten years after it has been planted; but it will continue to be productive for one hundred years (Psa 92:14). If we say sixty or seventy, and assign to it an average crop of 100 lbs. a year, each fruit-bearing tree will have yielded two or three tons of dates as tribute to its owners in the course of its lifetime. “The palm grows slowly but steadily, uninfluenced by those alternations of the seasons which affect other trees. It does not rejoice overmuch in winter's copious rain, nor does it droop under the drought and burning sun of summer. Neither heavy weights, which men place upon its head, nor the importunate urgency of the wind. can sway it aside from perfect uprightness. There it stands, looking calmly down upon the world below, and patiently yielding its large clusters of golden fruit from generation to generation. Nearly every palace and mosque and convent in the country has such trees in the courts, and, being well protected there, they flourish exceedingly” (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 65 sq.).

It is remarkable for its erect and cylindrical stem, crowned with a cluster of long and feather-like leaves, and is as much esteemed for its fruit, the “date,” as for its juice, whether fermented or not, known as “palm wine,” and for the numerous uses to which every part of the plant is applied. The peculiarities of the palm-tree are such that they could not fail to attract the attention of the writers of any country where it is indigenous, and especially from its being an indication of the vicinity of water even in the-midst of the most desert country. Its roots, though not penetrating very deep or spreading very wide, yet support a stem of considerable height, which is remarkable for its uniformity of thickness throughout. The center of this lofty stem, instead of being the hardest part, as in other trees, is soft and spongy, and the bundles of woody fibres successively produced in the interior are regularly pushed outwards, until the outer part becomes the most dense and hard, and is hence most fitted to answer the, purposes of wood. The outside, though devoid of branches, is marked with a number of  protuberances, which are the points of insertion of former leaves. The leaves are from four to six or eight feet in length, ranged in a bunch around the top of the stem; the younger and softer being in the center, and the older and outer series hanging down. They are employed for covering the roofs or sides of houses, for fences, framework, mats, and baskets. The male and female flowers being on different trees, the latter require to be fecundated by the pollen of the former before the fruit can ripen. The tender part of the spatha of the flowers being pierced, a bland and sweet juice exudes, which, being evaporated, yields sugar, and is no doubt what is alluded to in some passages of Scripture; if it be fermented and distilled a strong spirit or arak is yielded. The fruit, however, which is yearly produced in numerous clusters and in the utmost abundance, is its chief value; for whole tribes of Arabs and Africans find their chief sustenance in the date, of which even the stony seeds, being ground down, yield nourishment to the camel of the desert.

With an imagination and a vocabulary equally copious, the Arabs are said to have three hundred and sixty names or epithets for the palm-tree, and to be able to enumerate three hundred and sixty uses to which different portions are applied. Certainly it would be difficult to name a more serviceable tree. Not only is its fruit a daily article of diet, but various preparations from it are used as medicines and tonics. “On the abortive fruit and ground date-stones the camels are fed. From the leaves they make couches, baskets, bags, mats, brushes, and fly-traps; from the trunk cages for their poultry and fences for their gardens; and other parts of the tree furnish fuel. From the fibrous webs at the bases of the leaves thread is procured, which is twisted into ropes and rigging; and from the sap, which is collected by cutting off the head of the palm, and scooping out a hollow in its stem, a spirituous liquor is prepared” (Burnett, Outlines of Botany, p. 400). No wonder that to the present day in the proverbs and the poetry of the East the palm is constantly reappearing. Says Mohammed, “Honor your maternal aunt, the date-palm; for she was created in paradise, of the same earth from which Adam was made.” In the same spirit we are told by a later Moslem tradition, “Adam was permitted to bring with him out of paradise three things — the myrtle, which is the chief of sweet-scented flowers in the world; an ear of wheat, the chief of all kinds of food; and dates, the chief of all the fruits of the world.” These dates were conveyed to the Hejaz, where they grew up, and became the progenitors of all the other date-palms in Asia, Africa, and Europe; and it is the decree of Allah  that all the countries where they grow shall belong to the faithful! (see Quarterly Review, cxiv. 214). The later Hebrews have a proverb, alluding to the mixture of evil with the best possessions, “In two cabs of dates there is a cab of stones and more;” and referring to the usefulness of little things, the Arabs say, “A small datestone props up the water-jar.” In their own ironical fashion, when the modern Egyptians would describe a great boaster, they say, “He paid a derhem for some dates, and now he has his palm-trees in the village.” For the greater part the date-trees belong to ancient families, and to possess them is a sign of wealth and high lineage; but this magniloquent fellow passes off his sorry purchase as the fruit of his own plantation. Beyond its substantial uses, the palm is endeared by many bright and sacred associations. Its erect and columnar trunk, so regularly notched and indented, supplied to Solomon a chief means of ornamentation in the construction of the Temple (1Ki 6:29; 1Ki 6:32; 1Ki 6:35; 1Ki 7:36), and copies in brick of palm-tree logs survive in the rude architecture of Chaldaea (see Loftus, Chaldea and Susiana, p. 175). The branch or pinnated leaf — the mid-rib with its taper, sharp-pointed leaflets, alternately diverging, and forming a long and glossy plume of polished verdure — is itself a graceful object, and was doubly welcome, as its far- seen signal announced to the desert-ranger a halting-place, with food and cool shadow overhead, and wells of water underneath.

II. Locality. — The family of palms is characteristic of tropical countries, and but few of them extend into northern latitudes. In the Old World the species Phoenix dactylifera is that found farthest north. It spreads along the course of the Euphrates and Tigris across to Palmyra and the Syrian coast of the Mediterranean. It has been introduced into the south of Spain, and thrives well at Malaga; and is also cultivated at Bordaghiere, in the south of France, chiefly on account of its leaves, which are sold at two periods of the year — in spring for Palm-Sunday, and again at the Jewish Passover. In the south of Italy and Sicily, lady Calcott states that “near Genoa there is a narrow, warm, sandy valley full of palms, but they are diminutive in growth, and unfruitful.” Anciently the date-palm grew very abundantly (more abundantly than now) in many parts of the Levant. On this subject generally it is enough to refer to Ritter's monograph (“Ueber die geographische Verbreitung der Dattelpalme”) in his Erdkunde, and also published separately. See also Kempfer, Amoetates Exoticoe, and Celsius, Hierobot. 1, 444-579; Moody, The Palm-tree (Lond. 1860). While this tree was abundant generally in the Levant, it was regarded by the ancients  as peculiarly characteristic of Palestine and the neighboring regions (Συρία, ὅπου φοίνικες οἱ καρποφόροι, Xenoph. Cyrop. 6:2, § 22;” Judea inclyta est palmis,” Pliny, Nat. Hist. 13:4; “Palmetis [Judaeis] proceritas et decor,” Tacit. Hist. v. 6; comp. Strabo, 17:800, 818; Theophrast. Hist. Plant. 2:8; Pausan. 9:19, § 5). It is curious that this tree, once so abundant in Judea, is now comparatively rare, except in the Philistine plain, and in the old Phoenicia (so named from it) about Beirut. Old trunks are washed up in the Dead Sea. It is abundant in Egypt, and is occasionally found near springs in the Desert. It nowhere flourishes without a perennial supply of fresh water at the root. The well-known coin of Vespasian representing the palm-tree with the legend “Judaea capta” is figured in vol. 6, p. 486.

III. Scripture Notices. —

1. As to the industrial and domestic uses of the palm, it is well known that they are very numerous; but there is no clear allusion to them in the Bible. That the ancient Orientals, however, made use of wine and honey obtained from the palm-tree is evident from Herodotus (1:193; 2:86), Strabo (16, ch. 14, ed. Kram.), and Pliny (Nat. Hist. 13:4). It is indeed possible that the honey mentioned in some places may be palm-sugar. (In 2Ch 31:5 the margin has “dates.”)

2. The following places may be enumerated from the Bible as having some connection with the palm-tree, either in the derivation of the name, or in the mention of the tree as growing on the spot.

(1.) At ELIM, one of the stations of the Israelites between Egypt and Sinai, it is expressly stated that there were “twelve wells (fountains) of water, and threescore and ten palm-trees” (Exo 15:27; Num 33:9). The word “fountains” of the latter passage is more correct than the “wells” of the former: it is more in harmony, too, with the habits of the tree; for, as Theophrastus says (l.c.), the palm ἐπιζητεῖ μᾶλλον τὸ ναματιαῖον ὕδωρ. There are still palm-trees and fountains in Wady Ghurundel, which is generally identified with Elim (Robinson, Bib. Res. 1:69).

(2.) Next, it should be observed that ELATH (Deu 2:8; 1Ki 9:26; 2Ki 14:22; 2Ki 16:6; 2Ch 8:17; 2Ch 26:2) is another plural form of the same word, and may likewise mean “the palm-trees.” See Prof. Stanley's remarks (Sin. and Pal. p. 20, 84, 519), and compare Reland (Palaest. p. 930). This place vas in Edom (probably Akaba); and  we are reminded here of the “Idumaese palmae” of Virgil (Georg. 3:12) and Martial (10:50).

(3.) No place in Scripture is so closely associated with the subject before us as JERICHO. Its rich palm-groves are connected with two very different periods — with that of Moses and Joshua on the one hand, and that of the evangelists on the other. As to the former, the mention of “Jericho, the city of palm-trees” (Deu 34:3), gives a peculiar vividness to the Lawgiver's last view from Pisgah; and even after the narrative of the conquest we have the children of the Kenite, Moses's father-in-law, again associated with “the city of palm-trees” (Jdg 1:16). So Jericho is described in the account of the Moabitish invasion after the death of Othniel (Jdg 3:13); and, long after, we find the same phrase applied to it in the reign of Ahaz (2Ch 28:15). What the extent of these palm-groves may have been in the desolate period of Jericho we cannot tell; but they were renowned in the time of the Gospels and Josephus. The Jewish historian mentions the luxuriance of these trees again and again; not only in allusion to the time of Moses (Ant. iv, 6,1), but in the account of the Roman campaign under Pompey (id. 14:4, 1; War. 1:6, 6), the proceedings of Antony and Cleopatra (Ant. 15:4, 2),and the war. of Vespasian (War. 4:8, 2, 3). Herod the Great did much for Jericho, and took great interest in its palm-groves. Hence Horace's “Herodis palmeta pinguia” (Ep. 2:2,184), .which seems almost to have been a proverbial expression. Nor is this the only heathen testimony to the same fact. Strabo describes this immediate neighborhood as πλεονάζον τῷ φοίνικι, ἐπὶ, μῆκος σταδίων ἑκατόν (16:763), and Pliny says, “Hiericuntem palmetis consitam” (Hist. Nat. v. 14), and adds elsewhere that, while palm-trees grow well in other parts of Judaea, “Hiericunte maxime” (13:4). See also Galen, De Aliment. facult. ii, and Justin. 36:3. Shaw (Trav. p. 371 fol.) speaks of several of these trees still remaining at Jericho in his time, but later travelers have seen but slight vestiges of them.

(4.) The name of HAZEZON-TAMAR, “the felling of the palm-tree,” is clear in its derivation. This place is mentioned in the history both of Abraham (Gen 14:7) and of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 20:2). In the second of these passages it is expressly identified with Engedi, which was on the western edge of the Dead Sea; and here we can adduce, as a valuable illustration of what is before us, the language of the Apocrypha, “I was exalted like a palm-tree in Engaddi” (Sir 24:14). Here again, too, we can quote alike Josephus (γεννᾶται ἐν αὐτῇ φοίνιξ ὁ  κάλλιστος, Ant. 9:1, 2) and Pliny (“Engadda oppidum. secundum ab Hierosolymis, fertilitate palmetorumque nemoribus,” Hist. Nat. v. 17).

(5.) Another place having the same element in its name, and doubtless the. same characteristic in its scenery, was BAAL-TAMAR (Jdg 20:33), the Βηθθαμάρ of Eusebius. Its position was near Gibeah of Benjamin; and it could not be far from Deborah's famous palm-tree (Jdg 4:5), if indeed it was not identical with it, as is suggested by Stanley (Sin. and Pal. p. 146).

(6.) We must next mention the TAMAR, “the palm,” which is set before us in the vision of Eze 47:19; Eze 48:28, as appoint from which the southern border of the land is to be measured eastward and westward. Robinson identifies it with the θαμαρώ of Ptolemy (v. 16), and thinks its site may be at el-Milh, between Hebron and Wady Musa (Bib. Res. 2:198, 202). It seems from Jerome to have been in his day a Roman fortress.

(7.) There is little doubt that Solomon's TADMOR, afterwards the famous Palmyra, on another desert frontier far to the north-east of Tamar, is primarily the same word; and that, as Gibbon says (Decline and Fall, 2:38), “the name, by its signification in the Syriac as well as in the Latin language, denoted the multitude of palm-trees which afforded shade and verdure to that temperate region.” In fact, while the undoubted reading in 2Ch 8:4 is תִּדְמוֹר, the best text in 1Ki 9:18 is תָּמָר. See Josephus, Ant. 8:6,1. The springs which he mentions there make the palm-trees almost a matter of course. Abulfeda, who flourished in the 14th century, expressly mentions the palm-tree as common at Palmyra in his time; and it is still called by the Arabs by the ancient name of Tadmr.

(8.) Nor, again, are the places of the N.T. without their associations with this characteristic tree of Palestine. BETHANY, according to most authorities, means “the house of dates;” and thus we are reminded that the palm grew in the neighborhood of the Mount of Olives. This helps our realization of our Savior's entry into Jerusalem, when the people “took branches of palm-trees and went forth to meet him” (Joh 12:13). This, again, carries our thoughts backward to the time when the Feast of Tabernacles was first kept after the Captivity, when the proclamation was given that they should “go forth unto the mount and fetch palm-branches” (Neh 8:15) — the only branches, it may be observed (those of the willow excepted), which are specified by name in the original institution of  the festival (Lev 23:40). From this Gospel incident comes Palm- Sunday (Dominica in Ramis Palmarum), which is observed with much ceremony in some countries where true palms can be had. Even in northern latitudes (in Yorkshire, for instance) the country people use a substitute which comes into flower just before Easter:

 “And willow-branches hallow,

 That they palmes do use to call.”

(9.) The word PHOENICIA (Φοινίκη), which occurs twice in the N.T. (Act 11:19; Act 15:3), is in all probability derived from the Greek word (φοίνιξ) for a palm. Sidonius mentions palms as a product of Phoenicia (Paneg; Majorian. 44). See also Pliny, Hist. Nat. 13:4; Athen. 1:21. Thus we may imagine the same natural objects in connection with Paul's journeys along the coast to the north of Palestine, as with the wanderings of the Israelites through the desert on the south.

(10.) Lastly, PHOENICE (Φοίνιξ), in the island of Crete, the harbor which Paul was prevented by the storm from reaching (Act 27:12), has doubtless the same derivation. Both Theophrastus and Pliny say that palm- trees are indigenous in this island. See Hock's Kreta, 1:38, 388.

3. From the passages where there is a literal reference to the palm-tree we may pass to the emblematical uses of it in Scripture. Under this head may be classed the following:

(1.) The striking appearance of the tree, its uprightness and beauty, would naturally suggest the giving of its name occasionally to women. As we find in the Odyssey (6:163) Naasicaa, the daughter of Alcinous, compared to a palm, so in Son 7:7 we have the same comparison, “Thy stature is like to a palm-tree.” In the O.T. three women named Tamar are mentioned: Judah's daughter-in-law (Gen 38:6), Absalom's sister (2Sa 13:1), and Absalom's daughter (2Sa 14:27). The beauty of the last two is expressly mentioned.

(2.) We have notices of the employment of this form in decorative art, both in the real temple of Solomon and in the visionary temple of Ezekiel. In the former case we are told (2Ch 3:5) of this decoration in general terms, and elsewhere more specifically that it was applied to the walls (1Ki 6:29), to the doors (1Ki 6:32; 1Ki 6:35), and to the “bases” (1Ki 7:36). So in the prophet's vision we find palm-trees on the posts of the gates (Eze 40:16; Eze 40:22; Eze 40:26; Eze 40:31; Eze 40:34; Eze 40:37), and also on the walls and the doors  (Eze 41:18-20; Eze 41:25-26). This work seems to have been in relief. We do not stay to inquire whether it had any symbolical meanings. It was a natural and doubtless customary kind of ornamentation in Eastern architecture. Thus we are told by Herodotus (2:169) of the hall of a temple at Sais, in Egypt, which was ἠσκημένη στύλοισι φοίνικας τὰ δένδρεα μεμιμημένοισι; and we are familiar now with the same sort of decoration in Assyrian buildings (Layard's Nineveh and its Remains, 2:137, 396, 401). The image of such rigid and motionless forms may possibly have been before the mind of Jeremiah when he said of the idols of the heathen (Jer 10:4-5), “They fasten it with nails and with hammers, that it move not: they are upright as the palm-tree, but speak not.”

(3.) With a tree so abundant in Judea, and so marked in its growth and appearance, as the palm, it seems rather remarkable that it does not appear more frequently in the imagery of the O.T. There is, however, in Psalm 42:12 the familiar comparison, “The righteous shall flourish like the palm- tree,” which suggests a world of illustration, whether respect be had to the orderly and regular aspect of the tree, its fruitfulness, the perpetual greenness of its foliage, or the height at which the foliage grows — as far as possible from earth, and as near as possible to heaven. Perhaps no point is more worthy of mention, if we wish to pursue the comparison, than the elasticity of the fibre of the palm, and its determined growth upwards, even when loaded with weights (“nititur in pondus palma”). Such particulars of resemblance to the righteous man were variously dwelt on by the early Christian writers. Some instances are given by Celsius in his Hierobotanicon (Upsala, 1747), 2:522-547. One, which he does not give, is worthy of quotation: “Well is the life of the righteous likened to a palm, in that the palm below is rough to the touch, and in a manner enveloped in dry bark, but above it is adorned with fruit, fair even to the eye; below it is compressed by the enfoldings of its bark; above it is spread out in amplitude of beautiful greenness. For so is the life of the elect — despised below, beautiful above. Down below it is, as it were, enfolded in many barks, in that it is straitened by innumerable afflictions; but on high it is expanded into a foliage, as it were, of beautiful greenness by the amplitude of the rewarding” (Gregory, Mor. on Job 19:49). There may also in Son 7:8, “I will go up to the palm-tree, I will take hold of the boughs thereof,” be a reference to climbing for the fruit. The Sept. has ἀναβήσομαι ἐν τῷ φοίνικι, κρατσήω τῶν ὑψέων αὐτοῦ. So in Son 2:3  and elsewhere (e.g. Psa 1:3) the fruit of the palm may be intended; but this cannot be proved.

(4.) The passage in Rev 7:9, where the glorified of all nations are described as “clothed with white robes and palms in their hands,” might seem to us a purely classical image, drawn (like many of Paul's images) from the Greek games, the victors in which carried palms in their hands. But we seem to trace here a Jewish element also, when we consider three passages in the Apocrypha. In 1Ma 13:51 Simon Maccabaeus, after the surrender of the tower at Jerusalem, is described as entering it with music and thanksgiving “and branches of palm-trees.” In 2Ma 10:7 it is said that when Judas Maccabaeus had recovered the Temple and the city “they bare branches and palms, and sang psalms also unto Him that had given them good success.” In 2Ma 14:4 Demetrius is presented “with a crown of gold and a palm.” Here we see the palm- branches used by Jews in token of victory and peace. (Such indeed is the case in the Gospel narrative, Joh 12:13.) There is a fourth passage in the Apocrypha, as commonly published in English, which approximates closely to the imagery of the Apocalypse: “I asked the angel, What are these? He answered and said unto me, These be they which have put off the mortal clothing, and now they are crowned and receive palms. Then said I unto the angel, What young person is it that crowneth them and giveth them palms in their hands? So he answered and said unto me, It is the Son of God, whom they have confessed in the world” (2Es 2:44-47). SEE DATE.

## Palm-trees, City Of[[@Headword:Palm-trees, City Of]]

             (Deu 34:3; Jdg 1:16; Jdg 3:13; 2Ch 28:15). SEE JERICHO; SEE PALMTREE.

## Palma, Giacopo (1)[[@Headword:Palma, Giacopo (1)]]

             called Il Vecchio (“the elder”), to distinguish him from his great-nephew, a celebrated Italian painter of the 16th century, was a native of Serimalta, in the Vaila Brembana, in the Bergamese territory. There is uncertainty as to the exact time when this artist flourished. Lanzi, in his last edition, says, “Jacopo Palma, called Il Vecchio, was invariably considered the companion and rival of Lorenzo Lotto, who was born about 1490, and died in 1560, until M. La Combe, in his Dictionnaire Portatif, confused the historical dates relating to him. By Ridolfi we are told that Palma was employed in completing a picture left unfinished by Titian at his death in 1576. Upon this and other similar authorities, Combe takes occasion to postpone the birth of Palma until 1540, adding to which the forty-eight years assigned him by Vasari, he places the time of his death in 1588. ‘Others put it 1596 and 1623. In such arrangements the critics seem neither to have paid attention to the style of Jacopo, still retaining some traces of the antique, nor to the authority of Ridolfi, who makes him the master of Bonifazio  Veneziano, who died in 1553; nor to the testimony of Vasari, who, in his work published in 1568, declares that Palma died at Venice several years before that period, aged forty-eight.” Lanzi still further settles the matter by the date 1514, which he read on one of his pictures at Milan, representing the Saviour with several Saints, which he pronounces a juvenile production. Palma's manner, at first, according to Ridolfi, partook of the formality and dryness of Giovanni Bellini. He afterwards attached himself to the method of Giorgione, and aimed at attaining his clearness of expression and rich and harmonious coloring, visible in his celebrated picture of St. Barbara, in the church of S. Maria Formosa at Venice.

In some of his other pieces he more nearly approaches Titian in the tenderness and impasto of his carnations, and the peculiar grace which he acquired from studying the earlier productions of that great master. Of this kind is his Last Supper, in the church of S. Maria Mater Domini at Venice, and a Holy Family in S. Stefano at Vicenza, esteemed one of his happiest productions. Lanzi says, “The distinguishing character of his pieces is diligence and a harmony of tints so great as to leave no traces of his pencil; and it has been observed by one of his historians that he long occupied himself in the production of each piece, and frequently retouched it. In the mixture of his colors, as in other respects, he often resembles Lotto, and if he is less animated and sublime, he is, perhaps, generally more beautiful in the forms of his heads, especially of those of women and boys. It is the opinion of some that in several of his countenances he expressed the likeness of his daughter Violante, very nearly related to Titian, a portrait of whom, by the hand of her father, was to be seen in the gallery of Sera, a Florentine gentleman. A variety of pictures intended for private rooms, met with in different places in Italy, are attributed to Palma, besides portraits, one of which was commended by Vasari as truly astonishing for its beauty; and Madonnas, chiefly drawn along with other saints on oblong canvas, a practice in common' use by many artists of that age.” The genuine pictures of Palma are exceedingly scarce, and highly prized. They are found in all the principal collections on the Continent, particularly at Paris, Dresden, Munich, Berlin, and St. Petersburg. But, above all, England is richest in works of his that are considered genuine; and they are not only to be found in the royal collections, but in many of those belonging to the nobility. It is evident that many of these are spurious, for he never could have executed half of them, even had his process been less tedious.

Lanzi explains this: “The least informed among people of taste, being ignorant of his contemporary artists, the moment they behold a picture between the  dryness of Giovanni Bellinit and the softness of Titian, pronounce it to be a Palma; and this is more particularly the case when they find the countenances well rounded and colored, the landscape exhibited with care, and roseate hues in the drapery occurring more frequently than those of a more sanguine dye. In this way Palma is in the mouths of all, while other artists, also very numerous, are only mentioned when their names are attached to their productions.” Vasari describes in high terms of commendation a picture of his in the church of S. Marco at Venice, representing the ship in which the body of St. Mark was brought from Alexandria to Venice exposed to a frightful tempest. “The picture is designed with great judgment; the vessel is seen struggling against the impetuous tempest, the waves burst with violence against the sides of the ship, the horrid gloom is only enlivened by flashes of lightning, and every part of the scene is filled up with images of terror, so strongly and naturally that it seems impossible for the power of art to rise to a higher pitch of truth and perfection.” Lanzi says Palma's most beautiful work is a picture preserved at the Servi. It represents the Virgin, with a group of beautiful spirits and a choir of angels, and other angels at her feet engaged in playing in concert upon their harps. “It is an exceedingly graceful production, delightfully ornamented with landscape and figures in the distance, very tasteful in tints, which are blended in an admirable manner, equal to the most studied productions of the contemporary artists of Bergamo.” Another admirable picture is his Adoration of the Magi, formerly in the Isola di S. Elena, now in the I. R. Pinacoteca of Milan.

## Palma, Giacopo (2)[[@Headword:Palma, Giacopo (2)]]

             called Il Giovine (i.e.” the younger”), to distinguish him from the preceding artist, his great-uncle, was born at Venice, according to Ridolfi, in 1544. There is as much contradiction about this artist as about his great-uncle, and we therefore depend solely on Lanzi. He was the son of Antonio Palma, an artist of confined genius, who instructed him in the rudiments of his art. He early exercised himself in copying the works of Titian and other Venetian painters. Ridolf says that he studied with Titian, and others say that he was the scholar of Tintoretto; the last assertion is highly improbable. At the age of fifteen he was taken under the protection of the duke of Urbino, and accompanied him to his capital. The duke afterwards sent him to Rome, where he resided eight years, and laid a good foundation for designing from the antique, by copying from the works of Michael  Angelo and Raffaelle, and particularly by studying the chiaroscuros of Polidoro da Caravaggio. The last was his great model,. and next to him came Tintoretto, Palma being naturally induced, like them, to animate his figures with a certain freedom of action and a spirit peculiarly his own. His abilities were noted by the pope and Giacopo junior was employed to decorate an apartment in the Vatican. On his return to Venice he distinguished himself by several works conducted with extraordinary care and diligence, which gained him much reputation.

Lanzi says, “There are not wanting professors who have bestowed upon him a very high degree of praise for displaying the excellent maxims of the Roman school, united to what was best of the Venetian.” He was, however, but little employed, and only obtained the third rank; and even this chiefly through the means of Vittoria, a distinguished sculptor and architect, who was considered an excellent judge and arbiter of works of art. Palma, by Vittoria's aid, soon came into general notice, and on the death of his antagonists he was overwhelmed with commissions. Lanzi observes of Palma that he was an artist who might equally be entitled the last of' the good age and the first of the bad. When he found his reputation established, and himself almost without a competitor, he began to relax his diligence by such rapidity of execution that Lanzi says many of his works may be pronounced rough drafts. “In order to prevail upon him to produce a piece worthy of his name, it became requisite not only to allow him the full time he pleased, but the full price he chose to ask.” Upon such terms he executed the fine picture of S. Benedetto for the church of SS. Cosmo and'Damiano for the noble family of Mora. Such are his Santa Apollonia at Cremona, his St. Ubaldo, and his Annunciation at Pesara; his Finding of the Cross at Urbino, and other valuable specimens scattered elsewhere. In these his tints are fresh, sweet, and clear; less splendid than those of Veronese, but more pleasing than in Tintoretto. Among his best works at Venice are the Deposition from the Cross, in the church of S. Niccolo dei Fratri; the Martyrdom of St. James, in S. Giacomo del Ono; Christ taken in the Garden, in La Trinith; the Visitation of the Virgin to St. Elizabeth, in S. Elizabetta; and the Plague of the Serpents, at S. Bartolomeo. The last, though a revolting subject, which strikes horror in the beholder, is one of his masterly productions, and equal to Tintoretto. Palma died in 1628. We have quite a number of etchings by this eminent artist, executed in a spirited and masterly style. Bartsch gives a list of twenty-seven. They are sometimes marked with his name in full, and sometimes with a monogram composed of a P crossed with a palm-branch. The following are the  principal: Samson and Delilah; Judith putting the Head of Holofernes into a Sack, held by an attendant; the Nativity; the Holy Family, with St. Jerome and St. Francis; St. John in the Wilderness; the Decollation of St. John; the Tribute Money; the Adulteress before Christ; Christ answering the Pharisees who disputed his Authority; the Incredulity of St. Thomas; St. Jerome in Conference with Pope Damasus — scarce; an ecclesiastic and a naked figure, with two boys.

## Palmaroli, Pietro[[@Headword:Palmaroli, Pietro]]

             an Italian painter is celebrated especially as a picture restorer. He flourished near the opening of this century, and was the first to transfer frescos from the wall to canvas. The first work so transferred was the Descent from the Cross, by Daniele da Volterra, in the church of Trinith de' Monti, in 1811: it is still in that church, but not in the chapel in which it was originally painted. The successful transfer of this picture caused a great sensation at Rome and in other parts of Italy, where such transfers were and still are repeatedly practiced with success. Palmaroli transferred and restored many celebrated works in Rome and in Dresden. As a restorer, his services to art are almost inestimable. At Dresden is Raffaelle's celebrated Madonna di San Sisto, restored by him. In 1816 Palmaroli freed the celebrated fresco of the Sibyls, painted by Raffaelle for Agosiino Chigi in the church of Santa Maria della Pace, from the destructive restorations in oil which were made by order of Alexander VII. He died at Rome in 1828. See Platner,, Beschreibung der Stadt Rom, vol. iii, pt.3, p. 385; Kunstblatt, 1837; Nagler, Neues Allgeneines Kiinstler- Lexikon, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts. ii 647.

## Palmegiani, Marco[[@Headword:Palmegiani, Marco]]

             called Marca da Forli, an Italian painter of much merit, scarcely known till the researches of Lanzi brought him before the world, was a native of Forli, and the favorite disciple of Francesco Melozzo. He had two manners: the first dry and formal, extremely simple in composition, with gilt ornaments, as was the custom of the quattrocentisti, or artists of the 14th century. In his second his composition is more copious, and of greater proportions, his outline bolder, and he dispensed with the gilded ornaments. He was accustomed to add to his principal subject some others unconnected with it as in his picture of the Crucifixion, in the church of S. Agostino di Forlis, in which he inserted two or three groups on different  grounds, one of which represents St. Paul visited by St. Anthony, and another represents St. Augustine convinced by the angel on the subject of the incomprehensibility of the Supreme Triad. Lanzi says that “in these diminutive figures, which he. inserted either, m the altarpiece or on the steps, he displayed apart extremely refined and pleasing.” He often enriched his backgrounds with animated landscapes and beautiful architecture. His works are numerous in Romagna, and are to be found in the Venetian states. In the Palazzo Vicentini, at Vicenza, is one of his most beautiful pictures, representing a Dead Christ, between Nicodemus and Joseph. He excelled in painting Madonnas and similar subjects. Lanzi says he generally signed his name “Marcus Pictor Foroliviensis,” or “Marcus Palmasanus P. Foroliviensis Pincebat.” He seldom adds the date, but there are two pictures in the collection of prince Ercolani dated 1513 and 1537. Vasari calls this artist Pannegiano. Others call him Palmezzano. Zani says he signed his pictures Marcus Palmasanis, Palmisanus, or Palmeganus, Foroliviensis”, etc. Kugler says there are several pictures by Marco Palmezzano in the museum at Berlin.

## Palmer[[@Headword:Palmer]]

             (Lat. palnifer, “a palm-bearer”), the name of one of those numerous classes of pilgrims (q.v.) whose origin and history form one of the most interesting studies in the social life of mediaeval Europe. Properly the Palmer designated a pilgrim who had performed the pilgrimage to the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, and had returned or was returning home after the fulfilment of his vow. Palmers obtained that peculiar, name from their custom of carrying branches of the Oriental palm, in token of their accomplished expedition. On arriving at their home they repaired to the church to return thanks to God, and offered the palm to the priest, to be placed upon the altar. The palms so offered were frequently used in the procession of Palm-Sunday (q.v.). Even after the time of his return the religious character of the Palmer still continued; and although his office might be supposed to have ceased with the fulfilment of his vow, many Palmers continued their religious peregrinations even in their native country. They thus became a class of itinerant monks, without a fixed residence, professing voluntary poverty, observing celibacy, and visiting at stated times the most remarkable sanctuaries of the several countries of the West. Their costume was commonly the same as that of the ordinary pilgrim, although modified in different countries.

## Palmer, Anthony[[@Headword:Palmer, Anthony]]

             an English divine of some note, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. He was educated at Oxford, became fellow of Baliol College, and obtained the living of Bourton, Gloucestershire. In 1662 he was ejected for nonconformity. He afterwards had charge of a congregation in London. Palmer died in 1678. He wrote The Gospel New Creature, wherein the Work of the Spirit in awakening the Soul is plainly opened [on Psa 25:11, etc.]; to which is annexed, The Tempestuous Soul calmed by Jesus Christ [on Mat 8:23-27] (3d ed. Lond 1743, 8vo).

## Palmer, Benjamin Morgan D.D.[[@Headword:Palmer, Benjamin Morgan D.D.]]

             an American Presbyterian minister, was born in the city of Philadelphia in 1787. After ordination he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Beaufort, S.C., and was subsequently connected as co-pastor with the congregation at Circular and Archdale churches in Charleston. He died in 1847. He published a number of occasional Sermons (1809-1836), and The Family Companion, etc. (1835). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:341-348.

## Palmer, Christian David Friedrich von[[@Headword:Palmer, Christian David Friedrich von]]

             a celebrated German Protestant theologian in the department of practical theology, was born Jan. 24. 1811, at Winnenden, near Stuttgard, in Wturtemberg. He received his early education at Schonthal, and he then entered the theological school at Tubingen, attending the lectures of Steudel, Baur, and Schmidt. In 1833 he passed a brilliant examination; in 1836 he was admitted as repetent into the Tubingen Stift; in 1839 he was appointed deacon at Marbach; in 1843, second deacon at Tubingen, five years later archdeacon; and in 1851 dean of the Tubingen diocese, and minister at Tubingen. In connection with his ministry, Palmer had also to lecture on paedagogics and national education, which lectures he continued until his death. In 1852 he was appointed professor in ordinary of homiletics, catechetics, morals, and paedagogics, and lectured besides on liturgy, the history of ecclesiastical music, and New-Testament exegesis. In 1852 he was honored with the degree of D.D., and ennobled by his monarch. In 1869 he was elected vice-president of the synod, and in 1870 the city of Tubingen elected him as its representltive in the diet; Palmer died May 29, 1875. As to his theology, it belonged to the so-called  Vermittelungstheologie, i.e. to that evangelical branch of the Church which, though in a moderate sense conservative, yet favors progress and really represents in Germany the truly living theology of theage. His works, which have found a large circulation, are, Evangelische Homiletik (Stuttgard, 1842; 5th ed. 1867) Evangelische Katechetik (ibid. 1844; 5th ed, 1864): — Evangelische Paidagogik (1852; 4th ed. 1869): — Evangelische Pastoraltheologie (ibid. 1860; 2d ed. 1863): — Evangelische Hymnologie (ibid. 1865): — Die Moral des Christenthums (ibid. 1864): — Predigten (ibid. 1867): — Evangel. Casualreden (4th ed. 1864- 1865, 4 vols.): — Geistliches-u. Weltliches (ibid. 1873): — Predigten aus neuerer Zeit (ibid. 1874). Besides these scientific works, he wrote a number of essays and articles for the Jahrbiicher fr deutsche Theologie, of which review he was one of the editors since 1856; for the Encyklopddie fur das gesanmte Erziehungs und Unterrichtswesen, of which also he was one of the editors since 1859; and for Herzog's Real- Encyklopadie. The Wurtemberg Landes-Choralbuch, published in 1843, also owes to him a great deal. See Augsburger Allgem. Zeitung, June 14, 1875; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Kurtz, Lehrbuch denr Kirnchengeschichte (7th ed. Milan, 1874), 2, 316;. Weissacker. Zur Erinnerlung an Dr. Palmer, in the Jaharbiicher Jur deutsche Theologie (1875), p. 353 sq.; Woorte der Erinnerung an. Dr. Palmer (Tubing. 1875); Literarischer Handweiser fur das katholische Deutschland.(1875), p. 252. (B. P.)

## Palmer, Edward Henry[[@Headword:Palmer, Edward Henry]]

             an English Orientalist, was born at Cambridge, August 7, 1840. In 1868 he took part in the expedition for exploring the Sinai territory, and made an examination of the names of places, traditions, and antiquities of Arabia  Petraea. With the same object in view he explored, in connection with Tyrwhitt Drake, the desert Et-Tih and Moab, in 1869 and 1870. Upon his return to England he was made professor of Arabic at Cambridge in 1871. In 1878 he settled at London, and in 1882 went on a secret mission, at the instance of the English government, into the desert east of the Suez canal. On his second trip through the desert he was killed, in October, 1882. Palmer published an Arabic translation of Thomas Moore's Paradise and the Peri (1865): — Oriental Mysticism (1867): — Report on the Bedawizn of Sinai and their Traditions (1870): — The Desert of the Exodus (1871): — A History of the Jewish Nation (1874; Germ. transl. Gotha, 1876): — A Grammar of the Arabic Language (London, 1874): — A Persian-English Dictionary (1876): — Life of Haroun Al Raschid (1878), and for Max Muller's Sacred Books of the East he translated the Koran. See Besant, Life and Achievements of Edward Henry Palmer (London, 1883). (B.P.)

## Palmer, Elihu[[@Headword:Palmer, Elihu]]

             an American Rationalist, who flourished near the close of tie last century, was graduated at Dartmouth College in 1787. He was the head of the Columbian Illuminati, a deistical company at New York, established about 1801, consisting of ninety-five members. Its professed aim was to promote “moral science,” against religious and political imposture. The Temple of Reason was a weekly paper, of which the principal editor was one Driscoll, an Irishman, who had been a Romish priest, and who removed with his paper to Philadelphia. Mr. Palmer delivered lectures on deism, or preached against Christianity. But, according to Mr. Cheetham, he was, “in the small circle of his Church, more priestly, more fulminating,” than Laud and Gardiner of England; “professing to adore reason, he was in a rage if anybody reasoned with him.” He was blind from his youth. He died at Philadelphia in March, 1806. He published an Oration, July 4, 1797 The  Principles of Nature (1802). Comp. Francis, Old New York (1858), p. 134- 137; see Alien, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Palmer, Heinrich Julius E[[@Headword:Palmer, Heinrich Julius E]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Giessen, June 28, 1803. In 1828 he was appointed professor at the gymnasium in Darmstadt, and died in 1865, a doctor of philosophy. He published, Religiose Vortage (Mayence, 1833; second series, Darmstadt, 1839): — Lehrbuch der Religion under der Geschichte der christl. Kirche (1849, 2 volumes): — Der christliche Glaube und das christliche Leben (4th ed. 1862): — Die confessionellen Fragen der Gegenwart vom kirchenrechtlichen und theologischen Standpunkte (1846). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2: 191; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:971 sq. (B.P.)

## Palmer, Henderson D[[@Headword:Palmer, Henderson D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born Jan. 12, 1812, and united with the Church Nov. 29, 1829. He was soon appointed class leader, but feeling called to the more responsible work of the ministry, he studied for some time at La Grange College. He next emigrated to Texas, then an infant republic. After teaching a few months in the town of Nacogdoches, where Roman Catholicism was the only form of religion organized, the love of Christ constrained him to appoint meetings for exhortation and prayer, until the 7th of July, 1858, when he was licensed to preach at Box's Fort, Nacogdoches County. In 1839 he was admitted to the Mississippi Conference, and kept in the district in which he had been laboring. In 1841 he travelled the Jasper Circuit, where his labors were crowned with a gracious revival of religion. In 1842 he travelled the Montgomery Circuit; in 1843, the Egypt Circuit; in 1844, the Cherokee Circuit. In 1845 his appointment is unknown to us. In 1846-47 he was a superannuate. In the year 1848 he travelled the Palestine Circuit. In the years 18491853 he was local. In the year 1854 he was readmitted and appointed to the San Augustine Circuit. In 1855 his appointment is unknown to us; in 1856 he travelled the Shelbyville Circuit; in 1857-58, the Coffeeville Circuit; in 1859, the Shelbyville Circuit; in 1869, Dangerfield Circuit; in 1861 he was supernumerary; in 1862, on the Linden Circuit; in 1863, the Coffeeville Circuit; in 1864-65, unknown to us; in 1866-68, he was again superannuated. He died Feb. 17, 1869, at his home in Upsher County, Texas. For more than thirty years he was a faithful, zealous, and useful preacher.

## Palmer, Herbert B.D.[[@Headword:Palmer, Herbert B.D.]]

             a learned English divine, was born at Wingham, Kent, in 1601; and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, but afterwards chosen fellow of Queen's. After taking holy orders, he became preacher at St. Alphage's Church, Canterbury, in 1626. Three years afterwards he was silenced for nonconformity. In 1632 he was made vicar of Ashwell, Herts, and was chosen one of the Assembly of Divines in 1643, on the triumph of dissent over Anglicanism. He preached also at various places in London until the earl of Manchester appointed him master of Queen's College, Cambridge,  in 1644. He died in 1647. Palmer had a considerable share in the Sabbatum Redivivums with Cawdrey. His own principal work is entitled Memorials of Godliness and Christianity (13th ed. Lond. 1708, 12mo). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of British and American Authors, vol. 2, S.V.

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

             a noted English Presbyterian divine, who forsook the Calvinistic doctrines and embraced Socinianism, was born in London in 1729. After the completion of his education, he became assistant pastor of a Presbyterian congregation in New Broad Street, London, in 1755. In 1759 he became their sole pastor. He died in 1790. He published, King David's Death, and Solomon's Succession to the Throne, considered and improved; a Sermon. on 1Ch 29:27-28 [Funer. of George II] (Lond. 1760, 8vo): — Free Thoughts on the Inconsistency of Conforming to any Religious Test; as a Condition of Tolesiation wih the true Principle of Protestant Dissent (ibid. 1779, 8vo): — Sermon, 2Co 1:12, on the Death of the Rev. Caleb Fleminig, D.D.; with the Oration delivered at the Interment by Joseph Towers (ibid. 1779, 8vo): — An Appendix to the Observations in Defence of the Liberty of Man as a Moral Agent; in Answer to Dr. Priestly's Illustrations of Philosophical Necessity; occasioned by the Dr.'s Letter to the Author (ibid. 1780, 8vo). See Darling Cyclop. Bibliog.

## Palmer, Julius[[@Headword:Palmer, Julius]]

             a martyr to the Protestant cause in England, flourished under (bloody) queen Mary. In 1555 he was a fellow of Magdalen College. He was especially noted at that time as an offensive assertor of Romish principles. The brave manner in which the Protestants presented their cause, and fought and died for its support, struck him, notwithstanding his unyielding. prejudice, and he was led to inquire carefully into their doctrines, which resulted in his conversion after the torture of Latimer and Ridley, whom he had learned to esteem as good Christian men. He lost his fellowship, and taught awhile. In 1556 he was imprisoned as a heretic and burned. See Soames, Hist. of the Reformation, 4:47, 76.

## Palmer, Karl Christian[[@Headword:Palmer, Karl Christian]]

             father of Heinrich Julius, was born at Delitzsch, May 2, 1759. In 1787 he was professor at Leipsic, and died at Giessen, July 17, 1838, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, De Nexu inter Theologiam Moralem et Publican Religionis Institutio (Leipsic, 1788): — Paulus und Gamaliel, ein Beitrag zur altesten Christengeschichte (Giessen, 1806): — Predigten uber die Evangelien des ganzen. Jahres (1817). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:495, 569; 2:134. (B.P.)

## Palmer, Mrs. Phoebe[[@Headword:Palmer, Mrs. Phoebe]]

             one of the most noted American women of our day, is celebrated not only for many philanthropic labors, but for an unusually pious life. She was born  near the opening of this century. Inheriting Methodism as a birthright, she was early converted to God. There was nothing, however, remarkable in the character of her piety in those days. She was indeed very reticent of profession, and timid of all public effort. Through the influence, however, of her sister, Mrs. Lankford, she was led to see the privilege of the believer to enter into the fulness of Gospel rest, by faith in Christ as an uttermost Saviour. She was then happily married to Dr. Waiter Palmer, of New York, himself an earnest Methodist. Many who favored the sanctification doctrine as Mrs. Palmer accepted it were accustomed to meet frequently in their homes interchangeably. Mrs. Palmer also opened her parlors, and soon her home became the famous centre of spiritual life and power, extending its influence not only over this vast country, but all over the globe. In 1860, or thereabout, Dr. Palmer, who then had a lucrative practice, was obliged to give it up in order to assist his wife in her revival labors, which they performed wherever they were persuaded God called them to work. From that time they were very little in New York, spending sometimes months together in extended travels for revival services all through the country, East and West, and the British provinces, besides three continuous years in Great Britain. Meantime the weekly meeting at their home in New York went on, uninterrupted by Mrs. and Dr. Palmer's absence, with unabated interest and power, attracting ministers and people, of all denominations, and from every quarter of the Christian world. No meeting anywhere has had so cosmopolitan and literally unsectarian a complexion, notwithstanding the peculiarly Methodistic idea on which it was based, as this Palmer-meeting for the promotion of holiness. It was not even discontinued by her decease in November, 1875.

Very beautifully and fittingly did that saint, who had ministered to so many thousands in her life, and whose life had been one of the sweetest benedictions of heaven on earth for nearly half a century raise her feeble hands in their last pious act, and open her lips, for the last time, to say to those around her, and to all who love her memory, “The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen!” She published, The Way to Holiness (N. Y. 1854, 12mo): — Faith and its Effects (1856, 12mo): — Devotion to God (new ed. 1857): — The Useful Disciple: — Pioneer Experience, and many other works of like tendency. They were nearly all republished in England, and had as wide a circulation there as in the United States. “The secret of this good woman's power, the point of analysis,” says Dr. Bottome (in Zion's Herald, November, 1875), “is easily reached. There was about her but little of personal attractiveness. Simple in manner, and plain in person and dress;  even to severity; hesitant in speech, and almost destitute of emotion in her addresses and in all her exercises, except of the most subdued character; confining herself almost absolutely to the conscience and judgment of her hearers, her presentation of truth was of the barest logic. Accepting the Word of God as the end of all controversy, a simple statement of a Scripture declaration was all sufficient. God said it, and it must be so. And yet it was not what she said that had its powerful charm and its resistless force on those who heard her; it was that wonderful embodiment of entire consecration, that personification of the truth which she illustrated in her life and person, that affected others. ‘She believed, and therefore spoke.' Her favorite passages were, ‘I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies a living sacrifice,' etc.; and I can do all things through Christ strengthening me.' These grand principles of Christian faith became the warp and wsoof of her very being. ‘For her to live was Christ.' ‘This one thing I do,' was her perpetual motor-a life of intense industry in a life of all-absorbing love — one idea — the grandest secret of success known to intelligent minds.”

## Palmer, Ray[[@Headword:Palmer, Ray]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Little Compton, R.I. No. 12, 1808; graduated from Yale College in 1830; taught, 1830-34; was pastor, 1835- 66; secretary of the American Congregational Union, 1866-78; associate pastor in Newark, N.J., 1881-84, and died March 29, 1887. He was a corporate member of the A.B.C.F.M. from 1854; visitor of Andover Theological Seminary, 1865-78; director of the A.H.M. Society, 1862-83. He was the author of Hymns and Sacred Pieces (1865): — Home; or, The Unlost Paradise (1868). His Complete Poetical Works were published in 1876.

## Palmer, Samuel[[@Headword:Palmer, Samuel]]

             an English divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, first at London as minister at the Weigh-house, and later, from 1767, at Hackney. He died near the opening of this century. He published, The Nonconformist' Memorial, being an Account of the Lives, Sufferings, and Printed Works of the Two Thousand Ministers ejected Aug. 24,1666 [1662]; originally written by E. Calamy, D.D., abridged, corrected, and methodized, with many additional Anecdotes and several new Lives (2d ed. Lond. 1802, 3 vols. 8vo). This edition contains many important additions and corrections. The first was published in 1774: — The Protestant Dissenter's Catechism, containing, I, A brief History of the Nonconformists; II, The Reasons of the Dissent from the National Church (8th ed. Lond. 1782, 12mo) — Sermon on 2Ti 1:12, The Dying Believer's Confidence and Joy in Christ [Funeral]; to which is added an Oration, by Samuel Morton Savage, D.D. (ibid. 1778, 8vo). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. ii, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 11, s.v.

## Palmer, Walter C., M.D[[@Headword:Palmer, Walter C., M.D]]

             a devoted Methodist evangelist, was born February 9, 1804. He was converted in 1817, and among the hallowed associations of the "Old Allen  Street Church" in New York, grew up to a beautifully developed Christian character. He practiced medicine for many years in that city, and at length, in connection with his saintly wife, gave up his time to labors for the conversion and sanctification of souls, travelling extensively, and holding meetings everywhere in this country as well as in Great Britain. He died at Ocean Grove, July 29, 1883. See (N.Y.) Christian Advocate, January 3, 1884; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

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

             an English theologian of our times, was educated at Oxford University, and became fellow of Worcester College, Oxford. After taking holy orders, he was made prebendary of Sarum, then rural dean, and finally vicar of Whitchurch, at Dorset. He is especially noted as a student of liturgy (q.v.). His masterly work on this branch of ecclesiastical research is entitled Origines Liturgicoe, or Antiquities of the English Ritual, and a Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies (3d ed. Oxf. 1839, 2 vols. 8vo). A fourth edition (1845) contains a notice of those rites of the English Church which are not comprised in the Book of Common Prayer, also of the origin and history of the canonical hours of prayer. The additions were published separately. Palmer also published, The Apostolical Jurisdiction and ‘Succession of the Episcopacy in the British Churches Vindicated against the Objections of Dr. Wiseman in the Dublin Review (Lond. 1840): — A Treatise on the Church of Christ; designed chiefly for the Use of Students in Theology (3d ed. rev. and enl. ibid. 1842, 8vo): — A Conmpendious Ecclesiastical History fiom the Earliest Period to the Present Time (new ed. enl. ibid. 1841, sm. 8vo): Letters to N. Wiseman, D.D., osn the Errors of Romanism, in respect to the Worship of Saints, Satisfactions, Purgatory, Indulgences, and the Worship of Images and Relics; to which is added an Examination of Mr. Sibthorp's Reasons for his Secession from the Church (Oxf. 1842; 3d ed. Lond. 1851, 8vo. In this edition “some discussions of minor importance have been omitted,” and an introductory letter has been added on the titular hierarchy): — A Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts of the Times, with Reflections on existing Tendencies: to Romanism, and on the Present Duties and Prospects of Members of the Church (2d ed. Oxf. 1843) (comp. a review [Recent Developments of Puseyism, by H. Rogers] in Edinb. Rev. 80, 309): — The Doctrine of Development and Conscience considered in Relation to the Evidences of Christianity and of the Catholic System (Lond. 1846, 8vo) (see review [On the Study ofthe Christians Evidences] in Edinb. Rev. 86, 3,97): -Sermon on 1Jn 5:4, The Victory of Faith [Church Societies]; with an Appendix (ibid. 1850, 8vo): — A Statement of Circumstances connected with the Proposal of Resolutions at Special General Meeting of the Bristol Church Union, Oct. 1, 1850 (ibid. 1850). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. 2, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.

## Palmer, William H[[@Headword:Palmer, William H]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born Aug. 16,1821, in Wisconsin. In early life he devoted himself to legal studies, and practiced several years at the bar. In 1858 he was converted and in less than one year from that time joined the West Wisconsin Conference. His first appointment was Point Bluff, and he was next stationed at Lancaster. The outbreak of the war, however, broke up his pastorate, for he felt it his duty to serve his country. On leaving the army he was readmitted to conference, and stationed at Dodgeville. Here he remained two years, at Darlington two, Monroe two, Providence two, and Platteville two, where, like the faithful soldier, he fell at his post. For months his health had been gradually failing, but he was ever cheerful, happy, and hopeful. At his last quarterly conference he was granted leave of absence, in the hope that rest would recruit his health, but he gradually grew worse, and died Sept. 23, 1874. He led a pure and holy life, and his memory is dearly cherished by those who knew him. See Minutes of Conferences, 1875, p. 149.

## Palmer-Worm[[@Headword:Palmer-Worm]]

             (גָּזָם, gazam; Sept. κάμπη; Vulg. rsuca) occurs Joe 1:4; Joe 2:25; Amo 4:9. Bochart (Hieroz. 3, 253) has endeavored to shown that gazaim denotes some species of locust; but the ten Hebrew names to which Bochart assigns the meaning of different kinds of locusts can hardly apply to so many, as not more than two or three destructive species of locust are known in Bible lands. The derivation of the Hebrew word from a root which means “to cut off,” is as applicable to several kinds of insects, whether in their perfect or larva condition, as it is to a locust, the action of the jaws being nearly the same in both cases. Both insects, when in numbers, shear away the leaves, slice after slice, and leaf after leaf, until the plant is completely shorn of its verdure, when it either dies, or becomes at least incapable of bearing fruit for that season. Hence most interpreters prefer to follow the Sept. and Vulg., which are consistent with each other in the rendering of the Hebrew word in the three passages where it is  found. The κάμπη of Aristotle (Hist. Anim. 2, 17, 4, 5, 6) evidently denotes a caterpillar, so called from its “bending itself” up (κάμπτω) to move, as the caterpillars called geometric, or else from the habit some caterpillars have of “coiling” themselves up when handled. The es-uca of the Vulg. is the κάμπη of the Greeks, as is evident from the express assertion of Columella (De Re Rust. 11:3, 63, ed. Schneider). The Chaldee and Syriac understand some locust larva by the Hebrew word. Oedmann (Vetrm. Samml. fasc. 2, c. 6 p. 116) is of the same opinion. Tychsen (Comment. de locustis, etc., p. 88) identifies the gazam with the Gryllus cristatus, Lin., a South African species. Michaelis (Supp. p. 220) follows the Sept. and Vulg. SEE CATERPILLAR.

The English word palmer-worm is provincially used for the hairy muff-like caterpillar of the great tigermoth (Arctia caja). This is a very indiscriminate and voracious feeder, but we never heard of its attacking cultivated plants in such numbers as to produce the slightest alarm. Indeed, we much doubt whether any single species would devour indiscriminately plants with qualities so different as the olive, the fig, the vine, and the fruits of an Oriental “garden.” There are other varieties of the larger moths, however, which are very destructive to vegetables, especially that very common one in the latter part of summer, called the gamma moth (Plusia gamma), easily recognised by its bearing on each wing a Greek y, in silver on a dark brown. Perhaps, therefore, we need not look for any precise species, as represented by the gazam; but may understand the word to bear a sense as wide and general as its Greek or English equivalent.; and to include several species of caterpillars, all having this in common, a greedy devouring of cultivated produce, and a preternatural multiplication of their numbers. See Locust.

## Palmers[[@Headword:Palmers]]

             SEE PALMER.

## Palmieri, Guieppe[[@Headword:Palmieri, Guieppe]]

             an Italian painter, was born in 1674. He studied at Florence, but it is not known under whom. Orlandi extols him as one of the first painters of his age. Lanzi thinks Orlandi too extravagant in his praise. He adds, however, that in the human figure Palmieri is a painter of spirit, and has a magical and beautiful style of color, very harmonious and pleasing when the shades do not predominate. In Palmieri's Resurrection, in the church of St. Domenico at Genoa, and in other works of his carefully painted, judges of the art find little to reprove. He died in 1740.

## Palmistry Or Chiromancy[[@Headword:Palmistry Or Chiromancy]]

             is a species of divination by interpreting the lines in the palm of the human hand; often practiced by travelling fortune-tellers, especially Gypsies (q.v.). It has even been thought by some to be alluded to in Job 37:7 (see Walter, Numm eo chiromantea probari queat, Rint. 1729). SEE DIVINATION.

## Palmyra[[@Headword:Palmyra]]

             SEE TADMOR.

## Palombo, Bartolomeo[[@Headword:Palombo, Bartolomeo]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Rome about 1610, and studied under Pietro da Cortona. Palombo is highly commended by Orlandi; and Lanzi says he was one of Cortona's best scholars. There are only two pictures by him at Rome — an altarpiece in the church of S. Giuseppe, and another of S. Maria Madalena de' Paggi, now placed in the church of S. Martino a' Monti. These works are well designed, strong in coloring, excellent in chiaroscuro, and the figures are extremely graceful. He probably painted much for the collections. He was living in 1666.

## Palpa Version of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Palpa Version of The Scriptures]]

             Palpa is a dialect spoken in the small states north of Oude, below the Himalayas. A version of the New Test. was commenced at Serampore in 1817, and completed at press about 1832. See Bible of Every Land, page 122. (B.P.)

## Palsy[[@Headword:Palsy]]

             (Gr. παράλυσις, which, however, only occurs in the New Testament in the adjective form παραλυτικός, etc., one smitten with palsy) is properly a disorder which deprives the limbs of sensation or motion, or both; and it is usually attended with imbecility of mind — nor is this to be wondered at, since its immediate cause is a compression on the brain. The palsy of the New Testament is a disease of very wide import. Many infirmities seem to have been comprehended under it.

1. The Apoplexy, a paralytic shock which affected the whole body.

2. The Hemiplegy, which affects and paralyzes only one side of the body.

3. The Paraplegy, which paralyzes all the parts of the system below the neck.

4. The Catalepsy is caused by a contraction of the muscles in the whole or part of the body (e.g. in the hands), and is very dangerous.

The effects upon the parts seized are very violent and deadly. For instance, when a person is struck with it, if his hand happens to be extended, he is unable to draw it back. If the hand is not extended when he is struck with the disease, he is unable to extend it. It appears diminished in size and dried up. Hence the Hebrews were in the habit of calling it a, withered hand (1Ki 13:4; 1Ki 13:6; Zec 11:17; Mat 12:10-13; Joh 5:3).

5. The Cramp. This, in Oriental countries, is a fearful malady, and by no means unfrequent. It is caused by the chills of the night. The limbs, when seized with it, remain immovable; sometimes turned in, and sometimes out, in the same position as when they were first seized. The person afflicted resembles a man undergoing the torture, and experiences nearly the same exquisite sufferings (Mat 8:6; Luk 7:2). Our Savior is recorded to have miraculously cured several paralytics (Mat 4:24; Mat 8:13; Mat 9:2; Mat 9:6; Mar 2:3-4; Luk 5:18; Joh 5:5). SEE PARALYTIC.

## Palti[[@Headword:Palti]]

             (Heb. Palti', פִּלְטַי, my deliverance; Sept. Φαλτί), son of Raphu of the tribe of Benjamin, and one of the twelve spies sent out by Moses (Num 13:9) B.C. 1657.

## Paltiel[[@Headword:Paltiel]]

             (Heb. Paltiel', פִּלְטַיאֵל, deliverance of God; Sept. Φαλτιήλ), son of Azzan, and chief man of the tribe of Issachar, one of those appointed to divide the Promised Land among the tribes on their entrance into it (Num 34:26). B.C. 1618. SEE PHALTIEL, which in the Hebrew is the same form.

## Paltite[[@Headword:Paltite]]

             (Heb. Palti', פִּלְטַי, same as Palti [q.v.]; Sept. Φαλτί), the Gentile name of Helez, one of David's captains (2Sa 23:26); the same name, probably, as PELONITE SEE PELONITE (q.v.) in the parallel passage ( Chronicles 11:27), and such seems to have been the reading followed by the Alex. MS. in 2 Samuel. The Peshito-Syriac, however, supports the Hebrew, “Cholots of Pelat.” But in 1Ch 27:10, “Helez the  Pelonite,” of the tribe of Ephraim is again mentioned as captain of 24,000 men of David's army for the seventh month, and the balance of evidence therefore inclines to “Pelonite” as the true reading. The variation arose from a confusion between the letters ונ and ט. In the Syriac of 1 Chronicles both readings are combined, and Helez is described as “of Palton.”

## Palu, Pierre De La[[@Headword:Palu, Pierre De La]]

             (Paludanus, or Petrus de Palude), a patriarch of Jerusalem, was born in Valambon, Bresse, about 1277. Son ofGerard de la Palu, a nobleman of Valambon, he entered the order of St. Dominic at Paris, taught with success in that university, and became in 1317 definitor of the province of France. In the following year John XXII appointed him nuncio to Flanders to make a treaty of peace; but he did not succeed in this negotiation, which, on the contrary, created many enemies. In 1330 the same pope consecrated him patriarch of Jerusalem and administrator of the bishopric of Nicosia, in Cyprus. Pierre went immediately to Palestine, and neglected nothing to engage the sultan of Egypt to show himself more favorable to Christians. His efforts remaining without success he returned to France, and preached in 1331 a new crusade; but his appeal was not heard. He was at the same time appointed apostolic administrator of the bishopric of Couserans. He died in Paris Jan. 31, 1342. This prelate has left a great number of works; the principal ones are, Commentaires upon the third and fourth books of the Sentences of P. Lombard (Venice, 1493; Paris, 1514, 1517, fol., and 1530, 2 vols. fol.): — Concordances sur la Somme de St. Thomas (Salamanca, 1552, fol.): — Sermons, de Tempore et Sanctis (Antwerp, 1571; fol.): — Traite de la Pitissance ecclesiastique (Paris, 1506, fol.). See Echard et Quetif, Script. ordinis Praedicatorum; Touron, Hist. des Hommes illustres de Saint-Dominique 2:223-237.

## Paludanus[[@Headword:Paludanus]]

             (Jean van den Broek), a Belgian theologian, was born at Mechlin in 1565, and died at Louvain in 1630. In the latter city he taught theology and the holy Scriptures, and wrote several works of piety and controversy; among others, Vindiciae theologiae adversus verbi Dei corruptelas (Antwerp, 1620-22, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Paludanus, Henri[[@Headword:Paludanus, Henri]]

             a Franciscan friar, flourished at Liege in the 17th century. He translated from the Spanish of Didier de la Vega Conciones et exercitia pia (Cologne, 1610, 2 vols. 12mo), and Paradisus gloriee Sanctorum (ibid. 1610, 8vo). See Valere Andre, Bibl. Belgica; Paquot, Memoires, vol. 9.

## Pamb otia[[@Headword:Pamb otia]]

             a festival celebrated by all the inhabitants of Boeotia that they might engage in the worship of Athene Itonia. While this national festival lasted it was unlawful to carry on war; and accordingly, if it occurred in the course of a war, hostilities were forthwith interrupted by the proclamation of truce between the contending parties.

## Pamelius, Jacob[[@Headword:Pamelius, Jacob]]

             a Dutch divine of note, was born May 11, 1536, At Bruges. His father was an officer under Charles V. Jacob studied at Bruges, Louvain, Paris, and Padua. After his return to Holland the University of Louvain conferred upon him the degree of D.D., and he was given the country in his native place. He there collected a large and valuable library for a critical edition of the fathers but when the civil war broke out he left his native country and went to St. Omer, where he was appointed archdeacon. He was next provost of St. Savior's at Utrecht. While about to take possession of the bishopric of Metz, to which position he was appointed by Philip II, he died at Mens, Sept. 18, 1587. He wrote, Liturgica Latinorum (Col. 1571, 2 vols. 4to): — Catalogus commentariorum in universam Bibliam: — Commentarii in librum Judith, in epistolam Pauli ad Philimonem, besides his splendid editions of the works of St. Cyprian, Tertullian, and Rhabanus Maurus. “The commentaries of this author upon Tertullian,” says Dupin, “are both learned and useful; but he digresses too much from his subject, and brings in things of no use to the understanding of his author.” Dupin passes much the same judgment on Pamelius's labors on Cyprian. All the later editors of these two fathers have spoken well of Pamelius, and have transcribed his best notes into their editions. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, 3:1214; Andreas, Bibl. Belg. p. 425; Teissier, Eloges, 2:93; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Darling, Encyclop. Bibliogr. s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Pammachius[[@Headword:Pammachius]]

             ST., a friend and contemporary of St. Jerome (q.v.), was a senator at Rome, and stood high in the esteem of his countrymen. Being persuaded of the value of a religious life, the death of his wife constrained him to turn aside from society, and he embraced an ascetic life. He died in a convent in 410. Jerome, who was his intimate associate and friend from youth up, carried on a correspondence with Pammachius, which is of historical value to the ecclesiastical student. Jerome in his letters, as also Augustine and Paulinus of Nola in theirs, extols the virtuous life of Pammachius, especially the philanthropic labors in which he abounded. See Zöckler, Leben des Hieronymus (Gotha, 1865).

## Pamphilus[[@Headword:Pamphilus]]

             a Christian martyr, was an Eastern prelate of such extensive learning that he was called a second Origen. He was a native of Phoenicia, was born probably at Berytus, and educated by Prierius, after which he was received into the body of the clergy at Caesarea, where he established a library, and lived in the practice of every Christian virtue. He was a man of profound learning, and devoted himself chiefly to the study of the Scriptures and the writings of the early Church fathers. Jerome states that Pamphilus copied most of the works of Origen with his own hand; and, assisted by Eusebius, gave a correct copy of the Old Testament, which had suffered greatly from the ignorance or negligence of former transcribers. He likewise gave lectures on literary and religious subjects in an academy established by him for that purpose, until A.D. 307, when he was apprehended and carried before Urban, the governor of Palestine. Urban, having in vain: endeavored to turn him to paganism, ordered him to be tortured severely, and to be imprisoned; which was accordingly done. He was beheaded in A.D. 309. Pamphilus founded a library at Caesarea, chiefly consisting of ecclesiastical worlds, which became celebrated throughout the Christian world. It was destroyed before the middle of the 7th century. He constantly lent and gave away copies of the Scriptures. Both Eusebius and Jerome speak in the highest terms of his piety and benevolence. Jerome states that Pamphilus composed an apology for Origen before Eusebius; but at a later period, having discovered that the work which he had taken for Pamphilus's was only the first book of Eusebius's apology for Origen, he denied that Pamphilus wrote anything except short letters to his friends. The truth seems to be that the first five books of the Apology for Origen were  composed by Eusebius and Pamphilus jointly, and the sixth book by Eusebius alone, after the death of Pamphilus. Another work which Pamphilus effected in conjunction with Eusebius was an edition of the Septuagint, from the text in Origen's Hexapla. This edition was generally used in the Eastern Church. Montfaucon and labricius have published Contents of the Acts of the Apostles as a work of Pamphilus; but this is in all probability the production of a later writer. Eusebius wrote a Life of Pamphilus, in three books, which is now entirely lost, with the exception of a few fragments, and even of these the genuineness is extremely doubtful. We have, however, notices of him in Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 7:32), and in the De Viris Illustribus and other works of Jerome. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Hagenbach, [Hist. of Doct. 1:230; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1:720; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 1:118, 144; Alzog, Patrologie, § 34; Pressense, Hist. of the Early Years of Christianity (Doctrines, p. 411); Lardner, Credibility, pt. ii, c. 59, and the authorities there quoted.

## Pamphylia[[@Headword:Pamphylia]]

             (Gr. Παμφυλαί, of every race), a province in the southern part of Asia Minor, having the Mediterranean on the south, Cilicia on the east, Pisidia on the north, and Lycia on the west. It was nearly opposite the island of Cyprus; and the sea between the coast and the island is called in Act 27:5 the sea of Pamphylia. The chief cities of this province were Perga and Attalia. It seems in early times to have been less considerable than either of the contigous districts; for in the Persian war, while Cilicia contributed a hundred ships and Lycia fifty, Pamphylia sent only thirty (Herod. 7:91, 92). The name probably then embraced little more than the crescent of comparatively level ground between Taurus and the sea To the norths along the heights of Taurus itself, was the region of Pisidia. The Roman organization of the country, however, gave a wider range to the term Pamphylia. In St. Paul's time it was not only a regular province, but the emperor Claudius had united Lycia with it (Dio Cass. 40,17), and probably also a good part of Pisidia. However, in the N.T. the three terms are used as distinct. The greater part of it was wild and mountainous, but intersected by beautiful vales. It presented a great variety of soil and climate, ranging from the perpetual snow region on the summits of Taurus, down to the orange-groves that to this day encircle the town of Adalia. The southern aspect and sheltered situation of the coast give it a temperature higher than that of most parts of Palestine. Among the most  interesting natural curiosities of Pamphylia may be reckoned the river Catarrhactes, which, taking its rise in the lake Teogitis, a little to the south of Antioch in Pisidia, rolls its calcareous waters down to the sea near Attaleia, where they pour over the cliffs into the Levant; from this circumstance the river takes its name. Its bed, or rather its beds, near the termination of its course, are continually changing, so that it becomes difficult to identify the position of any ancient sites in the vicinity of this river. The view from the sea of these waterfalls is very striking, and is not unlike that of the falls at Hierapolis in Phrygia. The valleys are rich and fertile, but towards the sea unhealthy; it is however probable that their climate has deteriorated in modern times, like that of the whole sea-coast from Ephesus eastwards. At the mouth of the rivers respectively were situated the important cities of Attaleia, Perga, Aspendus, and Side; so that Pamphylia, though one of the smallest of the provinces into which Asia Minor was divided, was by no means the least in consequence.

It was in Pamphylia that St. Paul first entered Asia Minor, after preaching the Gospel in Cyprus. He and Barnabas sailed up the river Cestrus to Perga (Act 13:13). Here they were abandoned by their subordinate companion John-Mark; a circumstance which is alluded to again with much feeling, and with a pointed mention of the place where the separation occurred (Act 15:38). It might be the pain of this separation which induced Paul and Barnabas to leave Perga without delay. They did however preach the Gospel there on their return from. the interior (Act 14:24-25). We may conclude, from Act 2:10, that there were many Jews in the province; and possibly Perga had a synagogue. The two missionaries finally left Pamphylia by its chief seaport, Attalia. We do not know that St. Paul was ever in this district again; but many years afterwards he sailed near its coast, passing through “the sea of Cilicia and Pamphylia” on his way to a town of Lycia (Act 27:5). We notice here the accurate order of these geographical terms, as in the above-mentioned land-journey we observe how Pisidia andt Pamphylia occur in true relations, both in going and returning (εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας.. ἀπὸ τῆς Πέργης εἰς Α᾿ντιοχείαν τῆς Πισιδαίς, Act 13:13-14; διελθόντες τὴν Πισιδίαν ηλθον εἰς Παμφυλίαν, Act 14:24). Pamphylia was then a flourishing commercial province; the rivers, now silted up, or rendered useless for ships by the formation of bars across their mouths, were then navigable to a considerable extent. Cimon sailed up the river Eurymedon with his army as far as Aspendus, and the Cestrus was navigable in the time  of Strabo up to Perga for ships of heavy burden. The whole province is remarkable for its natural beauties, its fauna and flora are varied and abundant, and the researches of Tchiatcheff (Asie Mineure [Paris, 1853], vol. 3) show that in these respects it was surpassed by no province of Asia Minor. The climate, like that of Lycia and Cilicia, is highly favorable to this result; the mean temperature is higher than that of any other countries under the same parallels of latitude, and the summers approach those of the tropics: that portion of Europe which most nearly resembles it is the valley of the Guadalquivir. The inhabitants, like a portion of those in the neighboring provinces — Lycia and Cilicia — were mild and courteous in manners, and greatly addicted to commerce, to which indeed they were led by the peculiarly favorable situation of the country. Attalus built Attaleia in order to command the trade of Syria and Egypt, and the result fully answered his expectations. At the same time this commendation of the race inhabiting these provinces must be restricted within narrow limits. The Pisidians were famous robbers; the higher regions of Cilicia were infested by predatory tribes, and piracy was the profession of great numbers on the sea-coast. Even the Pamphylians themselves were not free from the like imputation, in proportion as they receded towards the mountains. St. Paul could not cross Mount Taurus without being “in peril of robbers.” Compared, however, with the Cappadocians, the Lycaonians, and the Pisidians, the inhabitants of Pamphylia may be regarded as a civilized and inoffensive race. Various accounts have been given of the origin of the Pamphylians. Some say they were a mixed race, composed of a number of amalgamated tribes, and hence their name Παμφυλοι (“mingled tribes”). This appears to be the opinion of Herodotus (8:91) and Pausanias (7:3). Others maintain that they sprung from a Dorian chief called Pamphylus (Rawlinson's Herod. 3:276, note); others from Pamphyle, the daughter of Rhacius (Steph. Byz. s.v.). The truth seems to be that there was an ancient tribe of this name, speaking a language of its own, and which in more recent times partly amalgamated with the Greeks who overran Asia Minor. It is this language to which Luke refers in Act 2:10. It was probably a barbarous patois, known only to the residents in the little province of Pamphylia (comp. Arrian, Anab. 1:26); and hence the astonishment of those who heard the apostles speak it.

The greater part of Pamphylia is now thinly populated, and its soil uncultivated. There are still a few little towns and villages near the coast, surrounded by fruitful fields and luxuriant orchards. Some of these occupy  ancient sites, and contain the remains of former grandeur. See Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 1:242; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v. SEE ASIA MINOR.

## Pan[[@Headword:Pan]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of the following words in the original. SEE DISH.

1. Kiyor, כַּיּוֹרor כַּיּרֹ(from כּוּר, to cook), a basin of metal used for boiling or stewing (1Sa 2:14; Sept. λέβητα τὸν μέγαν; Vulg. lebetem); also as a laver (as generally rendered) or basin for washing (Exo 30:18; Sept. λουτῆρα; Vulg. labrum; 1Ki 7:38; 1Ki 7:40; 1Ki 7:43; Sept. χυτροκαύλους; Alex. χυτρογαύλους; Vulg. luteres); and (with

אֵשׁ) a brazier for carrying fire (Zec 12:6; A.V. “hearth;” Sept. δαλὸνπυρός; Vulg. caminum ignis); finally a wooden platform from which to speak (2Ch 6:13; A.V. “pulpit”), doubtless from its round form. SEE LAYER.

2. Machabdth, מִחֲבִת(from חָבִתobs., prob. to cook; comp. Arab. khabaza, to prepare food), a shallow vessel or griddle used for baking cakes (Lev 2:5; Lev 6:14 [A.V. 21]; 7:9; 1Ch 23:29 [“flat plate,” marg. A.V.]; Eze 4:3); Sept. τήγανον; Vulg. sartago; apparently a shallow pan or plate, like that used by Bedawin and Syrians for baking or dressing rapidly their cakes of meal, such as were used in legal oblations. SEE CAKE.

3. Masreth, מִשְׂרֵת, a flat vessel or plate for baking cakes (2Sa 13:9; Sept. τήγανον). Gesenius says the etymology is uncertain, but suggests that the word may be derived from a root שָׂרָהor שָׁרָה= Arab. sharay, to shine, and was applied to the pan because it was kept bright. The distinction, therefore, between this and the preceding word may be that the masreth was used dry, while the machabath was employed for cooking in oil. SEE BAKE.

4. Sir, סַיר, a deep vessel used for cooking food (Exo 27:3), properly a large (see 2Ki 4:38) pot (as usually rendered) or caldron (as rendered in Jer 1:13; Jer 3:18-19; Eze 11:3; Eze 11:7; Eze 11:11); especially for boiling meat, placed during the process on three stones  (Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1:58; Niebuhr. Descr. de l'Arabie, p. 46; Lane, Mod. Eg. 1:181). SEE CALDRON.

5. Parur, פָּרוּר(Sept. χύτρα; Vulg. olla), a vessel used for baking the manna (Num 11:8), for holding soup (Jdg 6:19; A.V. “pot”), and for boiling flesh (1Sa 2:14, “pot”). Gesenius says it is for פָּארוּר, heat, from פָּאִר= Arab. par, to boil. Furst questions this, and derives it from פָּרִר, to excavate, to deepen. SEE POT.

6. Tselachoth, צֵלָחוֹת(pl. of צֵלָחָה), large dishes or platters (2Ch 35:13; Sept. λέβητες; Vulg. ollae). The cognate צִלִּחִת, tseldchath, denotes a dish which maybe held in the hand and turned over for the purpose of wiping it (2Ki 21:13); in Pro 19:24; Pro 26:13, it is used tropically of the bosom. SEE PLATTER.

7. Marchesheth, מִרְחֶשֶׁת(from רָחִשׁ, to bubble over), a kettle for boiling meat (Lev 2:7; Lev 7:9; “frying-pan”). SEE FRYING-PAN.

8. Greek λέβης, a pot (1Es 1:12; 2Ma 7:3); but τηγανίζειν, to broil (2Ma 7:5, “fry in the pan”). SEE ROAST.

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

             is the name of the chief god of pastures, forests, and flocks among the ancient Greeks. The later rationalizing mythologists, misconceiving the meaning of his name (Πάν), which they confounded with τὸ πᾶν, “the whole” or “the universe,” whereas it is more probably connected with πάω (Lat. pasco), “to feed,” “to pasture,” represented him as a personification of the universe; but there is absolutely nothing in the myth to warrant such a notion. Pan neither in his genius nor his history figures as one of the great principal deities, and his worship became general only at a comparatively late period. He was, according to the most common belief, a son of Hermes (Mercury) by the daughter of Dryops; or by Penelope, the wife of Ulysses; while other accounts make Penelope the mother, but Ulysses himself the father — though the paternity of the god is also ascribed to the numerous wooers of Penelope in common. The original seat of his worship was the wild, hilly, and wooded solitudes of Arcadia, whence it gradually spread over the rest of Greece, but was not introduced into Athens until after the battle of Marathon. Homer does not mention him. His personal appearance is variously described. After the age of Praxiteles he is  represented with horns, a goat's beard, a crooked nose, pointed ears, a tail, and goat's feet. The legend goes that his strange appearance so frightened his mother that she ran off for fear; but his father, Herpies, carried him to Olympus, where all the gods, especially Dionysus (Bacchus), were charmed with the little monster. When he grew up he had a grim, shaggy aspect and a terrible voice, which bursting abruptly on the ear of the traveler in solitary places — for Pan was fond of making a great noise- inspired him with a sudden fear (whence the word panic). It is even related that the alarm excited by his blowing upon a shell decided the victory of the gods over the Titans. Previous to the age of Praxiteles Pan was usually represented in a human form, and was characterized by the shepherd's pipe, the pastoral crook, the disordered hair, and also sprouting horns.

Pan was the patron of all persons occupied in the .care of cattle and of bees. in hunting and in fishing. During the heat of the day he used to take a nap in the deep woods or on the lonely hill-sides, and was exceedingly wroth if his slumber was disturbed by the halloo of the hunters. He is also represented as fond of music, and of dancing with the forest nymphs, and as the inventor of the syrinx or shepherd's flute, also called Pan's pipe. Cows, goats, lambs, milk, honey, and new wine were offered to him. The fir-tree was sacred to him, and he had sanctuaries and temples in various parts of Arcadia — at Treezene, at Sicyon, at Athens, etc. The Romans identified the Greek Pan with their own Italian god Inuus, and sometimes also with Faunus. His festivals, called by the Greeks Lyccea, were brought to Italy by Evander, and they were well known at Rome by the name of the Lupercalia. The worship and the different functions of Pan are derived from the mythology of the ancient Egyptians. This god was one of the eight great gods of the Egyptians, who ranked before the other twelve gods, whom the Romans called Consentes. He was worshipped with the greatest solemnity all over Egypt. His statues represented him as a goat, not because he was really such, but this was done for mysterious reasons. He was the emblem of fecundity. and they looked upon him as the principle of all things. His horns, as some observe, represented the rays of the sun, and the brightness of the heavens was expressed by the vivacity and the ruddiness of his complexion. The star which he wore on his breast was the symbol of the firmament, and his hairy legs and feet denoted the inferior parts of the earth such as the woods and plants. Some suppose that he appeared as a goat because when the gods fled into Egypt, in their war  against the giants, Pan transformed himself into a goat, an example which was immediately followed by all the deities.

When, after the establishment of Christianity, the heathen deities were degraded by the Church into fallen angels, the characteristics of Pan — viz. the horns, the goat's beard, the pointed ears, the crooked nose, the tail, and the goat's feet — were transferred to the devil himself, and thus the “Auld Hornie” of popular superstition is simply Pan in disguise. See Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Vollmer, Mythol. Wortelbuch, p. 1283, 1284; Westcott, Handbook of Archaeology, p. 186.

## Pan-Movements[[@Headword:Pan-Movements]]

             for the union of the different Christian bodies of the world are of recent origin, and so largely at work at the present time that it is hardly possible to say more here than simply call the inquirer's attention to the Pan- Anglican Synods held in recent years, SEE SYNODS; SEE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS; and the Pan-Presbyterian Synods for the purpose of effecting a Presbyterian union. SEE PRESBYTERIANS. A Pan- Methodistic organization has been suggested, and is likely to secure the hearty cooperation of all Methodists of every branch and every country (comp. Methodist Quar. Rev. Jan. 7, 1875, p. 172, 173). See Evangelical Alliance Conference, 1873 (New York, 1874, 8vo).

## Pan-Presbyterian Council[[@Headword:Pan-Presbyterian Council]]

             SEE PRESBYTERIAN ALLIANCE.

## Panabaker[[@Headword:Panabaker]]

             JOHN, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Berkeley County, Va., March 21, 1798; was converted in 1821; joined the Baltimore Conference in 1824, and the same year was transferred to the Virginia Conference; after much success his health failed, and he superannuated in 1829, and died April 30, 1830. He was a man of great simplicity and useful talents, and his labors were productive of much good. See Minutes of Conferences, 2:76.

## Panaceia[[@Headword:Panaceia]]

             (Gr. the All-healing) was the name of a daughter of Asclepius worshipped at: Oropus.

## Panachaea[[@Headword:Panachaea]]

             the goddess of all the Achaeans, a sur name of Demeter, and also of Athene.

## Panaetius Of Rhodes[[@Headword:Panaetius Of Rhodes]]

             a celebrated ancient philosopher, the principal propagator of stoicism (q.v.) at Rome, was a native of Rhodes, and was born about 180 B.C. He studied at Athens under Diogenes the Stoic, went to Rome about 140 B.C., and there gave lessons in philosophy. He became intimately associated with Scipio AEmilianus, the younger Laelius, and Polybius, and made all these converts to stoicism. He also modified stoicism somewhat, suffering himself to be influenced in his philosophical opinions by his Latin surroundings. Hence Panaetius is spoken of as the first harbinger of  eclecticism. “He toned down the harsher elements of Stoic doctrine,” says Ueberweg, “and aimed at a less rugged and more brilliant rhetorical style, and, in addition to the authority of the earlier Stoics, appealed also to that of Plato, Aristotle, Xenocrates, Theophrastus, and Dicaearchus. Inclined more to doubt than to inflexible dogmatism, he denied the possibility of astrological prognostications, combated all forms of divination, abandoned the doctrine of the destruction of the world by fire, on which other Stoics had already had doubts, and with Socratic modesty confessed that he was still far from having attained to perfect wisdom” (History of Philosophy, 1:189; comp. Cicero, De Fin. 4:28). Panaetius died about B.C. 111 at Athens. His principal work is περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος, which is A Treatise on the Theory of Moral Obligation, divided into three parts: the first treats of those cases in which men deliberate between what is honest and what is dishonest; the second, concerning what is useful and what is disadvantageous; and the third of those cases in which the useful is opposed to the honest. The third part, as far as supplied by his disciple Posidonius, is inferior to the two other parts. The work formed the basis of Cicero's De Oficiis (comp. Cicero, De Officiis, 3:2, and Epist. ad Att. 16:11).

Panaetius wrote also a treatise On Divination, of which Cicero probably made use in his own work on the same subject. In bk. 2:42, Cicero quotes Pansetius as “one among the Stoics who rejected the predictions of the soothsayers; and his disciple, Scylax of Halicarnassus, an astrologer himself, and also a distinguished statesman in his native town, as one who despised all the Chaldaean arts of fortune-telling.” Another work by Panaetius treats On Tranquility of Mind, which some suppose may have been made use of by Plutarch in his work bearing the same title. He wrote also a book On Providence, mentioned by Cicero (Ad Atticum, 13:8), another On Magistrates, and one On Heresies, or sects of philosophers. His book On Socrates, quoted by Diogenes Laertius, and by Plutarch in his Life of Aristides, probably made a part of the last-mentioned work. Laertius and Seneca quote several opinions of Panaetius concerning ethics and metaphysics, and also physics. He argued that the torrid zone was inhabited, contrary to the common opinion of his time. Seneca (Epist. 116) relates his prudent and dignified reply to a young man who had asked his advice on the passion of love. For further information concerning this distinguished philosopher of antiquity, see Disputatio Historico-Critica de Panaetio Rhodio, by F. G. van Lynden (Leyden, 1802); and Chardon de la Rochette, lelanges de Critique et de Philologie (Paris, 1812), vol. i; Ritter, Gesch. der Philosophie.

## Panagia[[@Headword:Panagia]]

             (Gr. all holy) is a name for the bread cut crosswise and distributed to Greek monks in the refectory after every meal.

## Panathenaea[[@Headword:Panathenaea]]

             the most famous of all the Attican festivals celebrated in Athens in honor of Athene (Minerva) Polias, the guardian of the city. At first it was called Athenaea, being limited in its observance to the inhabitants of Athens, but when it was extended to all Attica, in the reign of Theseus, who combined the whole of the Attic tribes into one body, it received the name of Panathenaea; All writers who mention the Panathenaea distinguish a greater and a lesser one; the former was celebrated every fourth year, the latter annually. On the year in which the greater occurred, the lesser Panathenaea were wholly omitted. Both these festivals continued for twelve days, which was a longer time than any other ancient festival lasted. The greater was distinguished from the lesser festival by being more solemn and magnificent. The Panathenaea took place in the month Hecatombaeon (July), and were observed with solemnities of various kinds. Bulls were sacrificed to Athene, each town of Attica, as well as each colony of Athens, supplying a bull. Races on foot, on horses, and in chariots were indulged in; contests were held in wrestling, in music, and in recitation; amusements, in short, of every kind were practiced on this festive occasion.

The prize of the victors in these contests consisted of a vase supplied with oil from the olive-tree sacred to Athene which was planted on the Acropolis; and numerous vases of this kind have been discovered in different parts of Greece and Italy. In the case of the victors in the musical contests, a chaplet of olive-branches was given in addition to a vase. Dancing was one of the amusements in which the peo, indulged at this festival, and particularly the pyrrhic dance in armor. Both philosophers and orators also displayed their skill in debate. Herodotus is even said to have read his history to the Athenians at the Panathenaea. Another entertainment on the occasion of this festival was the Lampadephoria, or torch festival. A representation of the solemnities of the great procession in the Panathenea is found on the sculptures of the Parthenon in the British Museum. This procession to the temple of Athene Polias was the great solemnity of the occasion. It seems to have been limited to the greater Panathenaea, and to have had as its object the carrying of the peplus of Athene to her temple. The peplus or sacred garment of the goddess was  borne along in the procession suspended from the mast of a ship, which was so constructed as to be moved along on land by means of underground machinery. Nearly the whole population of Attica took part in the procession, either on foot, on horseback, or in chariots; the old men- carrying olive-branches, the young men clothed in armor, and maidens of noble families, called Canephori, carrying baskets which contained gifts for the goddess. At the great Panathenlea golden crowns were conferred on those individuals who had deserved well of their country; and prisoners were set at liberty during the festival.

## Pancarea[[@Headword:Pancarea]]

             is the name given to a representation of the six general councils painted on the walls of St. Peter's at Rome in the 8th century.

## Panchatantra[[@Headword:Panchatantra]]

             (literally, the five books) is the name of the celebrated Sanscrit fable-book of the Hindûs whence the Hitopadesa was compiled and enlarged. Its authorship is ascribed to a Brahmin of the name of Vishnusarman, who, as its introduction in a “later recension relates, had undertaken to instruct, within six months, the unruly sons of Amarasakti, a king of Mahilaropya or Mihilaropya, in all branches of knowledge required by a king, and for this purpose composed this work. If the latter part of this story be true, it is more probable, however, as professor Benfey assumes, that Vishnusarman was merely the teacher of the princes, and that the existing work itself was composed by some other personage; for an older recension of the work does not speak of his having brought his tales into the shape of a work. The arrangement of the Panchatantra is quite similar to that of the Hitopadesa. The fables are narrated in prose, and the morals drawn from or connected with them are interwoven with the narrative in verse; many such verses, if not all, being quotations from other works. On the history of the Panchatantra, and its relation to the fable-books and fables of other nations, see the excellent work of professor Theodor Benfey, Panchatantra: Fif Bucher indischer Fabeln, Marchen, und Erzaihlunlgen (Leips. 1859, 2 vols.). The first volume contains his historical and critical Researches, and the latter his literal translation of the Panchatantra into German.

## Pancotto, Pietro[[@Headword:Pancotto, Pietro]]

             an Italian painter, educated in the school of the Caracci, flourished about 1590. According to Malaysia, he was an eccentric genius. His principal work is a grand fresco representing The Last Judgment, in the church of the Madonna di S. Colombano at Bologna. In it he revenged himself on the parish priest by introducing his portrait in caricature, which excited the indignation of the clergy, and probably lost him any further employment from them. Lanzi places him in the third rank, among the Bolognese painters, Domenichino and Guido holding the first.

## Pancras[[@Headword:Pancras]]

             ST. (Ital. San Pancrazio; Fr. St. Pancrace), a noted Italian ecclesiastic who suffered martyrdom for the Christian cause, flourished near the opening of the 4th century. When only a boy of fourteen he boldly offered himself as a martyr, and most valiantly defended the Christian faith before the emperor Diocletian, who punished Pancras's audacity by executing him. His remains were buried by Christian women. French kings formerly confirmed their treaties in his name. for he was regarded as the avenger of false swearing, and it was believed that all who swore falsely in his name were immediately and visibly punished. A church dedicated to this saint was built at Rome in A.D. 500. He is commemorated by the Roman Catholic Church May 12. See Butler, Lives of the Saints, vol. i.

## Pandavas[[@Headword:Pandavas]]

             or the descendants of Pandu, is the name of the five princes whose contest for regal supremacy with their cousins, the Kuirus, the sons of Dhritarashtra, forms the foundation of the narrative of the great epic poem, the Mahabharata (q.v.). Their names are Yudhishthira, Bhima, Ajunna, Nakula, and Sahadeva — the former three being the sons of Pandu by one of his wives, Pritha; and the latter two by his other wife Madri. But though Paindui is thus the recognized father of these princes, the legend of the Mahabharata looks upon him in truth merely as their father by courtesy; for it relates that Yudlushthira was the son of Dharma, the god of justice; Bhima, of Vfyu, the god of wind; Arjuna, of Indra, the god of the firmament; and Nakula and Sahadeva, of the Aswins, the twin-sons of the sun.

## Pandects[[@Headword:Pandects]]

             This word, which properly means a work containing all subjects (πανδέκτης), an encyclopaedia, is principally applied to the general code of law drawn up by order of the emperor Justiniann (q.v.) It acquired the name of Pandects from the universality of its comprehension; it is called also by the name Digestum, or Digest. It was an attempt to form a complete system of law from the authoritative commentaries of the jurists upon the laws of Rome. The compilation of the Pandects was undertaken after that great collection of the laws themselves which is known as the Codex Justinianeus. It was entrusted to the celebrated Tribonianus, who had already distinguished himself in the preparation of the Codex. Tribonianus formed a commission consisting of seventeen members, who were occupied from the year 530 till 533 in examining, selecting, compressing, and systematizing the authorities, consisting of upwards of two thousand treatises, whose interpretation of the ancient laws of Rome was from that time forward to be adopted with the authority of law. A period of ten years had been allowed them for the completion of their work; but so diligently did they prosecute it that it was completed in less than one third of the allotted time; and some idea of its extent may be formed from the fact that it contains upwards of nine:thousand separate extracts, selected according to subjects from the two thousand treatises referred to above.

The Pandects are divided into 50 books, and also into 7 parts, which correspond respectively with books 1-4, 5-11, 12-19, 20-27, 28-35, 36-44, and 45-50. Of these divisions, however, the latter (into parts) is seldom attended to in citations. Each book is subdivided into titles, under which are arranged the extracts from the various jurists, who are thirty-nine in number, and are by some called the classical jurists, although other writers on Roman law confine that appellation to five of the number, Papinian, Paulus, Ulpian, Gains, and Modestinus. The extracts from these indeed constitute the bulk of the collection; those from Ulpian alone making one third of the whole work, those from Paulus one sixth, and those from Papinian one twelfth. Other writers besides these thirty-nine are cited, but only indirectly, i.e. when cited by the jurists whose works form the basis of the collection. The principle upon which the internal arrangement of the extracts from individual writers was made had long been a subject of controversy. The question seems now to be satisfactorily solved; but the details of the discussion would carry us beyond the prescribed limits. Of the execution of the work, it may be said that  although not free from repetition (the same extracts occurring under different heads), and from occasional inaptness of citation, and other inconsistencies, yet it deserves the very highest commendation. In its relations to the history and literature of ancient Rome it is invaluable; and taken along with its necessary complement the Codex, it may justly be regarded (having been the basis of all the mediaeval legislation) as of the utmost value in the study of the principles not alone of Roman, but of all European law,” including the ecclesiastical. The word Pandects was used by Papias (q.v.) to designate the Scriptures.

## Pandemos[[@Headword:Pandemos]]

             a surname of Aphrodite (Venus), under which she was worshipped at Athens from the time when Theseus united the scattered tribes of Attica into one political body. White goats were sacrificed to the goddess. The surname of Pandemos was also applied to Eros (Cupid).

## Pandera[[@Headword:Pandera]]

             SEE PANTHERA.

## Panderen, Egbert Van[[@Headword:Panderen, Egbert Van]]

             a Dutch engraver, was born at Haarlem, according to Nagler, in the year 1575, though others say in the year 1606. Nagler gives a list of thirty-three prints by him. They are executed with the graver in a formal style, with little effect, and the drawing is incorrect. Some of them are interesting from the subjects. The following are the best: The Virgin interceding with Christ for the Salvation of Mankind (after Rubens): — The Four Evangelists ( after Peter de Jode ): — St. Louis, with a border representing his miracles (after the same master).

## Pandia[[@Headword:Pandia]]

             is said to have been a goddess of the moon worshipped by the ancient Greeks.

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

             an Attic festival, the precise nature of which is somewhat doubtful, some supposing it to have been instituted in the nor of the goddess of the same name, and others alleging it to have been a festival in honor of Zeus  (Jupiter), and celebrated by ail the Attic tribes just like the Panathenaea (q.v.). It was held on the 14th of the Greek month Elaphebolion, and it appears to have been celebrated at Athens in the time of Demosthenes.

## Pandiosos[[@Headword:Pandiosos]]

             was a daughter of Cecrops Agraulos, worshipped at Athens along with Thallo. She had a sanctuary near the temple of Athene Polias.

## Pandolfi, Giovanni Giacomo[[@Headword:Pandolfi, Giovanni Giacomo]]

             an Italian painter; flourished at Pesaro about 1630. He was a scholar of Frederigo Zuccaro. Lanzi says, “His works are celebrated in his native city, and do not yield the palm to those of Zuccaro, as seen in his pictures of S. Giorgio and S. Carlo in the cathedral.” He also decorated the whole chapel in the Nome di Dio with various subjects in fresco from the Old and New Testaments.

## Pandora[[@Headword:Pandora]]

             (i.e. the All-endowed), according to Grecian myth, was the first woman on the earth. When Prometheus had stolen fire from heaven, Zeus instigated Hepheestus to make woman out of earth to bring vexation upon man by her graces. The gods endowed her with every gift necessary for this purpose, beauty, boldness, cunning, etc.; and Zeus sent her to Epimetheus, the brother of Prometheus, who forgot his brother's warning against receiving any gift from Zeus. A later form of the myth represents Pandora as possessing a vessel or box filled with winged blessings, which mankind would have continued to enjoy if curiosity had not prompted her to open it, when all the blessings flew out, except Hope.

## Pandours[[@Headword:Pandours]]

             SEE SERVIANS.

## Pandu[[@Headword:Pandu]]

             (literally, white) is the name in Hindû mythology of the father of the Pandavas (q.v.), and the brother of Dhritarashtra. Although the elder of the two princes, he was rendered by his “pallor” — implying, perhaps, a kind of disease — incapable of succession, and therefore obliged to relinquish his claim to his brother. He retired to the Himalaya Mountains, where his  sons were born, and where he died. His renunciation of the throne became thus the cause of contest between the Pandayas, his sons, and the Kurus, or the sons of Dhritarashtra.

## Pandulph(us)[[@Headword:Pandulph(us)]]

             a Roman cardinal, flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He was an- Italian by birth, and is spoken of as a man of consummate ability. Pandulph was high in the confidence of pope Innocent III, and was employed by the pontiff as legate to king John of England to bring about a reconciliation of that unhappy monarch with irresistible Rome. The successful termination of Pandulph's mission has been spoken of in our article JOHN SEE JOHN (q.v.). Of Pandulph's general personal history but little is accessible. Milman says that he was not cardinal at all (Hist. of Lat. Ch. v. 35, foot-note 2), but there is evidence to the contrary. The schismatic pope Anacletus II in 1230 made Pandulph cardinal-deacon of S. Cosmas and Damianus (comp. Wattenbach, Deutschland's Geschichtsquellen, p. 447). In 1225 Pandulph had been made bishop of Norwich by the king at the request of pope Honorius. Pandulph died about the middle of the century. He wrote the biographies of several pontiffs, among them-Gelasius II, Calixtus II, and Honorius II. As he was himself a party to the history of which he wrote in these works Pandulph's labor cannot be too highly estimated. He was moreover a man of great ability, and wielded a powerful pen. His imagination was lively, his eye appreciated beauty, and his heart was kindly disposed towards any of the men whom the Roman priesthood called to preside over their spiritual dominion, and he was therefore well fitted for the task he mapped out for himself. See Piper, Monum. Theol. p. 445, 446; Milman, Hist. of Lat. Ch. v. 25-26, 35- 36, 41, 50, 53, 316; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2:215-217.

## Pane[[@Headword:Pane]]

             is the name, in ecclesiastical architecture, for a bay in a cloister; the side of a tower; a panel or compartment of wainscoting or ceilings. SEE PANEL.

## Paneas[[@Headword:Paneas]]

             SEE CAESAREA PHILIPPI.

## Panegyric[[@Headword:Panegyric]]

             (Lat. panegyricoe orationes) is the name of the orations pronounced upon the graves of the early Christian martyrs. They were especially a labor of love with the Church fathers, who thus came to compose some of their most praised homilies (q.v.). Among the ablest were those by Chrysostom. Basil the Great, the Gregories of Nazianzum and of Nyssa, Ambrose, Augustine, Leo, Chrysologus, and others. These panegyrics contained partly thanksgivings to God for the mercy shown the martyrs, partly encouragement to like action for remaining faithful if the occasion should arise, partly intercessory prayers for the whole Church, and encouraging reminders of the approaching resurrection of the dead. See Siegel, Christliche Alterthumer, 3:281.

## Panegyricon[[@Headword:Panegyricon]]

             (πανηγυρικόν, flattering) is the title of an Eastern Church collection of sermons by the most approved authors of the Christian Church on different festivals. Almost every province in the East has a separate collection, and the consequence is that the book remains in MS. form. Sometimes on very high festivals the sermon for the day is transcribed into the Menea, an Eastern office-book corresponding to the Breviary (q.v.), or other office- books, as was that of St. Chrysostom into the Pentecostarion (q.v.) for Easterday. See Neale, Introd. to the Hist. of the East. Ch. vol. ii, ch. iii, esp. p. 889.

## Panegyris[[@Headword:Panegyris]]

             a term used by the ancient Greeks to denote a meeting of an entire nation or people for the purpose of uniting together in worship. It was a religious festival, in which the people engaged in prayer, sacrifices, and processions, besides games, musical contests, and other entertainments. At these meetings poets recited their verses, authors read their productions, orators delivered their speeches, and philosophers conducted grave debates in the midst of assembled multitudes. At a later period the panegyris seems to have degenerated into a mere market or fair for the sale of all kinds of merchandise, and to have almost entirely lost its religious character.

## Panel[[@Headword:Panel]]

             (through Fr. from Lat. pannus, a piece of cloth) is probably in its English form only a diminutive of pane; it wasn formerly often used for the lights of windows, but is now almost exclusively confined to the sunken compartments of wainscoting, ceilings, etc, and the corresponding features in stone-work, which are so abundantly employed in Gothic architecture as ornaments on walls, ceilings, screens, tombs, etc.

Of the Norman style no wooden panels remain; in stone-work, shallow recesses, to which this term may be applied; are frequently to be found; they are sometimes single, but oftener in ranges, and are commonly arched, and not unusually serve as niches to hold statues, etc.

In the Early English style the panellings in stonework are: more varied; circles, trefoils, quatrefoils, cinquefoils, etc., and the pointed oval called the vesica piscis, are common forms; they are also frequently used in ranges, like shallow arcades, divided by small shafts or mullions, the heads being either plain arches, trefoils, or cinquefoils, and panels similar to these are often used singly; the backs are sometimes enriched with foliage, diaper- work, or other carvings.

In the Decorated style wood panelling is frequently enriched with tracery, and sometimes with foliage also, or with shields and heraldic devices: stone panelling varies considerably; it is very commonly arched, and filled with tracery like windows, or arranged in squares, circles, etc., and feathered, or filled with tracery and other ornaments in different ways; shields are often introduced, and the backs of the panels are sometimes diapered.

In the Perpendiculadr style: the walls and vaulted ceilings of buildings are sometimes almost entirely covered with panelling, formed by mullions and tracery resembling the windows; and a variety of other panels of different forms, such as circles, squares, quatrefoils, etc., are profusely used in the subordinate parts, which are enriched with tracers, featherings, foliage,  shields, etc., in different ways: in wood panelling the tracery and ornaments are more minute than was usual at an earlier period; and towards the end of the style these enrichments, instead of being attached to the panels, are usually carved upon it, and are sometimes very small and delicate. There is one kind of ornament which was introduced towards the end of the Perpendicular style, and prevailed for a considerable time, which deserves to be particularly mentioned; it consists of a series of straight moldings worked upon the panel, so arranged and with the ends so formed as to represent the folds of linen; it is usually called the linen pattern. Many churches have wooden ceilings of the Perpendicular style, and some perhaps of earlier date, which are divided into panels, either by, the timbers of the roof or by ribs fixed on the boarding; some of these are highly ornamented, and probably most have been enriched by painting. After the expiration of Gothic architecture panelling in great measure ceased to be used in stone-work, but was extensively employed in wainscoting and plaster-work; it was sometimes found in complicated geometrical patterns, and was often very highly enriched with a variety of ornaments.

## Panetti, Domenico[[@Headword:Panetti, Domenico]]

             an Italian painter, was born in 1460 at Ferrara. It is not known under whom he studied; but, according to Baruffaldi, he painted in the dry, formal style of the time, till his pupil, Benvenuto da Garofalo, returned from Rome after acquiring the new style under Raphael. The instructor now became the pupil of his former disciple, and, although somewhat advanced in years, Panetti so entirely changed his manner that he became one of the ablest artists of his time. He executed many works for the churches of Ferrara which Lanzi says are worthy of competition with the best masters of the 14th century. Among his best works are the Descent from the Cross, in the church of S. Niccola; the Visitation of the Virgin to St. Elisabeth, in S. Francesco; and a picture of St. Andrea at the Agostiniani. There is one of his pictures in the Dresden gallery, and Kugler mentions as one of his a beautiful picture of The Entombment in the museum at Berlin. He usually inscribed his name in full upon his pictures, which Lanzi says bear evidence of change in pictoric character without an example. He died in 10530,

## Pange Lingua Gloriosi Proelium Certaminis[[@Headword:Pange Lingua Gloriosi Proelium Certaminis]]

             This world-famous hymn, one of the grandest in the treasury of the Latin Church, was composed by. Fortunatus (q.v.) on occasion of the reception of certain relics by St. Gregory of Tours and St. Radegund, previously to the consecration of a church at Poitiers. It is therefore strictly and primarily a processional hymn, though very naturally afterwards adapted to Passion-  tide” (Neale). The following is the form of the hymn in the Roman Breviary:

Pange lingua gloriosi lauream certaminis, Et super crucis tropaeo dic trinmph.nnm iinoilem, Qualiter redemptor orbis immolatns vicelit. De parentis protoplasti fraude factor condolens Quando pomi noxialis in necem morsu ruit, Ipse lignum tune naotavit damna ligni ut solveret. Hoc opus nostrae salatis: ordo depoposcerat; Multiformis proditoris ars nt arreml falleret, Et medelam ferret inde hostis unde loserat. Quando venit erigo sacri plenitudo temporis Missus est ab arce patris natus orbis conditor Atque ventre virginali carune amictus produt. Vagit infans inter arcta conditis praesepia, Melibra panuis involuta virgo mater alligat, Et Dei manus pedesque stricta cingitfascia. Lustra sex qui tam peregit, tenpus implens corporis Sponte libera redemptor passioni deditus, Agnus in crucis levatur'immolandas stipite.

Felle potus ecce langouet: spina, clavi, lancea - Mite ‘corppi perforaiunt,' nnda mnitiiat et ernor: - Telrra, pontus- , astra, mundus quo layantur flumine. Crux fidelis inter omnes arbor una nobilis Silva talem nulla profert fronde, flore,gemine: Dulce ferinim, dulce lignumj dulce ponds sunstinent. Flecte ramos arbor alta, tensa laxa visciera, Et rigor lentescat ille qnem dedit nativitas, Et siperini.membnra regis tende miti stipite. Sola digna tu fuisti ferre mnlidi victimam, Atque portum prseparare area mundo naufrago, Quem sacer cruor perulnxit fusus agni corpore. [Sempiterna sit beatse Triintati gloria. .Equan patri filioque, par decus paraclito: Unius trinique nomen laudet universitas.]

Of this hymn, which the hynmologist Daniel pronounced “in pulcherrimorum numero recensendum,” we give a part of Mrs. Charles's fine rendering:

“Spread, my tongue, the wondrous story of the glorious battle, far! What the trophies and the triumphs of the cross of Jesus are — How the Victim, immolated, vanquished in that mighty war. Pitying, did the Great Redeemer Adam's fall and ruin see, Sentenced then to death by tasting fruit of the forbidden tree, And he marked that wood the weapon of redeeming love to be. Thus the scheme of our redemption was of old in order laid, Thus the wily arts were baffled of the foe who man betrayed, And the armor of redemption from Death's armory was made.”  Like the-preceding it has been translated into English and German. See Schaff, Christ in Song, p. 155; Neale, Mediaeval Hymns and Sequences, p. 1-4; Caswall, Lyra Catholica, p. 137; Mrs. Charles, Christian Life in Song, p. 133; Hymns Ancient and Modern; Muller, Singers and Songs of the Church, p. 11; Evenings with the Sacred Poets, p. 47 sq.; Bassler, Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder, p. 65, 193; Simrock, Lauda Sion Salvatorem, p. 92 sq.; Rambach, Anthologie, 1:100 sq.; Konigsfeld, Lateinische Hymnen und Gesdnge, 2:78 sq.; Fortlage, Gesdnge christlicher Voizeit, p. 108 sq.; Daniel, Hymnologischer Bluthenstrauss, p. 14, 101; id. Thesaurus Hymnologiscus, 1:163-165; Wackernagel, Das deutsche Kirchenlied, 1:61 sq.; Koch, Geschichte des Kirchenliedes (Stuttgard, 1866), 1:57 sq. (B. P.)

## Pange Lingua, Gloriosi Corporis Mysterium[[@Headword:Pange Lingua, Gloriosi Corporis Mysterium]]

             is one of the most famous and remarkable hymns of the Roman Breviary (q.v.). The Pange Lingua was written by St. Thomas Aquinas, the “Doctor Angelicus,” and is used in the Roman Catholic Church on the feast of Corpus Christi and in solemn masses. It was composed at the instance of pope Urban IV. When that pontiff determined to establish the festival of the Holy Sacrament he directed Aquinas to prepare the “office” for that day. The Pange Lingua is a most characteristic example as well of the mediaeval Latin versification as of that union of theology with asceticism which a large class of these hymns present. Besides its place in the Breviary, this hym forms part of the service called Benediction with the Blessed Sacrament, and is sung on all occasions of the exposition, procession, and other public acts of eucharistic worship. The celebrated hymn in its received form reads as follows:

Pange, lingua gloriosi Corporis mysterium, Salgninisque pretiosi, Qiiem in mundi pretium, iructus ventris generosi, Rex effudit gentium. Nobis datus, nobis inatus Ex intacta virgine, Et in mudo.counversatus, Sparso verbi sermine, sui mormas incolatus Miro clausit ordine |In supremae nocte coena Recuimbens cum fratribus, Observata lege plene Cibis in legalibus, Cibum turbae duodens

“Se dat suis manibus Verbum caro, panlem iernum Verbo carnem efficit: Fitque sanguis Christi merum;.” Etssensus deficit, Ad firmandum cor sincerum Sola tides sufficit. Tantnm ergo Sacramentum  Veneremur cernui; Et antiqnum.documentum Novo cedat ritni, Prsestet fides supplementunm Sensuum defectui. Genitori, genitoque Lanet jubilatio, Salus, honor, virtus quoque Sit et benedictio: Procedenti ab utroque Compar sit laudatio.

“This hymn,” says Mr. Neale, “contests the second place among those of the Western Church with the Vexilla Regis, the Stabat Mater, the Jesus dulcis Memoria, the Ad Regias Agni Dapes, the Ad Supernam, and one or two others, leaving the Dies Irae (q.v.) in its unapproachable glory. It has been a bow of Ulysses to translators.” How true this remark is may be seen from the following specimens both in English and German: Neale (Of the glorious Body telling).; Benedict (Sing, my tongue, the theme undying); Schaff (Sing, my tongue, the mystery telling); Palmer (Sing, and the mystery declare); Caswall (Sing, my tongue, the Savior's glory); “Hymns Ancient and Modern” (Now, my tongue, the mystery telling); Rumbach (Preiset Lippen das Geheinniss); Simrock (Kundet Lippen all des Hehren); Daniel (Preist ein Wunder ohne Gleichen); Fortlage (Zunge, king in Wanderftnen); Konigsfeld (Singet, Iochgesang des Grossen). Trench, in his collection of sacred Latin poetry, has omitted it, because it strongly savors of transubstantiation. For the various translations, comp. Schaff, Christ in Song; Neale, Medieeval Hymns; Benedict, Hymn of Hildebert; Caswall, Hymns and Poems; Hymns Ancient and Modern; Rambach, Anthologie, vol i; Simrock, Lauda Sion-Salvatorem Konigsfeld, Lateinische Hymnen und Gesange; Bassler, Auswahl altchristlicher Lieder; Fortlage, Gesdnge christlicher Vorzeit; Daniel, Hymnologischer Blithenstrauss (Halle, 1840). (B.P.)

## Panhellenia[[@Headword:Panhellenia]]

             a festival of all the Greeks, as the name implies. Its first institution is ascribed to the emperor Hadrian.

## Panhellenius[[@Headword:Panhellenius]]

             a surname of Dodonean Zeus (Jupiter), as having been worshipped by all the Hellenes or Greeks. There was a sanctuary built for his worship in AEgina, where a festival was also held in his honor.

## Panicale, Masolino Da[[@Headword:Panicale, Masolino Da]]

             an eminent Italian sculptor and painter, born at Panicale, in the Florentine territory, in 1378. He first studied modelling and sculpture under Lorenzo Ghiberti, who at that time was unrivaled in composition and design, and in giving animation to his figures. Being already a distinguished artist, he studied coloring under Gherarda Stamina. Thus uniting in himself the excellence of two schools, and diligently cultivating the art of chiaroscuro, he produced a new style, not wholly exempt from dryness, but grand, determined, and harmonious beyond any former example; and one that was carried to higher perfection by his scholar, Masaccio. The chapel of S. Pietro al Carmine is a monument of his genius. He there painted the Four Evangelists, the Vocation of St. Peter to the Apostleship, the Denial of Christ, Curing the Lame Man at the Gate of the Temple, and the Preaching to the Multitude. Panicale died in 1415, before the completion of the chapel, and the rest of the Acts of St. Peter. These were afterwards painted by Masaccio. Some of his works have been engraved.

## Panico, Antonio Maria[[@Headword:Panico, Antonio Maria]]

             a Bolognese painter, who, according to Bellora, was a disciple of Annibale Caracci, whom he accompanied to Rome at an early age, and whose manner he emulated. He was much employed by Mario Farnese in decorating his country-seats at Castro and Latera. His most established work is a picture of the mass in the cathedral at Farnese, in which, Lanzi says, he was assisted by Annibale, who even conducted some of the figures. This, however, seems doubtful, as Caracci died in 1609, and Panico in 1652. It is not probable that the latter would have been entrusted with so important a commission almost in his youth, which must have been the case were such an association true.

## Paniel, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Paniel, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Mannheim, April 19, 1802. He studied at Heidelberg, was for some time preacher at Kiaferthal, near Mannheim, in 1834 at Ziegelhausen, near Heidelberg, in 1839 pastor at Bremen, and died in 1867, doctor of theology. He published, Allgemeine Uebersicht derjenigen Gegenstande, welche das gegenwartige Bedurfniss der evangelisch-protestantiscehen Kirche Badens empfiehlt (Mannheim, 1832): — Homiletisches' Magazin (Heidelberg, 1836, 2 volumes): — Pragmatische Geschichte der christlichen Beredsamnkeit und der Homiletik (Leipsic, 1839-40). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:972 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:129. (B.P.)

## Panieri, Ferdinando[[@Headword:Panieri, Ferdinando]]

             an Italian theologian, was born at Pistoia Nov. 24, 1759. He was for some time professor of dogmatic theology in the seminary of his native town. He was favorable to Jansenism (q.v.), and assisted in the synod of 1786, where the principles of the Jansenists were discussed; but as he was in danger of persecution for his liberal stand, he afterwards addressed to the holy chair a complete retraction of his conduct. A canonicate was then given him, and the direction of the ecclesiastical conferences of the diocese in which he held the professorship. He died at Pistoia Jan. 27, 1822. His principal writing is Examen sur les peches qui se commettent dans les fetes et les plaisirs du siecle (Pistola, 1808-1813, 4 vols.). See Catalogue des Saints de Pistoie (ibid. 1818, 2 vols.); Mahul, Annuaire necrol. 1823; Joefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:134.

## Panigarola, Francois[[@Headword:Panigarola, Francois]]

             a celebrated Italian Romanist, noted especially as a pulpit orator, was born of noble descent at Milan Jan. 6,1548. He was educated by Noel Conti and Aonio Paleario, and early gave proof of great vivacity of mind and a wonderful memory. He studied law for several years at Pavia and Bologna, at the same time leading a very disorderly life. Recalled to other sentiments by the death of his father, he entered the Order of Cordeliers in 1567, and soon distinguished himself by his talent for preaching. In 1571 he went to Paris to finish his theological studies, where he preached before Catharine de' Medici. After having stopped at Lyons and Antwerp, he returned in 1573 to his own country, and for several years taught theology in different convents of his order. His sermons, which in the opinion of Tiraboschi,  display the richest imagination, great force of thought, and energetic style, are full of gravity, although a little redundant. They gained him the merited reputation of the most eloquent orator of his country's contemporaries. After having passed two years near San Carlo Borromeo, who highly esteemed Panigarola, he was promoted to the bishopric of Asti in 1587. Two years after he was sent to Paris, to sustain there by his eloquence the party of the League. In 1590 he returned to his diocese. which he administered till: his death with great zeal. He died May 31, 1594. Among his eighty and more works, printed or in MS., we will quote, Lezioni xx contro Calvino (Venice, 1583, 4to): — Prediche spezzate (Asti. 1591. 4to): — Tre prediche fatte in Parigi (ibid. 1592, 8vo): — Compendio degli Annali Ecclesiastici del Baronio (Venice, 1593, 4to): — Sei quaresimali fatti in Roma (Rome, 1596, 2. vols. 4to): — Specchio di guerra (Bergamo, 1597, 4to): — Conciones Latinae (Cologne, 1600, 8vo): — Homiliae Romanic habitue anno 1580 (Venice, 1604, 8vo): — Rhetoricoe ecclesiasticcu libri iii. ( Cologne, 1605, 8v): — La quaresima in sonetti con le figure (Bergamo, 1606, 4to ): — Il predicatoe, o sia commentario al libro dell' Eloquenza di Denmetrio Phalereo (Venice, 1609, 4to): — Sagri concertt (Milan, 1625, 4to): — Carmina Latina, in vol. vii of the “Carmina poetarum Italorum.” Panigarola has left some very interesting menoires upon his life, preserved in MS. in the library of St. Ango of Milan and in the Ambrosian library of the same city. See Bongratia de Varenna, Vita di Panigarola (Milan, 1617, 4to; in French in the Bibliotheque of Bullart); Ughelli, Italia sacra, t. iv; Argelati, Scriptores mediolanenses Tiraboschi, Storia della letter. Italiana.

## Panini[[@Headword:Panini]]

             the most celebrated of the Sanscrit grammarians, is said to have been the grandson of the inspired legislator Devala, and lived at so remote an age that he is reckoned among the fabulous sages mentioned in the Puranas (see Colebrooke, Asiat. Res. 7:202). With regard to his death we have the following tradition in the Hitopadega: “It is related that the valuable life of Panini was destroyed by a lion.” The Indians consider him as their most ancient grammarian, but his great work is confessedly derived from earlier treatises on the same subject: he often quotes his predecessors Sacalya, Gargya, and others; and it appears from a passage in the Bhagavad-Gita (unless the following line is an interpolation of a later age) that the nomenclature of grammar existed when the great epic poem, the Maha- Bharata, was composed. Panini's grammar consists of 3996 short  aphorisms, or sutras, divided into eight books, in which the rules of grammar are delivered with such oracular brevity and obscurity that they need a commentary to render them intelligible even to the learned Indians. Besides the Carica of Bhartrihari, a brother of king Vicramaditya, there were the following treatises, written expressly to illustrate it: 1. the Bhattikavya, which was nominally a poem describing the adventures of Rama, but really a collection of all the defective and anomalous forms of words in the language (published at Calcutta, 1826); 2. the Maha-Bhashya, or “great commentary,” by Patanjali. A new edition of Panini has been published with the following title: Panini's acht Bicher gtraimmatischer Regeln (Sanscrit, with Commentary by Dr. Otto Bohtlugk [Bonn, 1839], 2 vols. 8vo). The first volume contains the Sanscrit text of Panini's Sutras with the native scholia; the second volume contains an introduction, a German commentary, and indexes.

## Panionia[[@Headword:Panionia]]

             the great national festival of the Ionians. in honor of Poseidon (Neptune), the god whom they specially revered. On this occasion a bull was sacrificed, and if the animal roared during the process of killing it was regarded as pleasing to the deity. The sacrifices were performed by a young man of Priene, who was chosen for the purpose with the title of king. The festival was held on Mount Mycale, where stood the Panionium, or temple of Poseidon Heliconius.

## Panis Benedictus[[@Headword:Panis Benedictus]]

             (blessed bread), a portion of bread in the ancient African Church, which, being seasoned with salt, was given with milk and honey at baptism. SEE HONEY; SEE MILK. The expression in the patristic writings first occurs in Augustine's work on Baptism. It has given rise to a perplexing controversy respecting the sacrament of the catechumens (q.v.). Bonar, Basnage, and Bingham contend that the panits benedictus of Augustine was not the sacramental bread at all, but bread seasoned with salt; and that the baptism so administered was regarded by the early Christians as the emblem of purity and incorruption. The blessed bread of the Greek Church is the Antidoron (q.v.).

## Panis Conjuratio[[@Headword:Panis Conjuratio]]

             (exorcism of the bread) was the technical term which designated the ordeal of consecrated bread or cheese practiced in the Middle Ages. It was administered by presenting to the accused a piece of bread (generally of barley) or of cheese, about an ounce in weight, over which adjurations had been pronounced. After appropriate religious ceremonies, including the communion, the morsel was eaten; the event being determined by the ability of the accused to swallow it. This depended of course on the imagination, and we can readily understand how, in those times of faith, the oppressive observances which accompanied the ordeal would affect the criminal who, conscious of guilt, stood up at the altar, took the sacrament, and pledged his salvation on the truth of his oath. ‘The mode by which a conviction was expected may be gathered from the forms of the exorcism employed, of which a number have been preserved:

“O Lord Jesus Christ, . . grant, we pray thee, by thy holy name, that he who is guilty of this crime in thought or in deed, when this creature of sanctified bread is presented to him for the proving of the truth, let his throat be narrowed, and in thy name let it be rejected rather than devoured. And let not the spirit of the devil prevail in this to subvert the judgment by false appearances. But he who is guilty of this crime, let him, chiefly by virtue of the body and blood of our Lord which he has received in communion, when he takes the consecrated bread or cheese tremble, and grow pale in trembling, and shake in all his limbs; and let the innocent quietly and healthfully, with all ease, chew and swallow this morsel of bread or cheese, crossed in thy holy name, that all may know that thou art the just Judge,” etc.

Even more whimsical in its devout impiety is the following:

“O God most High, who dwellest in the heaven, who through thy Trinity and majesty hast thy just angels send, O Lord, thy angel Gabriel to stick in the throat of those who have committed this theft, that they may neither chew nor swallow this bread and cheese created by thee. I invoke the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, with twelve thousand angels and archangels; I invoke the four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, uand John; I invoke Moses and Aaron, who divided the sea, that they may bind to their throats the tongues of men who have committed this theft, or consented  thereto. If they taste this bread and cheese created by thee, may they tremble like a trembling tree, and have no rest, nor keep the bread and cheese in their months, that all may know thou art the Lord, and there is none other beside thee.”

## Panis Literae[[@Headword:Panis Literae]]

             ("bread briefs") were letters of recommendation, by which a secular lord ordered a monastery or other institution of charity to receive a certain. person for support. The right of issuing such letters was connected with the duty, originally imposed upon such institutions, of showing hospitality to princes and other great lords when they were travelling. During the Middle Ages the emperor of Germany exercised a very extensive right of this kind; but the custom existed also in other countries. Towards the end of the 18th century the princes of the different countries refused to admit such royal briefs in their respective territories, and Frederick the Great openly refused to acknowledge such a brief, and asked to be let alone in future with such imperial orders. See Kluber, Litteratur de dedeuischen  Stcaatsrechts (Erlangen, 1791), pages 540-543, 548; Haberlin, Pragmatische Geschichte der neuesten kaiserlichen Walkapitulation (Leipsic, 1792), page 97; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. "Panisbrief." (B.P.)

## Paniter, David[[@Headword:Paniter, David]]

             a Scotch prelate, was vicar of the Church of Carstairs, in the diocese of Glasgow, prior of St. Mary's Isle in Galloway, and some time commendator of the abbey of Cambuskenneth. In 1543 he was; principal secretary of state. He was made bishop of the see of Ross about 1545, and was still there in 1556. He probably died in 1558. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 192.

## Panjabi Version[[@Headword:Panjabi Version]]

             SEE PUNJABI VERSION.

## Pannag[[@Headword:Pannag]]

             (פִּנִּג, pannag) occurs only once in Scripture, but so much uncertainty exists respecting the meaning of the word, that in many translations, as, for instance, in the Authorized English Version, the original is retained. Thus in the account of the commerce of Tyre, it is stated in Eze 27:17, “Judah and the land of Israel, they were thy merchants; they traded in thy markets wheat of Minnith, and pannag, and oil, and honey, and balm.” From the context it is evident that wheat oil, and honey were conveyed by Judah and Israel — that is, the products of their country as an agricultural people — as articles of traffic to the merchants and manufacturers of Tyre, who, it is certain, must, from their insular position, have obtained their chief articles of diet from the neighboring land of Syria. It is probable, therefore, that pannag, whatever it may have been, was the produce of Palestine, or at least of Syria. In comparing the passage in Ezekiel with Gen 43:11, where the most valued productions of Palestine are enumerated, the omission of tragacanth and ladanum (A.V. “spices and myrrh”) in the former is very observable, and leads to the supposition that pannag represents some of the spices grown in that country. The Sept., in rendering it κασία. favors this opinion, though it is evident that cassia cannot be the particular spice intended (see Gen 43:19). Hitzig observes that a similar term occurs in Sanscrit (pannaga) for an aromatic plant. Some of  the rabbins have also thought that it was a district of Judaea, which, like Minnith, yielded the best wheat (Furst, Web. Lex. s.v.); others, as Junius and Tremeilius, from the similarity in the name, have thought it might be the original of the name of Phoenicia. But Hiller (Hierophytica, 2:51) thinks it to be the same with the πάναζ of the Greeks, the Roman panax, whence comes “panacea,” the universal remedy.

The name panax occurs as early as the time of Theophrastus (9:10), and several kinds are described by him, as well as by Dioscorides; one kind is called especially Syrian panax. Of one of these plants, now supposed to be a species of Ferua la sespitium or Heracleum, the juice was called opopanax. It is curious, however, that the plant yielding the opopanax of commerce is still unknown, as well as the exact locality where it is, produced, whether in Syria, or in some part of the Persian empire. By the Arabs it is called juwashir. Lady Calcott has supposed (Script. Herbal, p. 371 sq.) the panax of the ancients to refer to Panax quinquejblium, or ginseng of the Chinese, which they also suppose to be a universal remedy, though not possessed of any active properties. But the name panax was not applied to this plant until the time of Linnoaus, and there is no proof, nor indeed is it probable, that it found its way from China at any such early period: at all events the Israelites were not likely to convey it to Tyre. The Syrian version, however, translates pannag by the word dochan, which signifies “millet,” or Panicum miliaceum. Bishop Newcome, therefore, translates pannag by the word panis, signifying the species of millet which was employed by the ancients as an article of diet, and which still is so by the natives of the East. This view is favored by the expression in the book of Sohar, quoted by Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v.), which speaks of bread of pannag:” though this again is not decisive, for the pannag may equally well have been some flavoring substance, as seems to be implied in the doubtful equivalent (קוֹלְיָא) given in the Targum. One objection to its being millet is that this grain has a name, dochan, which is used by the same prophet in Eze 4:9. SEE MILLET. From the context it would seem most likely that this pannag was a produce of the country, and probably an article of diet (Kitto; Smith). Perhaps the best explanation of this uncertain word which can now be given is that which refers it to a kind of pastry or sweet cake (from an obsolete root, פָּנִג, to be savory; so Gesenius and Furst). SEE TYRE.

## Pannini, Cav. Giovanni Paolo[[@Headword:Pannini, Cav. Giovanni Paolo]]

             an eminent Italian painter of perspective architecture, was born at Piacenza in 1691. He went early to Rome, where he studied under Pietro Lucatelli. He had a passion for painting, and applied himself with great assiduity in designing the remaining monuments of antiquity wherever he found them, especially at Rome. He formed his style on Giovanni Ghisolfi, and became a perfect master of the art of perspective, surpassing all his contemporaries. He sketched every vestige of ancient magnificence — the ruins of superb edifices, cenotaphs, columns, arches, obelisks, and some of the most ancient buildings which ornamented Rome. His composition is rich, and his perspective critically correct. His works are universally admired for the grandeur of his architecture, the clearness of his coloring, the neatness and freedom of his touch, the beauty of his figures, and the elegant taste with which he disposed them, although he sometimes designed his figures of too large a size for his architecture, which injures the effect that would otherwise be produced by the immensity of the buildings. This fault, however, is only occasional in Pannini's works. He generally painted his pictures of a large easel size, but sometimes he wrought on a grander scale. Lanzi highly commends a picture of this class in the church of the Signora della Missione, representing Christ driving the Money-changers from the Temple, in which the architecture is truly magnificent, and the principal figures are drawn with great spirit and variety of character, and of much larger size than he usually painted. His works are numerous, and are not only to be found in the principal collections of Italy, but in other countries of Europe. At Rivoli, in the pleasure-house of the king of Sardinia, and in the pontifical palace of Monte Cavallo, are some of his choicest works. Many of his' pictures have been engraved. He died in 1758.

## Pannormia[[@Headword:Pannormia]]

             is the title of a canonical collection by bishop Ivo of Chartres (q.v.), consisting of eight books, and counted among the most valuable ecclesiastical labors of the pre-Gratian period. They were freely used by Gratian. See, on the relation of the Pannormium to the Decretum, Theiner, Ueber Ivo's vermneintliches Decret.; Savigny, Gesch. des rom. Rects ins M. A.; Wasserschleben, Zur Gesch. der: vorgratianischen Kirchenrechtsquellen, p. 59 sq. The Pannormia has been edited by Sebastian Brandt (Basle, 1499) and by M. A. Vosmediano (Louvain, 1557). It has also been printed in Migne's Patrol. vol. clxi.

## Panodorus[[@Headword:Panodorus]]

             an Egyptian monk who flourished in the reign of the emperor Arcadius, is noted as the author of a Chronography (χρονογράφιον), in which he found great fault with Eusebius, from whom, however, he took many of his statements. Panodorus is frequently mentioned by Syncellus. See Voss, De list. Grec. p. 308; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 7:444.

## Panomphaeus[[@Headword:Panomphaeus]]

             a surname of Zeus (Jupiter), as being the author of all omens and signs of every kind.

## Panormitanus[[@Headword:Panormitanus]]

             a surname of Nicolas Tudescus (or de Tudesco, de Tudeschis), a noted Italian prelate. who is so generally known under his surname that we insert him in this place. He was born in 1386 at Catania, in Sicily; in 1400 he entered the Benedictine Order; and in 1414 he became canon in his native city. Later he studied canon law at Bologna, and then taught at the high- schools in Siena, Parma, and Bologna. In 1425 he received from pope Martin V the abbey Maiiacum, near Messina; afterwards he became auditor of the Rota and apostolical referendary at Rome. Alphonso V of Aragon secured his services, and was so well pleased that he caused him to be elevated to the archbishopric of Palermo, and sent as legate to the council at Basle. In this celebrated ecclesiastical gathering Panormitanus was at first a devoted advocate of pope Eugenius IV; but when, in 1437, the council was moved to Ferrara for the obvious purpose of strengthening the papal interest, Panormitanus. ever anxious for the right use of power, forsook the papal side, and advocated the superiority of the council over the pope. In 1440 the antipope Felix II conferred on Panormitanus the cardinal's hat, and employed him as iegatus a latere at Mayence in 1441, and Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1442. In 1443, when king Alphonso made peace with pope Eugenius, Panormitanus was recalled from the council. He died shortly after at Palermo, in 1443 or 1445. He wrote a Commentary to the Decretals of Gregory IX and the Clementines, which is highly prized; also a justification of the Basle Council, which Gerbais translated into French in 1677, in the interest of Gallicanism. (J. H. W.)

## Pansaga, Cosimo[[@Headword:Pansaga, Cosimo]]

             an eminent Italian sculptor and architect, was born at Clusone, near Bergamo, in 1591, and visited Rome and studied sculpture and architecture under Pietro Bernini. The facade of the Church of Santo Spirito de' Neopolitani is the only work by him in that city. He, however, built and adorned a number of altars in Naples. Among his principal works are the facades of the churches of San Francesco Saverio, Santa Teresa degli Scalzi, and San Domenico Maggiore. He died in 1678. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Pantaenus[[@Headword:Pantaenus]]

             a Christian philosopher of the Stoic sect, flourished in the 2d century. He is supposed to have been a native of Alexandria, and to have taught philosophy and religion there about A.D. 180. He went on a mission to Ethiopia, from whence he is said to have brought the Gospel of St. Matthew, written in Hebrew (Eusebiums, Hist. Eccles.v. 10). But little else is known of his personal history. With the persecutions under Septimius Severus all trace of Pantaenus is lost. He is reported to have died in 213. He left several commentaries, but only a few scanty remains of them are now extant. Some of them are collected in Halloix, Illustr. Eccles. Orient. Scriptor. (Douaci. 16331636); Routh, Reliq. Sacr. 1:398 sq. See Redepenning, Origenes, vol. i Guericke, De Schola Alexandr. vol. i; Philo Judseus, Opera, 4:34; Alzog, KirchenGesch. 1:194; Ritter, Gesch. der christl. Philosophie, 1:421 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v. (J. H.W.)

## Pantaleon, St[[@Headword:Pantaleon, St]]

             (Ital. SAN. PANTALEONE; Gr. ῞Αγ. Πανταλέων), a noted Christian martyr under Galerius, was born (according to tradition) at Nicomedia, in Bithynia. His father, from whom he received his education, was a pagan; his mother was a Christian. Having applied himself to the study of medicine, he became eminent in his profession, and was appointed physician to the emperor Galerius. He was one of the most benevolent of men and successful of practitioners. His reputation roused the jealousy of the pagan physicians, who accused him to the emperor. Galerius, finding him a Christian, ordered him to be tortured, and then beheaded, which was done, A.D. 305. Pantaleon is much venerated in the Italian Church. especially at Venice. There have been some who doubted his existence, and believed his name to have been derived from the warcry of the Venetians, Pianta Leone (Plant the Lion)! But Justinian erected a church in his honor in Constantinople, and he was celebrated in the Greek Church at a time when Venice would have been more likely to introduce his worship from the East than to have orignated it in any other way. The patron of physicians, he is represented as young, beardless, and handsome. As a martyr he is bound to an olive-tree, with his hands. nailed to it above his head, a sword at his feet. Without observation he might be mistaken for St. Sebastian. When he is painted as patron he wears the physician's robe and bears the olive or palm, or both. He is commemorated in the Roman Church on July 27.

## Panteon[[@Headword:Panteon]]

             is the Spanish term for a crypt (q.v.) behind the altar, serving as the burial- place of the bishop.

## Pantheism[[@Headword:Pantheism]]

             (from πᾶς, all, and θεός, God), a general name for a belief in the identity of God and nature.

I. Definition. — This philosophical dogma has been very variously conceived, and is therefore liable to many definitions. According to Waterland, “it supposes God and nature, or God and the whole universe, to be one and the same substance — one universal being; insomuch that men's souls are only modifications of the divine substance” (Works, 8:81). According to Wegscheider, pantheism is “essententia, qua naturam divinam mundo supponunt et Deum ac mundum unum idemque esse statuunt” (p. 250). Lacoudre says, “Pantheistee qui contendunt unicam esse substantiam, cujus partes sunt omnia entia qua existunt.” Weissenborn defines pantheism as “the system which identifies God and the all of things or the unity of things.” To the critical student of the history of philosophy pantheism presents itself in six different forms. These are,

(1) mechanical or materialistic — God the mechanical unity of existence;

(2) ontological (abstract unity) pantheism — the one substance in all (Spinoza);

(3) dynamic pantheism;

(4) psychical pantheism — God is the soul of the world;

(5) ethical pantheism — God is the universal moral order (Fichte);

(6) logical pantheism (Hegel).

But, though pantheism has exhibited these varieties, the generally prevailing pantheistic notions may be subdivided until there remains only one phase that is generally understood to be referred to as pantheistic. That doctrine which is uncritically called the purely pantheistic, and which teaches that pantheism means absorption of God in nature, is atheistic in fact, and should be treated under atheism. (q.v.). That form of pantheism  which teaches the absorption of nature in God — of the finite in the infinite — amounts to an exaggeration of theism (q.v.). Those forms above spoken of as ethical and logical pantheism, and now seen in their culmination in Strauss's writings, the most anti-christian of them all, denying a personal God and a historical Christ, are properly rationlism (q.v.), because they are not strictly philosophic but semi-religious, seeking to supplant Christianity as a religion, and not as a philosophical system. Pantheism, then, strictly speaking, is the doctrine of the necessary and eternal co-existence of the finite and the infinite of the absolute consubstantiality of God and nature considered as two different but inseparable aspects of universal existence. True, this doctrine conducts to the same result as atheism, yet theoretically it is widely different, and starts from exactly the opposite premise. The Atheist begins with nature, perceives and recognizes the material universe, but denies that there is any God; the Pantheist starts with the assumption of the existence of a Divine Being as a truth which the soul cannot deny, and maintains that he is identical with nature-in other words, denies that there is any nature except God. Quite differently, the Christian maintains the existence of both God and nature. He accepts the doctrine of Scripture, which is that God existed before the universe, and is ever apart from it and above it; for he made it by a spontaneous act, and in infinite wisdom and power still upholds it. It is a revelation of him but no part of him; not God, but the voluntary manifestation of God. It is not what he is, but what he has willed to be. In other words, God is the Being present everywhere in and controlling nature, as the soul the body, but distinct from it.

II. Scriptural Doctrine. — Some attempts have been made to maintain that the germs of pantheism are to be found in the Bible, as in such declarations as that of 1Co 15:28, “That God may be all in all;” but it is evident that belief in an omnipresent God regnant in nature and belief in an impersonal God identical with nature are widely different. Not to press the language of Scripture unfairly into questions which it only touches incidentally, we think the following clearly bears against the pantheistic theory of the relation of God to the universe: “All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made which was made” (Joh 1:3). This surely is deism, not pantheism. The first clause states that all things came out of nothing into being by the will of the Logos; the second clause confirms this by denying the contrary proposition that anything ever came into being either of itself or by any other will than that of the Word. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the same way  speaks of creation having both a beginning and an end: — “They shall perish, but thou endurest: and they all shall wax old as a garment, and as a vesture thou shalt fold them up, and they shall be. changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall not change.” Here the contrast is emphatically marked between a perishing universe and its unchanging and unchangeable Author. It rests on the deistical axiom that the things which had a beginning must also have an end. If the Son of God had a beginning in time, he too should subside before the change of time. His is the only existence outside of God which does not follow the fixed conditions of the creation, and therefore he is one with God, and is God. The argument is identical with that of the evangelist John, and both alike rest on a deistical conception of the universe. Take one more passage in James, where it is said of God that “with him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” The reference is to that Light of lights, the Father of lights, which, unlike the sun, has neither annual orbit nor daily decline. The material sun rises and sets daily, and yearly climbs the sky to the solstice, and then declines to the tropic, but the uncreated Sun shines on, fixed and immovable. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

Scripture, indeed, fairly interpreted, knows nothing of that immanence of God in nature which lies at the root of all pantheistic modes of thought. Physical pantheism, which confounds God with nature and nature with God, and looks on the world as a huge animal with a rational and sensitive soul, repels by its very grossness, and has few votaries, except perhaps among the fanatics of the table-moving and spiritual-manifestation school Intellectual pantheism, which is more recondite and plausible, asserts that all the diversities of nature are resolvable into a unity of essence, and that this essence is God. He is the substance — substans — the occult substratum which underlies and upholds everything that we see. (Such was the pantheism of Benedict Spinoza.) But the nounmenon, or substance, can never be known except as phenenomenon, or appearance; and, therefore, Spinoza's God was nothing more than a grand conception, a nonentity. Yet Mr. Lewes says, “Spinoza stands out from the dim past like a tall beacon, whose shadow is thrown athwart the sea, and whose light will serve to warn the wanderers from the shoals and rocks on which hundreds of their brethren have perished” (Hist. of Philos. 2:154). The logical consequence of pantheism, whether physical or intellectual, is really to ignore the personality alike of God and of man; to subvert the foundation of all moral government; to eradicate a consciousness of sin; to turn man into a self-  idolater; and to load him with the chains of a crushing — and inexorable fatalism.” To paraphrase a well-known expression of Hobbes, we should call pantheism the ghost of atheism sitting crowned upon its grave. “Nous ne savons pas ce que Dieu est,” were the last words of philosophy according to Pascal; “ni s'il est” was the mocking addition of those who garbled his text; The fact is instructive; it teaches us how far philosophy can go, and what it must end in without the lamp of revelation. The unknown God of philosophy ends in the no-God of the Positivist, or the all-God of the Pantheist. Nor are. the two so far apart as some imagine. Impatient of the anthropomorphism of Scripture, and blind to the truth that the Father of our spirits is not far from every one of us, those who are unable to rest in materialistic atheism profess a spiritualistic pantheism which is curiously like and unlike the old dreary negation from which it is a recoil. The dynamical philosophy has replaced the mechanical: force and not matter is now at the beginning of all things; but force is no more God than matter. When the spiritual desires of humanity are really kindled, it can no more rest in the one than in the other. What we crave is a living person, not an abstract principle — a hand to direct us, an eye to look on us, and a heart. to love and pity us. Philosophy shrinks from anthropomorphism of this kind, and in its pride of intellect despises the vulgar for making to themselves a magnified man as God. But the genuine needs of human nature are not to be reasoned away with a sneer; divine philosophy, unlike human, sees the felt necessity, and meets it. In the words of a modern writer:

“Pantheism expresses the astonishment of reason to see nature separate from God. It is the speculation of the soul which ought to be one with the Eternal, but is robbed of the divine treasure, and cannot realize her loss... But is vain to sigh for a speculative unity, when the moral unity is broken. It is us into deny the mystery of change, because we cannot see how it is to be reconciled with the existence of the. Unchangeable. It is vain to attempt by means of syllogism to represent the Creator and his universe is one shoreless, waveless oceann, profound, equable, unbroken ... There is, indeed, an ocean of being, and the soul which sighs and reasons may think itself a wave upon the surface. But in one sense the comparison fails to hold. It is not at the mercy of the winds, nor wholly determined by the vast waters which support it. It has a unity and a moving power of its own. In another sense the comparison holds  good. — “The war of elements, the confusion we see everywhere, belongs only to the surface. The ocean is deeper than the waves. It cannot be influenced by the winds of time, nor stirred from its place by the billows which dash themselves, and foam, and are broken on the shore of human life ... ‘The floods have lifted up their voice, the floods lift up their waves- but the Lord on high is mightier than the voice of many waters, yea, than the mighty waves of the sea'” (Tulloch, Christian Theism, 1:204, 205).

The attempt to transcend such a conception as that of our Father in heaven, and to test it as a mere accommodation or landing-stage in the development of the human mind, from fetichism up to the pure philosophy of the absolute, only recoils on those who make it. We get no nearer the true absolute by using the phrase; on the contrary, by ridding ourselves of so much anthropomorphism, we only get out of the region in which true religious emotion is possible at all, viz. that of the emotions and affections. Men will not adore what they can neither love nor fear. In the legend of Icarus, Daedalus made him waxen wings, but as he soared nearer the sun the wax melted; and so the higher he rose the greater his fall. In the case of the modern Icarus there is the same failure, though from an opposite cause. In attempting to soar into the region of the absolute and unconditioned, men do not really reach the sun of absolute being, they only rise into a region where the air is too rarefied to breathe, and where, for want of a refracting medium, the light is as darkness. Their wings do not melt with the warmth of the sun's rays; on the contrary, they are frozen to death at these ungenial altitudes, and if they descend at all in safety, it is to learn the lesson that, if we would know God at all, we must know him as he has been pleased to reveal himself. “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?”

To the careful student of the sacred Scriptures the O.T. writings reveal a healthy realism in their conception of God. He is above the world and outside it. He taketh up the isles as a very little thing. He weighs the hills in scales and the mountains in balances. To the Psalmist, e.g., God is present in nature; but never once in the highest flights of devotional poetry does he let fall an expression as if the things we see were anything else than his handiwork. They are never co-eternal with God — on the contrary, they are his creatures. “When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;” it is God who “appoints  the moon for seasons; the sun knoweth his going down.” He “opens his hand, they are filled with good.” God is in the growing grass and the rolling thunder, in “the great and wide sea, wherein are things creeping and innumerable, where go the ships, and where is that leviathan who is made to play therein.” The rain is “the river of God,” and “the cedars of Lebanon” are said to be his planting; but we search in vain for a syllable or a hint of that mystical immanence of God in nature, such as modern pantheism conceives of as the relation of God to the universe. We may strip the Bible bare of its poetry, or translate it into the baldest; and dryest prose, but it yields up in no case any other sense than that of theism. The Deus opifex is there throughout, and almost in express terms. The argument of design, so much decried in our days, as if it had been an invention of the same school that invented the “Evidences,” is, by implication, if not in express terms, found in the O.T. “He that planted the eye, shall he not see; he that formed the ear, shall he not hear?” It is foreign, of course, to the simplicity of Scripture to introduce illustrations of contrivance in the adaptation of the organs of men and animals to the preexisting laws of matter. But the argument of Paley has been anticipated in principle, if not in detail.

Man is the last of the works of God, and as the world was adapted to him, so he was adapted to the world. Light existed before there was a single human eve to behold it, and therefore, as the properties of light existed before there was the organ to observe it, that organ was accommodated to the laws of light — not the laws of light to the organs of seeing. The stress of Paley's argument lies in this. And the Scriptures, rightly interpreted, tell the same tale. The transcendetal, not immanent thought of creation is, as we have seen, the keynote of Hebrew inspiration. There is an advance in the N.T. writings. The governmental character of God sinks a little into the background, and the Fatherly relation becomes more prominent in its stead. But the N.T. never oversteps itself or falls into the language of mysticism, confounding the Creator with his works.True, it glances at the thought that there shall be a time when even the Son, who must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet, shall give up the kingdom to him that hath put all things under him, that so God may be all in all. But this is very unlike pantheism, though it maybe taken to mean pantheism by those who wish to wrest that meaning out of Scripture. All that it implies is the ultimate and final elimination of moral, and with it physical evil out of the active universe. God is to be all in all in the sense that he shall become the supreme truth of the universe a truth which is law in the unconscious and love (or, at least, submission) in the  conscious class of his creatures. The reign of right will then be unbroken, not only from pole to pole of the universe, but also through all ranks and degrees of agents endowed with free will.

III. History. — The origin of pantheistic doctrine is as obscure as the dogma itself. The name Pantheists was first employed by the English Deist Toland in A.D. 1705. This somewhat learned man was at that time secretary and chaplain of a society which advocated the peculiar speculative view of God and his creation now known as Pantheism. A defense which he then published of this strange class of religionists — they claimed to be such he entitled Socinianism Truly Stated,... by a Pantheist to His Orthodox Friend. In A.D. 1720 he published an exposition of the society's doctrines, and he entitled that work Pantheisticon. Toland then said expressly that he had borrowed his notion from Linus, which the motto of his Pantheisticon expressed as “ex toto sunt omnia, et ex omnibus est totum,” briefly put by his antagonist Fay as “Pantheistarum Natura et numen unum idemque ssunt.” But though Toland may have framed the doctrines of his society after Linus, we are sure that the antiquity of pantheism is far beyond any such modern period. We find that it had its origin at a very remote period in the East, for it is prevalent in the oldest known civilization in the world — the Hindû. Yet it is a later development of thought than polytheism (q.v.), the natural instinctive creed of primitive races, and most probably originated in the attempt to divest the popular system of its grosser features, and to give it a form that would satisfy the requirements of philosophical speculation. We have said above that the notion of the immanence of God in nature lies at the root of all pantheistic modes of thought.

The student of Eastern religions will confirm us in this, at least so far as these ancient religions of Asia are concerned. The Oriental mind is saturated with the emanation notion.The doctrine, reappears in a thousand shapes; it exhales alike in poetry and philosophy. Creation signifies the summoning into existence of that which before was not. Emanation is a mere modification of that which is; it maintains the self- same existence, though under other forms and other conditions; it is the developed fruit of the quickened germ. It supposes an infinite eternal substance which arouses itself into action by a self-energy, and clothes itself with a multiplicity of forms that in the aggregate make up the universe. Thus the idea of the divine is that the whole is all things, and all things are the whole, and in the end all things will return once more into the inscrutable oneness from whence they came forth. Such was the  groundwork of the Brahminical system. It is taught in the Upanishad (q.v.), the Vedanta (q.v.), and Yoga (q.v.) philosophies, in the cosmogony of the most ancient Indian writing, the Institutes of Menu (q.v.), and in those poetical books which embody the doctrines of the Hindû philosophies, e.g. the Bhagavad Gita, which follows the Yoga doctrine. It is poetical and religious rather than scientific, at least in its phraseology; but is substantially similar to the more logical forms of Western development.

1. Hindû Pantheism. — Hindû philosophy proceeds upon the fundamental axiom that Brahm (q.v.) alone exists; all else is an illusion. Accordingly when mall regards external nature, and even himself, as distinct from Brahm, he is in a dreaming state, realizing only phantoms. But when he recognizes Brahm as the one totality, he rises to a waking state, and science is this awakening of humanity. It is at death, however, that the soul of the sage will be completely freed from illusion, and finally blended and lost in Brahm, the one infinite being from whom all things emanate, and to whom all things return. Pantheism is the necessary result of such a system. It denies true existence to any other than the one absolute, independent Being. It declares that what is usually called matter can have no distinct separation or independent essence, but is only an emanation from and a manifestation of the one so existing spiritual essence, Brahm. He is the vast ocean of which the surface waves are the whole external form, the foam and surge that go to make up his substance.

He is at once active and passive; active in the continued evolution of emanations that degenerate more and more from original perfection; and passive as being himself the degenerating emanations that are evolved. All, too, is Magian illusion: light yearned for increase, and its multiple became water; water similarly produced earth. The more visible creation becomes the more it degenerates, and the more is illusion intensified. It is only by contemplation that all forms and names and illusive appearances vanish the one real substance is perceived; and the truth is apprehended that the contemplative mind is one with the Infinite. In one sense this philosophy was devout, it was penetrated with a sense of the divine in everything, but on the other hand every part of nature was only a part of Brahm. The cow, the elephant, the flower were all some fractions of him. In the Bhagavad Gita, Krishna, the teacher, tells Arjuna, his pupil, that he is the universe. “I,” says the teacher, “am the creation and dissolution of the whole universe. There is not anything greater than I. All things hang on the sun as precious gems upon a string. I am moisture in the water, light in the sun and moon,  invocation' in. the breeze, sound in the firmament, sweet smelling savors in the earth, glory in the source of light. I am life in all things, and zeal in the zealous; I am the eternal soul of nature; I am the understanding of the wise, the glory of the proud, the strength of the strong, free from lust and anger.” “I,” continues Krishna, “am the sacrifice, I am the worship, I am the spices, I am the fire, I am the victim, I am the father and mother of the world.” All this is what is termed pure pantheism, that confusion of science and religion which is at once the weakness and the strength, the glory and the shame of the Hindû mind. (See Wuttke, Gesch. des Heidenthums, 2:241 sq., 282 sq., 318 sq.; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1:178 sq., 195 sq.)

2. Egyptian Pantheism. — As in the Hindû, so again in the Egyptian system, one inscrutable Being gives a first impulse to creation by the evolution of intelligence, Kneph (q.v.), the conceptive Demiurge; and next of Phtha (q.v.), the organizer of the world, the vital principle of fire and warmth. The various succeeding emanations in ogdoads and decades and dodecads are by pairs or syzygies, whereof the secondary principle is more or less antagonistic to the primary, representing the various phenomena of nature; such, too, are the φιλία and νεῖκος of Pythagoras and Empedocles. Thus Osiris (q.v.), radiant with white light, was combined with Isis (q.v.) in the many-tinted robe of nature; and Typhon (q.v.), the principle of evil, by union with Nephthys (q.v.), the ideal of consummate beauty produced the checkered state of good and evil which is the world of man. Life, as the spirit that pervades all nature, could never again be extinguished; its deification is read clearly in deciphered hieroglyphics, and death is only the narrow doorway that leads back to the fresh life of perpetual youth. In all this we see the remote elements of Gnosticism (q.v.). In the Egyptian therefore, as in the Indian system, the world of matter, whether real or phantasmal, emanates from and is, in fact, one with the Deity. The antagonism of the Egyptian theogony became a dualistic system in Chaldaea and Palestine, where Bel and Nebo, or Nergal, Matter, were made to proceed from the precosmic Ur, Light; and in Persia, — as seen in the antagonism of Ormuzd (q.v.) and Ahriman. The sect of Lipari, adorers, claiming to return to pre-Zoroastrian truth, professed a modified Zabianism that was wholly pantheistic. The Dabistan (School of Morals), a work on all the Oriental forms of religious belief — Magianism, Brahminism, Judaism, Islam, Christianity, and that which the author, Moslau-Fairi, terms the “religion of philosophers” names other  pantheistical sects (Dabistan, Oriental Fr. Comm. 1:203); but they have had nothing to do with the origin of similar principles in Europe. (See Stuhr, Die Religionssysteme der heidnischen Volker des Orients [Berlin, 1836]; Uhlemann, Handb. d. gesammten agyptisch. Alterthumskunde, esp. 2:244 sq.; Wuttke, Gesch. des Heidenthums. 2:145 sq.; Cudworth, Intellectual System, 2:237 sq., 245 sq.; Rawlinson, The Great Monarchies, vol. on Egypt; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 2:244 sq. et al.; British and For. Evangel. Rev. July, 1875, art. 8.)

3. Greek Pantheism. — Those who distinguish in philosophy between science and ethics — the former dealing with what is, the latter with what ought to be — point us to Hindu speculation as philosophy within the swaddling bands of theology, and claim that it was left for Greece to free man's mind from these trammels. Yet the philosophy of the Greeks in its earliest forms has a decidedly Oriental coloring, and naturally so, for Greece received its first ideas of civilization from Egypt and the East. Thales, indeed, professed the dualism of Chaldaea and Egypt. The Orphic doctrines — which embody the teaching of Linus and of his disciple Orpheus — from their very remote antiquity, are shrouded in mystery. But they are supposed by Dr. Cudworth (Intell. System, 2:94) and other eminent modern philosophers to have been pantheistic in their character. The material world is termed “the body of Zeus” in a poetic fragment said to have been written by Orpheus. At a later period we find the doctrine of emanations taught by Pythagoras (q.v.), an adept in ancient Orphic theology, and by other Greek philosophers, more especially by Xenophanes (q.v.), the founder of the Eleatic school ( SEE ELEATIC SCHOOL; and compare Creuzer, Symbolik; Irenaeus, Introd. xlii-xlv, Cambr. ed.; Aristotle, De Xenophane, iii; Diogenes Laertius, 2:19; De Ginando, i, vi). Pythagoras (B.C. 569-470) taught that. “one is all and all in a wide development of the unit. The monad produces the dyad; the two constitute the triad, and the product symbolizes the absolute unity that holds, as it were, in free solution spirit and matter. Unity becomes a multiple of itself by factors of increasing power, and this multiple is the universe, the very beginning of the divine unity, quickened in all its parts with the divine life. The soul of the world is the divine energy that interpenetrates every portion of the mass, and the soul of man is an efflux of that energy.

The world, too, is an exact impress of the eternal idea, which is the mind of God.” A poetical theogony was easily engrafted on such notions, and a polytheistic religion for the people. The philosophy of Anaximander (B.C.  610-547) the Milesian may almost, with equal accuracy, be described as a system of atheistic physics or of materialistic pantheism. Its leading idea is that from the infinite or intermediate (τὸ ἄπειρον), which is “one yet all,” proceed the entire phenomena of the universe, and to it they return. Xenophanes (B.C. 620-520), who, by the way, was the author of the famous metaphysical mot, “Ex nihilo, nihil fit,” is really the first classical thinker who promulgated the higher or idealistic form of pantheism. Denying the possibility of creation, he argued that there exists only an eternal, infinite one or all, of which individual objects and existences are merely illusory modes of representation; but as Aristotle finely expresses it — and it is this last conception which gives to the pantheism of Xenophanes its distinctive character — “casting his eyes wistfully upon the whole heaven, he pronounced that unity to be God” Heraclitus (q.v.), who flourished a century later, reverted to the material pantheism of the Ionic school, and appears to have held that the “all” first arrives at consciousness in man, whereas Xenophanes attributed to the same universal entity intelligence and self-existence, denying it only personality.

But it is often extremely difficult, if not impossible, to draw or to see the distinction between the pantheism of the earlier Greek philosophers and sheer atheism. In general, however, we may affirm that the pantheism of the Eleatic school was penetrated by a religious sentiment, and tended to absorb the world into God, while that of the Ionic school was thoroughly materialistic, and tended to absorb God into the world, and differed from atheism rather in name than intact. Zeno (B.C. 494), the distinguished Eleatic philosopher, maintained that there was but one real existence in the universe, and that all other things were merely phenomenal, being only modifications or appearances of the one sibstratunm All was false and hollow that was based upon the suggestions of sense. Thought and its object are identical. Through his dialectical reasoning the school of the Sophists originated. By them it was denied that simple substance can fill space; next it was stripped gradually of every attribute, until it reached the vanishing point of the pantheistic perspective; substance, then, being wholly neutral and void of color, ceased to have any appreciable quality, and the schools of philosophy subsided into the blank atheism of Leucippus (B.C. 500) and Democritus (B.C. 460-357), whose atomic fatalism finds a close parallel in the Zabianism of the Babylonians, Phoenicians; with other idolatrous offsets of the Shemitic stock. The deepest questions that can occupy the human intellect were bandied to and fro in sophistical discussion; all was  problematical, all was doubt, and the only principle which met with universal acceptance was the skeptical maxim, μέμνασο ἀπιστεῖν.

With Socrates (B. C. 468-399) opens a new epoch in Greek speculation. Hereafter we meet again with pantheistic notions, but they are no longer in extensive acceptance. The philosophers up to the days of Socrates had been simply physicists; they looked on nature or φύσις as an entity in itself. The other or complementary truth of real or correct philosophy had to be discovered. It was dreamed of by Pythagoras, but first fully discerned by Socrates; and we do not wonder that the wise said of him, “He first brought philosophy down from heaven to earth” — meaning that he was the first teacher who brought her down from airy abstractions and generalizations about matter and its origin to questions of human interest: our duty here, our hopes hereafter. From this time, too, dates the distinction of the two branches in philosophy, science and ethics, SEE PHILOSOPHY; and henceforth the great problem of Greek philosophy, as of all philosophy, became, “What is the ἀρχή — the first principle — the ground and cause and reason of all existence?” The final answer of that age is found in Plato (q.v.), for “Platonism was the culmination, the ripened fruit of the ages of earnest thought which preceded Plato. He gathered up, co-ordinated, and grasped into unity the results bequeathed by the mental efforts of his predecessors. The Platonic answer to this great question of philosophy is clear and unequivocal. A perfect MIND is the primal source of all being — a mind in which intellect, efficiency, and goodness are one and identical” (Cocker, Theistic Conception, p. 38, 39; comp. also his Christianity and Greek Philosophy; Butler, Lectures on Ancient Philosophy; Lewes, Biogr. Hist. of Philos.; and the references in the articles PLATO and PLATONISM). One of the first of the Platonic disciples to advocate pantheistic views was Speusippus († B.C. 339), Plato's sister's son, and the successor of Plato as scholarch (from 347 to 339). Speusippus pantheistically represents the Best or Divine as first indeed in rank, but as chronologically the last product of development, and he finds the principles of ethics in the happiness of a life conformed to nature (comp. Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1:133,134, and the literature there quoted). Dicaearchus (B.C. 300), a disciple of Aristotle, and therefore a Peripatetic (q.v.). also advocated pantheistic notions. He taught that: “there exist no individial substantial souls, but only in their stead one Universal, vital, and sensitive force, which is diffused through all existing organisms, and in transiently individualized in different bodies” (Ueberweg,  1:183).

The Stoics (founded B.C. 310) likewise taught this doctrine of force. Plato and his predecessor Socrates had endeavored to reduce all being (esse) to Unity, admitting only reason for a channel of knowledge. Aristotle, the disciple of Plato, but the founder of an independent school (known as the immanent in distinction from the Platoiic, which is known. as the transcendent), believing his senses as well as his reason left the dualism of mind and matter unreconciled. With Plato God was one and all things; with Aristotle God was one, and the universe a distinct existence. But as nothing can be which has not been before; as there can be no addition to the totality of existence, Aristotle made two eternals, the one Form, the other Matter-God, and the material from which the universe was made. The Stoics were not satisfied with the duality. They felt with Plato that all must be one, that an infinite cannot leave a finite standing over against it. They were willing to trust the testimony of sese, and to admit that logically mind and matter, God and the world, are separate and distinct; yet the Stoics contended that actually they must be one. They therefore made it their problem to show how God and the universe were distinct and yet one. Hence they came to teach that, “since the world contains parts endowed with self-consciousness, the world as a whole, which must be more perfect than any of its parts, cannot be unconscious: the consciousness which belongs to the universe is Deity. The latter permeates the world as an all-pervading breath, as artistically creative fire, as the soul and reason of the all, and contains the rational germs of all things” (λόγοι σπερματικοί). Hence they conceive the human and even the divine spirit, not as immaterial intelligence (νοῦς), but rather as a force embodied in the finest and highest material substances (comp. Ueberweg, 1:194, and the article SEE STOICS ). But by far the most decided and the most spiritual representatives of the pantheistic philosophy among the Greeks were the so-called Alexandrian Neo-Platonists (q.v.), in whom we see most clearly the influence of the East upon Greek thought. The doctrines of emanation, of ecstasy, expounded by Plotinus and Proclus, no less than the fantastic deamonism of Iamblichus, point to Persia and India as their birthplace, and in fact differ from the mystic teaching of the Vedanta only by being presented in a more logical and intelligible form, and divested of the peculiar mythological allusions in which the philosophy of the latter is sometimes dressed up.

4. Early Christian Pantheism in the East. — In the Church of Christ also, in the various Gnostic sects, subject to the same influences as the Neo-  Platonists, we can plainly trace the same tendency as in the Neo-Platonists. This is especially true of those Gnostics who were monarchical, believing in one principle, i.e. who made God the universal idea, which includes the world, as the genus includes the species. They were the pure Gnostic Pantheists; such were Apelles (A.D. 188), Valentinus (A.D. 140), Carpocrates (A.D. 120), and Epiphanes (A.D. 180). Those, however, who were dualistic, making two eternal principles, mind and matter, as did Saturninus (A.D. 111), Bardesanes (A.D. 152), and Basilides (A.D. 134), whose systems were borrowed from Zoroaster and issued in Manicheism .(q.v.), were scarcely pantheistic Gnostics. See Guericke, Handbuch der KirchenzGesch. 1:195 sq.

5. Pantheism in the Church of the West. — As we have just seen, most of the Christian sects of the early Church known as Gnostics were pantheistic in tendency. They were the first Christian Pantheists probably. With their disappearance pantheism disappears for a time from the Church. The foundation of schools of learning by Charlemagne in the 9th century restored Neo-Platonic ideas to the Church, and with it pantheism. Speculation had up to this time been held in with tight reins by the Church. But now John Scotus, surnamed Erigena, appeared with a translation of the mystical writings of Pseudo-Dionysius, the Areopagite. This work was followed by an original contribution from the pen of Scotus himself, entitled De Divisione Naturae, in which he teaches that God is the essence of all things, and that what men call creation is a necessary and eternal self- unfolding of the divine nature. He describes the Universal as a mighty river flowing from its source in an indefinite stream, quickening all things in its course, and carried back to the fountain-head by natural exhalation and condensation, to be again rolled forth as before (De Div. Nat. 3:103). The going forth of finite beings from the Deity Scotus called the process of unfolding (analysis, resolutio); the return of all things unto God, or the congregation of the infinite plurality of individuals in the genera, and finally in the simplest unity of all, which is God, so that then God should be “all in all,” he termed their deification (reversio, deificatio). As Scotus stands midway between the more ancient and modern Pantheists — the corner- stone of the old system constituting the foundation of the new — he is usually spoken of as the link between the two systems. In the 11th century William of Champeaux, the immediate precursor of the scholastic system, broached a theory which, if it were not pantheistic, led straight to pantheism. His notion of universals, borrowed from Plotinus, taught that all  individuality is one in its substance, and varies only in its non-essential accidents and transient properties. In the following century his theory was followed out into a thorough-going pantheism by Amalric of Bone (a disciple of Abelard), and his pupil David of Dinant. They declared that God is not the efficient cause merely, but the material, essential cause of all things. All positive religion, both doctrine and worship, is with them a synzbol; true religion a tranquil, intuitive absorption into the divine, all comprehending essence. They were condemned as heretics by a Church council held at Paris (q.v.) in A.D. 1210. Later versions of the Arab philosopher Averroes (q.v.), and Orientalized paraphrases of Aristotle, tended to give a still more decided pantheistic tinge to scholasticism (q.v.). Albertus Magnus, Duns Scotus, and Raymond Lully were the principal delinquents (comp. Encyclop. Metrop. 11:809). As has been aptly said, “The fermentation of philosophic thought had brought the scum of pantheism once more to the surface.”

In the 14th century the practical extravagance of the schoolmen's pantheism was repeated by the Mystics, not, however, in a materialistic, but in an idealistic form. They held creatures to be in and of themselves a pure nullity, and God alone to be the true being, the real substance of all things. All things are comprised in him, and even the meanest creature is a partaker of the divine nature and life. Such was the doctrine of the Beghards (q.v.), the Brethren of the Free Spirit (q.v.), and the later Cathari (q.v.). These Pantheists of the Middle Ages held different shades of opinion, which it is difficult accurately to distinguish. Some claimed for themselves a perfect identity with the Absolute, which reposes in itself, and is without act or operation. Another class placed themselves simply and directly on an equality with God, alleging that, being by nature God, they had come into existence by their own free will. A third class put themselves on a level with Christ, according to his divine and human nature. A fourth class finally carried their pantheistic notions to such an extravagant length as to land themselves in pure nihilism (q.v.), maintaining that neither God nor themselves have any existence.

Among the pantheistical Mystics of the 14th century Eckart occupied a very high place, having wrought his doctrines into a regular speculative system. “This system,” says Dr. Ullmann, “resembles the dome of the city in which he lived, towering aloft like a giant, or rather like a Titan assaulting heaven, and is for us of the highest importance.” Not unacquainted with the Aristotelian scholasticism, but more attracted by  Plato, the great priest, as he calls him, and his Alexandrian followers, imbued with the mystical element in the works of Augustine, though not with his doctrine of original sin, and setting out from the foundations laid by the Areopagite, Scotus Erigena, and by the earlier Mystics of the Middle Ages, but adhering still more closely to the pantheistic doctrines which Amalric of Bone and David of Dinant had transferred to the sect of the Free Spirit and to a part of the Beghards, Master Eckart, with great originality, constructed out of these elements a system in which he did not expressly design to contradict the creed of the Church, but which nevertheless, by using its formulas as mere allegories and symbols of speculative ideas, combats it in its foundations, and is to be regarded as the most important mediaeval prelude to the pantheistic speculation of modern times.” The fundamental notion of Eckart's system, which approached gross pantheism nearer than that of any other Mystic, is God's eternal efflux from himself, and his eternal reflux into himself — the procession of the creature from God, and the return of the creature back into God again by self-denial and elevation above all that is of a created nature. Accordingly Eckart urges man to realize habitually his oneness with the Infinite. From this time the doctrine of a mystical union with God continued to occupy a prominent place in the writings of those German divines who were the forerunners of the Reformation. The language was pantheistic, but the tenet designed to be inculcated was accurate and spiritual. “This mysticism,” says Mr. Vaughan, “clothes its thought with fragments from the old philosopher's cloak, but the heart and body belong to the school of Christ.”

6. Modern Pantheism. — Spinoza has usually been regarded as the father of modern pantheism, but in the writings of Giordano Bruno (q.v.), who wrote in the course of the latter half of the 16th century, a system as decidedly pantheistic as that of Spinoza is fully developed. It is a mixed system, partly Pythagorean, partly hylozoic, and partly borrowed from the writings of Proclus. He and his productions were burned, and his writings are consequently scarce, but Hallam (Introd. to the Lit. of Europe, 2:146- 154) has supplied the English reader with copious extracts. Bruno boldly lays down the principle that all things are absolutely identical, and that the infinite and the finite, spirit and matter, are nothing more than different modifications of the one universal Being. The world, according to this system, is simply the unity manifesting itself under the conditions of number. Taken in itself, the unity is God; considered as producing itself in  number, it is the world. Birth is expansion from the one center of life;. life is its continuance; and death is the necessary return of the ray to the center of light. The doctrine, somewhat modified, has in more recent times been taught in Italy by Vincenzo Gioberti (q.v.), but he can hardly be classed with Pantheists. He adhered to the Church as a communicant, and, with conditions, accepted the doctrines of Christianity. (See the sketch of Italian philosophy by Dr. Botta in Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy, 2:499 sq.)

It was reserved for the Jew Baruch Spinoza to first exhibit the dogmas of pantheism in the regular form of a demonstration. He stands today the representative of the pantheism of modern times. His system is alone worthy of the name of a philosophy. Yet its fallacy is not indiscernible, and proves most clearly that man must depend on revelation rather than on his own consciousness for a knowledge of the Infinite, and a hope in a life beyond the grace. An Old-Testament disciple simply, Spinoza ignored the teachings of Christ and his apostles, and accepted merely the belief in God. Spinoza was not a disbeliever in God as Bayle erroneously claims, but rather a disbeliever in the world. He was an Acosmist, to use Jacobi's expression, rather than an atheist. Spinoza's system, suggested primarily by the Cabala (q.v.) of Judaism, will be set forth in detail in the article SPINOZAISM SEE SPINOZAISM.

It is sufficient for us to say here that, aside from a study of the speculations of his own people, Spinoza was a careful student of Cartesianism, which derives existence from thought. Spinoza more fully developed this principle in his own system. He identified them, and referred both to the one Infinite Substance of which everything besides is simply a mode or manifestation. His natura naturans expresses the extended Deity. “Life is the divine expansion; thought is an attribute of the Deity, rather it is the Deity itself as sentient substance, though perfectly passive and impersonal.” This deity of Spinoza, then, is not a conscious and intelligent individual, but whatever of mental faculties it possesses can only be the aggregate of the mental powers and actions of the innumerable beings (if we may so call them) that possess intelligence. The extension (=the material universe) is eternal and self-existent. The personal identity of men and other supposed beings is an illusion. All religions are but salutary inventions to keep men in civil order and society, and to promote a virtuous and moral life. To speak of the intelligence or the will of the Deity is to speak of him as a man; it is as absurd as to ascribe to the Deify bodily motion. There is nothing whatever in common between the Divine Mind and human intelligence. “Cogitatio Deo  concedenda, non intellectus.” There is no such thing as freedom of thought or will; everything is one extended chain of consequences, and thought begets thought by a necessity that is under no other control than the fatal law of its own being. Evil is inconceivable where all is equally divine and necessary, and where liberty is null. All is good where all is order; it is our own ignorance of ultimate results, and of the necessary relation of things, that makes us think things evil which are not substantially so. Of a future state Spinoza speaks mistily. He is unable to imagine the soul separate from the body. Immortality consists in a return to God, to the annihilation of all personal and individual existence; it is the idea of Averroes (q.v.) again revived.

Spinoza, like Scotus, was never the representative man of a school; yet to this philosophy, propounded in the 17th century, can be most reasonably referred that pantheistic spirit which has pervaded the philosophy as well as the theology of Germany since the beginning of our present aera. Schelling (q.v.) and Hegel (q.v.), in fact, have proved themselves most faithful disciples of Spinoza, carrying out to their legitimate extent the principles of this rigid logical Pantheist. Fichte (q.v.), by his subjective idealism, had banished from the realms of existence both nature and God, reducing everything to the all-engrossing Ego. Schelling reproduced what Fichte had annihilated, but only to identify them with one another, thus declaring the universe and God to be identical, nature being, in his view, the self- development of Deity. The philosophy of Hegel was equally pantheistic with that of Schelling, inasmuch as he declared everything to be a gradual evolving process of thought, and God himself to be the whole process.

Thus “the fundamental principle of philosophical (i.e. modern) pantheism,” to use the language of Dr. Buchanan (Faith in God and modern Atheism compared), “is either the unity of substance, as taught by Spinoza, or the identity of existence and thought, as taught, with some important variations, by Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel. The Absolute is conceived of, not as a living Being to whom a proper personality and certain intelligible attributes may be ascribed, but as a vague, indeterminate somewhat, which has no distinctive character, and of which, in the first instance, or prior to its development, almost nothing can be either affirmed or denied. But this absolute existence, by some unknown inherent necessity, develops, determines, and limits itself: it becomes being, and constitutes all being: the infinite passes into the finite, the absolute into the relative, the necessary into the contingent the one into the many; all other existences are only so  many modes or forms of its manifestation. Here is a theory which, to say the very least, is neither more intelligible nor less mysterious than any article of the Christian faith. And what are the proofs to which it appeals, what the principles on which it rests? Its two fundamental positions are these — that finite things have no distinct existence as realities in nature, and that there exists only one Absolute Being, manifesting itself in a variety of forms. And how are they demonstrated? Simply by the affirmation of universal ‘Identity.' But what if this affirmation be denied?

What if, founding our reply on the clearest data of consciousness, we refuse to acknowledge that existence is identical with thought? What if we continue to believe that there are objects of thought which are distinct from thought itself, and which must be presented to the mind before they. can be represented by the mind? What if, while we recognize the ideas both of the finite and the infinite, the relative and the absolute, the contingent and the necessary, we cannot, by the utmost effort of our reason, obliterate the difference between them, so as to reduce them to one absolute essence? Then the whole superstructure of pantheism falls along with the idealism on which it depends; and it is found to be, not a solid and enduring system of truth, but a frail edifice, ingeniously contrived out of the mere abstractions of the human mind.”

Pantheism is by, no means confined to the philosophic schools of Germany. It has been taught, also, from her pulpits and her theological chairs (comp. Bretschneider, Dogmatik, 1:13; Ebrard, Kirchen- u. DogmenGesch. 4:267 sq.; Schwarz, Gesch. der neuesten Theologie [3d ed. Leips. 1804, 8vo], bk. i and ii; Dorner, Gesch. der Protest. Theologie; Baur [Tubingen school, and therefore in defense of pantheism in Christian theology], DogmenGesch. 3:320 sq.). Extreme Rationalists have not hesitated to pronounce Schleiermacher a Pantheist in the tendency of his doctrines, Hunt, in his Essay on Pantheism, has accepted this decision. There seems, however, to be no ground for such an assertion. Schleiermacher admired Spinoza, and even lauded that great thinker. In one of his famous Discourses on Religion, Schleiermacher exclaims with enthusiastic adoration — “Offer up reverently with me a lock of hair to the manes of the holy repudiated Spinoza. The high World Spirit penetrated him; the Infinite was his beginning and his end; the universe his only and eternal love,” etc. This is but a tribute which one thinker believed due to another. Schleiermacher coveted inquiry, a fair and full investigation of all things, feeling confidence from his own experience that Christianity could endure  the test. He did not ignore the great services of the philosophers, and recognized in Spinoza what services he had rendered the world. But it is absurd to accuse Schleiermacher of pantheism, because in his religious discourses he now and then used expressions to his refined hearers — thoroughly impregnated with the speculations of their day —which can be twisted into a shape where pantheistic notions can be discerned. It is about as reasonable as to deduce them from the expressions in Scripture to which we. had occasion to refer in the early portion of this article. Jacobi (q.v.) had spent his life's strength in breaking down the old Rationalists, who placed religion in reason, and had pleaded that religion is devout feeling, or an immediate self-consciousness. Schleiermacher closely followed this teacher, and out of Jacobi's system drew his entire theology. SEE SCHLEIERMACHER.

It is at the Tubingen University principally that pantheism has obtained its favorable exponents and heartiest advocates. The boldest and most reckless of pantheistic divines is undoubtedly Dr. David Friedrich Strauss (q.v.), who represents the left wing of the Hegelian system, as applied to theology. A personal God and a historical Christianity are alike rejected, and the entire doctrines of the Bible are treated as a congeries of mnythological ideas. The worship of human genius is recommended as the only real divinity. With Hegel, Strauss believes God to have no separate individual existence (“Ohne Welt is Gott nicht Gott”), but to be a process of thought gradually unfolding itself in the. mind of the philosopher. Christ also he regards as simply the embodied conceptions of the Church. The thought of the personality of Christ is “a purposeless residuum.” Humanity is the anointed of the Lord. The incarnation means, not the union of two natures in one personal subsistence, but union through the spirit of the absolute and the finite; the Deity thinking and acting in universal humanity. The resurrection and ascension — the corner-stones of the Christian building — are a mere representation of human progress by a double negation; the negative of all that is worth the name of life, followed by a resolution of that negative condition through quickened union with the Absolute. Thus there is no room for faith or trust, no sense of individual support, no hope of answered prayer, in this soulless and hopeless system. The “sting of ignorance” is ignorance of Straussian and Hegelian ideas; its removal is the only “resurrection to life.” Such extreme infidelity as this is scarcely exceeded by that of Feuerbach, who pronounces religion a dream of the human fancy. It is the extreme point to which pantheism has been  carried in Germany, and at this point it becomes nearly, if not completely, identical with atheism.

There arose, also, after the French Revolution of 1830, a school of light literature which went by the name of Young Germany, and which, combining German pantheism with French wit and frivolity, had as its avowed object, by means of poems, novels, and critical essays, to destroy the Christian religion. This school, headed by Heine, Borne, and others, substituted for the Bible doctrine that man was created in the image of God, the blasphemous notion that God is no more than the image of man. The literary productions, however, of this class of infidel wits were more suited to the atmosphere of Paris than that of Berlin, and accordingly some of the ablest writers of the school left Germany for France, and Young Germany, having lost its, prestige, was speedily forgotten. In more recent literature the pantheistic notions abound again, but not in such an objectionable shape. One of the ablest modern advocates of Spinozaism is the well-known German novelist, Berthold Auerbach, like his master in philosophy, of the Jewish profession, and, like him, a man of the highest moral life. While it must be conceded that Auerbach has purified and ennobled the infidel notions of the German masses, he yet has failed to quicken them spiritually, and there is only, as heretofore, a religion enthroned in the reason. SEE RATIONALISM.

The pantheistic system is too abstract and speculative in its character to find acceptance with the French mind generally. Near the beginning of the last century, however, Denis Diderot (1713-84), one of the Encyclopaedists (q.v.), passed from theism and faith in revelation to pantheism, which recognizes God in natural law, and in truth, beauty, and goodness. By the conception of sensation as immanent in all matter, he at once reached and outran the final consequence of materialism. In the place of the monads of Leibnitz, Diderot put atoms, in which sensations were bound up. The sensations became conscious in the animal organism. Out of sensations grows thought. He sought to construct a system. that should supersede the Christian, but in the attempt he was led away into utter darkness, and became the most heartless of atheists. SEE DIDEROT.

The prevailing philosophy of France. in our day, is deeply imbued with pantheism. It is to be attributed to Victor Cousin (1792-1867), the founder of the modern eclectic school of France. He declares God to be “absolute cause, one and many, eternity and time, essence and life, end and middle, at the summit of existence and at its base, infinite and finite together; in a  word, a trinity, being at the same time God and Humanity.” In what words could pantheism be more plainly set forth than in those just quoted? Yet Cousin anxiously repels the charge of pantheism, simply because he does not hold with Spinoza and the Eleatics that God is a pure substance, and not a cause. Pantheism, however, as we have seen, assumes a variety of phases, and though Cousin may not, with Spinoza, identify God with the abstract idea of substance, he teaches the same doctrine in another form when he declares the finite to be comprehended in the infinite, and the universe to be comprehended in God. (See Morell, Hist. of Philosophy, 2:478 sq.; Farrar, Critical History of Free Thought, p. 297 sq.; Princeton Review, April, 1856, art. viii.) .

The system of philosophico-theology, which maintains God to be everything, and everything to be God, has extensively spread its baleful influence among the masses of the people in various Continental nations. It pervades alike the communism of Germany and the socialism of France. Feuerbach, in the one country, holds that God is to be found in man, and the Saint Simonian, Pierre Leroux, in the other, that humanity is the mere incarnation of Divinity. In England and America also the same gross pantheism, decked out with all the charms of poetry and eloquence, is taught in our day. Man-worship is, indeed, the pervading element of the philosophy taught by the Emerson school, or Intuitionists, and is advocated and believed by a considerable number of speculative thinkers in England and America. “Standing on the bare ground,” says the apostle of this latest form of pantheism, “my head bathed by the blithe air, and uplifted into infinite space, all mean egotism vanishes. The currents of the Universal Being circulate through me. I am part or particle of God.” “The world proceeds from the same Spirit as the body of man. It is a remoter and inferior incarnation of God-a projection of God in the unconscious.” “Intellectual science has been observed to beget invariably a doubt of the existence of matter.” “The soul is... wider than space, older than time, wide as hope, rich as love.” Mr. Emerson regards Jesus as belonging to a true race of prophets, because he said, “I am divine;” but his Christ is plainly not an exceptional person, only one of a class. The language of the Bible he uses in a most extraordinary way, and all who insist on finding monotheism in the Scriptures, and not pantheism, as he does, he calls “dogmatical bigots.” The God of the Bible is a father with a father's pity for his children, but the God of the Pantheist is eternal fate which devours all things. “Believe in the God within you,” says Mr. Emerson. On principle  Mr. Emerson is no philanthropist, but a disapprover of acts of charity. He counts a man no more sacred than a mouse, and confounds the good with the bad (see Prof. Prentice's articles in Meth. Quar. Rev. July, 1874; April, 1875). Mr. Carlyle shares these opinions. The Pantheists themselves claim Frederick Robertson as theirs; but there is no more ground forth this than for their claim on Schleiermacher. Indeed, Robertson's view of the relation of God to the world is as near to Schleiermacher's as it well can be. SEE ROBERTSON.

Theodore Parker is also claimed by the Pantheists, but we think with as little propriety as Robertson. True, Parker was not as devout a man and as ardent a believer. in Christianity, but he was a believer in Providence and the immortality of the soul. His chief work A Discourse on Religion, and his after declarations present him to us as a Deist, and not a Pantheist. He was influenced by Schleiermacher, but got farther away from the Church and Christianity, and may be said to have held the position now assumed by Renan, the author of the Lift of Christianity. Both accept the essence of Christianity as essential to the needs of humanity, but refuse to acknowledge as lord and master the author thereof. SEE PARKER.

Hunt, the author of an essay on pantheism, and a noted English divine of our day, is the modern apostle of Christian pantheism. He insists that Christianity and pantheism must be reconciled, otherwise it will be the worse for Christianity:

“Pantheism is on all hands acknowledged to be the theology of reason — of reason it may be in its impotence, but still of such reason as man is gifted with in this present life. It is the philosophy of religion — the philosophy of all religions. It is the goal of Rationalism, of Protestantism, and of Catholicism, for it is the goal of thought. There is no resting-place but by ceasing to think or lesson on God and things divine. Individuals may stop at the symbol, churches and sects may strive to make resting-places on the way by appealing to the authority of a Church, to the letter of the Sacred Writings, or by trying to fix the ‘limits' of religious thought where God has not fixed them” (p. 375).

In order to determine what this Mr. Hunt would give the Christian, it is necessary to hear the definition of pantheism Hunt furnishes. Here it is:

“It might be better, indeed, to get rid, it it were possible, of the term Pantheism; but we cannot get rid of the thing, — for it emerges in all systems as it has emerged in all ages... The argument  from final causes proves the existence of a world-maker. It demonstrates that there is a mind working in the world. It is a clear and satisfactory proof of the ordinary understanding, of man but it proves nothing more than a finite God. We must supplement it by the argument from ontology. The one gives a mind, the other gives being, the two together give the infinite God, impersonal and yet personal — to be called by all names, or, if that is irreverent, to be called by no name” (p. 378)... “Is what is called Pantheism anything so fearfull that to avoid it we must renounce reason? To trace the history of theology from its first dawning among the Greeks down to the present day, and to describe the whole as opposed to Christianity, is surely to place Christianity in antagonism with the catholic reason of mankind. To describe all the greatest minds that have been engaged in the study of theology as Pantheists, and to mean by this term men irreligious, un-Christian, or atheistic, is surely to say that religion, Christianity, and theism have but little agreement with reason. Are we seriously prepared to make this admission? Not only to give up Plato and Plotius, Origen and Erigena Spinoza and Schleiermacher, but St. Paul and St. John, St. Augustine and St. Athanasius?” (p. 379).

In other words, the God of Christianity must be allowed not to be a God creating a world, and acting on a world from without but a God immanent and energizing in the universe which is co-extensive with him as its source; and dogmatic formulae and Biblical representations irreconcilable with that doctrine must be explained as metaphors or shadows, or cast aside — or otherwise Christianity itself must cease to be the religion of civilized humanity (Picton, in his essays on The Mystery of Matter [Lond. 1875, 8vo], has taken a like position). This pantheistic sentiment floating about in the poetry, criticism, theology, and even in the speculative thinking of the present time is attributable principally, we think, to the ravages made by Biblical criticism and to the aggressiveness of the physical scientists, who, in the advances which they are making in the acquisition of knowledge, are determined to extend inquiry also into the region of religious beliefs. Hence multitudes of men are puzzled what to think and what to believe. They do not like to face the fact that they have actually lost faith in revelation, and are no longer relying for help and guidance on the Spirit of God. but on the laws of nature; so they take refuge from the abhorred aspect of the naked truth that they, are “atheists” in a cloud of rose-colored poetical phrases;  which, if they mean anything, mean pantheism. “Quid philosophus ac Christianus,” said the rugged but sensible Tertulian. in hi' day; and the same remark may here be made, “What has Christianity to do with Pantheism?” The personality of God is a previous question which Christianity, in common with all historical religions, must assume. He that cometh to God must believe that he is. and that he is the rewarder of them that diligently seek him. Now the Pantheist repels wit, indignation the charge of atheism. Far from denying the existence of God, he pretends to recognize God in all he sees and hears and feels. In his creed God, and God is all. But the very essence of his system consists in the denial of a living, personal God, distinct from nature and presiding over it. This, if not atheism, approaches to the very verge of it. We may theoretically distinguish pantheism and atheism from each other, but the man who can look around him and say that the universe is God, or that he himself is an incarnation of God, a finite particle of the Infinite Being, makes assertions tantamounth in meaning to the statement that there is no God. Christianity has no longer to maintain a conflict with open, avowed, unblushing atheism, but with secret, plausible, proud pantheism. Nor can the result of the conflict be doubtful. Christianity will assuredly triumph over this, as she has already done over all her former adversaries, and men will rejoice in recognizing the old living personal God, who watches over them, to whom they can pray, in whom they can trust, and with whom they hope to dwell throughout a blessed eternity.

The baneful effects of pantheism cannot fail to unfold themselves wherever, as among the Hindûs, it lies at the foundation of the prevailing religion. Its practical fruits, in such circumstances, are moral degradation, barbarism, and cruelty. The natural consequences of a pantheistic creed are thus ably sketched by Dr. Buchanan:

“The practical influence of pantheism, in so far as its peculiar tendencies are not restrained or counteracted by more salutary beliefs, must be deeply injurious both to the individual and social welfare of mankind. In its ideal or spiritual form it maybe seductive to some ardent, imaginative minds, but it is a wretched creed notwithstanding; and it will be found, when calmly examined, to be fraught with the most serious evils. It has been commended, indeed, in glowing terms, as a creed alike beautiful and beneficent, as a source of religious life nobler and purer than any that can ever spring from the more gloomy system of theism; for, on the theory  of pantheism, God is manifest to all everywhere and at all times. Nature, too, is aggrandized and glorified, and everything in nature is invested with a new dignity and interest; above all, man is conclusively freed from all fantastic hopes and superstitious fears, so that his mind can now repose with tranquil satisfaction on the bosom of the Absolute, unmoved by the vicissitudes of life, and unscared even by the prospect of death. For what is death? The dissolution of any living organism is but one stage in the process of its further development; and whether it passes into a new form of self-conscious life, or is reabsorbed into the infinite, it still forms an indestructible element in the vast sum of being. We may therefore, or rather we must, leave our future state to be determined by nature's inexorable laws, and we need, at least, fear no Being higher than nature, to whose justice we are amenable, or whose frown we should dread. But even as it is thus exhibited by some of its warmest partisans, it appears to us, we own, to be a dreary and cheerless creed when compared with that faith which teaches us to regard God as our ‘Father in heaven,' and that ‘hope which is full of immortality.' It is worse, however, than dreary: it is destructive of all religion and morality; it is an avowed antagonist to Christianity; it is not less hostile to natural theology and to ethical science; it consecrates error and vice as being, equally with truth and virtue, necessary and beneficial manifestations of the ‘infinite.' It is a system of syncretism, founded on the idea that error is only an incomplete truth, and maintains that truth must necessarily be developed by error and virtue by vice. According to this fundamental law of ‘human progrres', atheism itself may be providential; and the axiom of a fatal optimism. Whatever is, is best' — must be admitted equally in regard to truth and error, to virtue and vice.”

Modern pantheism is nothing else than the theosophy of the East imported into the West: an avowed attempt to displace the religious idea which God stamped upon the soul and conscience of humanity from the very cradle of the race in Paradise. The personality of the Deity and of Christ, with the individual responsibility of man, are the weighty questions upon which men's minds are to be unsettled. There is nothing original in the means adopted, unless indeed in their higher sublimation from all earthly taint of common-sense “Insana magis quam haeretica;” the present deification of  man is the last word of this philosophy. “J'ai assez lu,” says Saisset, as the conclusion of his comparison of the various systems of philosophy (Essai de Phil. Rel.); “jai assez discutd, l'age mur arrive, il faut fermer ces livres, me replier au dedans de moi et ne plus consulter que ma raison.”

IV. Literature. — See Ritter, Gesch. der christl. Philos. vol. i, ii; Fischer, Gesch. der neueren Philos.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. vol. i, ii; Buchanan, Modern Atheism (1855); Dix, Lect. on Pantheism; W. H. Mill, Application of Pantheistic Principles to the Gospel Theory (1840); Maret, Der Pantheismus in den modernen Gesellschaften (2d ed. 1842); Romany, Der neueste Pantheismus (1848); Bohmer, De Pantheismi Nominis Origine et Usu et Notione (1851); Volkmuth, Pantheismus (1837); Hoffmanmn, Zur Widerklegung des Naturalismus, Materialismus u. Pantheismus (1854); Weissenborn, Vorlesungen uber Pantheismus u. Theismus (Marb. 1859); Hunt, Essay on Pantheismn (1866); Saisset, Philos. Relig. (1862), 1:111 sq.; 2:315 sq.; and the English translation of his Modern Pantheismn (1866); Manning, Half Truths and the Truth (1873); Hanne, Die Idee der absoluten Personlichkeit (1869); Haccius, Kann der Pantheisnus eine Reformation der Kirche bilden (1870); Jundts, Histoire du Panthiisme populaire (Paris, 1875); Poitou, Philos. Syst. Relig. ch. viii; Gould, Origin and Development of Religious Belief (1871), 1:253, 256, 257, and especially ch. xiv; Bunsen, God in the World, 1:5 sq.; Pye-Smith, First Lines in Christian Theology, p. 112 sq.; Wharton, Theism and Scepticism (1859), p. 362 sq.; Guizot, Meditations sur l'tat actuel de la Religion Chretienne (1866); Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, i,25 sq.; Miller, The Doctrine of Sin (see Index in vol. ii); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doct. (see Index in vol. ii); Bournoufe. La Science des Religions, ch. xi; Pattison, Tendencies of Religious Thought in Engl. in “Essays and Reviews” (1860), p. 279-362; Van Mildert. Rise and Progress of Infidelity (Boyle Lect. 1802-4) (1838); Tennemann, Gesch. der Philos.; Thompson, Theism, p. 97; Auberlen, Dogmatics; Fisher, The Natural and the Supernatural; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought; Haag, Histoire des Dogmes Chretieznnes (see Index); McCosh, Intuition of God; Browne, Expos. of the Thirty-nine Articles, p. 19-36; Bayne, Christian Life; Hase, Dogmatik, p. 119 sq.; Migne, Conclusions, p. 619-870; Gioberti, Works, vol. ii, iii; Nitzsch, Practische Theologie; Niedner, Gesch. der Philos. p. 369; Journal Spec. Philos. Jan. 1871, art. x; Brit. and For. Edinb. Rev. Oct. 1866. p. 846 sq.; July, 1875, art. vii; Brit. Quar. Rev. April, 1875, art. ii; Lond. Rev. April, 1856,14 sq. 20 sq.; New-Englander, Jan. 1,1863, art. v;  Brit. For. Rev. vol. 17; Biblioth. Sacra, Jan. 1857, p. 55; 1860, p. 257; Oct. 1867; Chr. Rev. vol. 20; Journal Sac. Lit. vol. 9, 20; Lond. Academy, Nov. 1. 1873, p. 411; Theol. Eclect. Rev. 3:106; Amer. Presbyt. Rev. April, 1862, p. 199; April, 1863, p. 358; Amer. Quar. Ch. Rev. Oct. 1867; Oct. 1869.

## Pantheon[[@Headword:Pantheon]]

             the name among the Greeks and Romans for a temple dedicated to all the gods. It was in Rome also called the Rotunda. The “Pantheon” of Rome is a building deservedly celebrated for its fine dome. It suggested the idea of the domes of modern times. It was anciently dedicated by Agrippa, son-in- law to the emperor Augustus; but in A.D. 608 it was rededicated by pope Boniface IV to the Virgin Mary and all the saints (Chiesa di Santa Maria dei Marteri). In this once pagan but now Roman Catholic church may be seen different services going on at different altars at the same time, with distinct congregations around them, just as the inclinations of the people lead them to the worship of this or that particular saint. In 1632 a Barberini, then on the papal throne, thought he would add to his reputation by disfiguring the Pantheon, which he despoiled of the ornaments spared by so many barbarians, that he might cast them into cannon and form a high- altar for the church of St. Peter. (J. H. W.)

## Panthera[[@Headword:Panthera]]

             is, according to the Talmud, the name of a certain soldier, said to have been illegitimately the father of Jesus. This tradition was current before the composition of the Talmud, for as early as the 2d century Celsus, against whom Origen wrote his treatise, introduces a Jew who, in speaking of the mother of Jesus, says that “when she was pregnant she was turned out of doors by the carpenter to whom she had been betrothed, as guilty of adultery, and that she bore a child to a certain soldier named Panthera.” The word Panthera, or, as it is written in the Talmud, בו פנדירא, Son of Pandera, seems to have been used in an allegorical sense, meaning “the son of a wanton,” for according to allegorical exegesis the panther derives the name from τὸ πᾶν θηρᾶν, thus signifying “the personification of sensuality.” Only in unexpurgated editions of the Talmud, the last of which appeared at Amsterdam in 1645, the name of Jesus occurs some twenty  times. The Toledoth Jeshu (q.v.), a detestable compilation put together out of fragmentary Talmudic legends, contains everything that is supposed to have been uttered by Jewish blasphemers, and in, the Latin translation given by Wagenseil, in his Tela Ignea Satance (Altorf, 1681), it is made accessible to all who wish to know more about this matter. In the German language the student can peruse Eisenmenger, who has brought together all these blasphemous sayings, attributing them all to Judaism, while really they are only the utterances of several ignoble souls. In his Entdecktes Judenth. 1:106,107,109,115,116, 133, 261 sq., the German and the original are given. See also Buxtorf, Lexicon Talmudicumri, s.v. סטד, סטדא, p. 73-2 and s.v. פנדורה, p. 874 (Fischer's ed.); Hoffmann, Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen, p. 90 sq.; Farrar, Life of Christ, 1:76; Nitzsch, Ueber eine Reihe talmudischer undpatristischer Tauschungen welche sich an den missverstandenen Spottnamen, בן פנדירא, geknupft, in the Theologische Studien ut. Kritiken (1840), p. 115 sq.; P. Cassel, Panthera-Stada, etc., in his Apologetische Briefe (Berlin, 1875). (B. P.)

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

             a Flemish painter and engraver, was born at Antwerp about 1600. Little is known of him as a painter, but it appears that he was a disciple of Rubens from the inscriptions on some of his prints. He etched quite a number of plates after Rubens and from his own designs. They were executed in a spirited and masterly style, but his drawing is frequently incorrect. The following, after Rubens, are his most esteemed prints: Esther before Ahasuerus: — The Nativity: — The Adoration of the Magi: — Mary Washing the Feet of Christ: — The Assumption of the Virgin: — The Holy Family, with the Infant Christ and St. John playing with a Lamb: — St. John Baptizing Christ: — Samson Killing the Lion and the Bear: — St. Sebastian.

## Panvinio, Onufrio[[@Headword:Panvinio, Onufrio]]

             an Italian monk noted as as historian and antiquarian, was born at Verona in 1529, and took at an early age the habit of the Order of St. Augustine. He pursued his studies at Rome, whence he was called to Florence in 1554 to fill the chair of theology in that city; but soon afterwards, at his own request, was superseded in the office, and obtained leave from his superiors to visit the chief cities of Italy in order to collect inscriptions. At Venice he became acquainted with Sigonio, who had been appointed professor of  belles-lettres in that city in 1552, and he was not less enthusiastically attached than Panvinio himself to the study of antiquities. The acquaintance soon ripened into a lasting friendship. At Rome Panvinio was patronized by cardinal Cervini, who in 1555 became pope Marcellus II, and by him Panvinio was appointed to a situation in the library of the Vatican, with a salary of six gold ducats a month. The pope, however, died a short time after his, election, and Panvinio was then patronized by cardinal Farnese, who gave him apartments in his palace, admitted him to his table, and treated him in other respects with the greatest liberality. Panvinio died at Palermo April 7, 1568, while visiting there. He was a man of great learning and indefatigable industry. Niceron, in his Memoires, mentions twenty- seven works by Panvinio which had been printed; and Maffei, in his Verona Illustrata, gives a list of Panvinio's MSS. in different libraries of Italy and Germany. The most important of his works are the following, some of which were not printed till after his death: Epitome Pontificum Romanorum usque ad Paulumn IV (Venice, 1557, fol.): — Viginti-septem Pontificum Romanorum Elogia et Imagines (Rome, 1568, fol.): — Fasti et Triumphi Romanorum a Romulo usque ad Carolun V (Venice, 1557; Mader published another edition in 1662 at Helinstindt): — In Fastos Consulares Appenddix: — De Ludis Sacul ribus et Antiquis Romanorum Nominibus (Heidelb. 1588, fol.): De Baptismate, Pascali Origine, et Ritu consecrandi Agnos Dei (Rome, 1560, 4to): — De Sibyllis et Carminibus Sibyllinis (Venice, 1567, 8vo): — De Triumpho Commentarius (Venice, 1573, fol.; Helmstadt, 1676, 4to, by Mader): — De Ritu sepeliendi Mortuos apud Veteres Christianos et eorumn Cenmeterii; (Louvain, 1572, 8vo): De Republica Romana Libri III (Venice, 1581, 8vo): De Bibliotheca Pontficis Vaticana (Tarragona, 1587, 4to): — De Ludis Circensibus Libri II, et de Triunmphis Liber I (Venice, 1600, fol.): — Amplissimi Oniatissimique Triumphi, ex Antiquissimis Lapidum et Numnmorum Monumentis, etc. Descriptio (Rome, 1618, fol.): De Antiquitate et VirisIllustribus Verona Libri VIII (Padua, 1648, fol.). The following treatises are contained in the great collection of Graevius, “Thesaurus Antiquitatum Romanarum:” De Civitate Romana and De Imperio Romano, in vol. i; De Antiquis Romanorumn Nominibus, in vol. ii; Antique Urbis Iznago, in vol. iii; De Lutis Circensibus, De Ludis Scecularibus, and De Triumpho Commentarius, in vol. 9; His great treatise De Cerimoniis Curie Romanc, in 11 vols. folio, is in MS. in the royal library at Munich. See Reuter De Onuphrio Panvinio (Altorf, 1797, 4to); Aschbach, Kirchen- Lexikon, 4:423, 424; Weiss, in Biographic Universelle, s.v.; Tiraboschi,  Storia della Letteratura Italiana, vol. vii; English Cyclop. s.v. . Piper, Monumental Theol. § 163,216. (.J. n.W.)

## Panvinius[[@Headword:Panvinius]]

             SEE PANVINIO.

## Panzani, Gregorio[[@Headword:Panzani, Gregorio]]

             an Italian ecclesiastic, flourished in the first half of the 17th century. Sent by pope Urban VIII to England, he remained there from 1634 to 1636, in order to reconcile the differences which had arisen among the Roman Catholics. On his return home he was made canon of St. Lorenzo at Rome, and bishop of Miletus in partibus. He wrote some interesting memoirs upon the mission, but they have never appeared in separate form. Dodd has inserted some extracts in his History of the Church, and an English priest, Joseph Berington, published a translation of them, entitled Memoirs of Gregorio Panzani (Birmingham, 1794, 4to). See Chaudon, Dict. Hist Univ.

## Panzer, Georg. Wolfgang[[@Headword:Panzer, Georg. Wolfgang]]

             a German theologian, was born at Sulzbach in 1729, and was educated at Altdorf, where he took his doctorate in philosophy in 1749. In 1751 he was made pastor at Etzelwang, near Nuremberg; in 1760, dean at St. Sebaldus, in Nuremberg; in 1772, senior preacher; in 1773, pastor. He died in 1804. Besides his Annales Typographici, he wrote a history of the German Bible, Literar. Nachrichten v. den allenrdltesten gedruckten Deutschen Bibeln (Nuremb. 1777): — Gesch. der Nurnberger Ausgabenz der Bibel, etc. (ibid. 1778): — Gesch. Der Augsburger Ausgaben (1780): — Die unverdnderte Augsburgische Confession (1785): — LiterarGesch. der luther.-deutschen Bibel.ibersetzung 1517-1581 (1783, 1791), etc. He also devoted himself to a careful editing of the Church hymn-books.

## Panzer, Johann Friedrich Heinrich[[@Headword:Panzer, Johann Friedrich Heinrich]]

             son of the preceding, also noted as a German theologian, was born at Nuremberg March 25, 1764. He was educated at the universities in Altdorf and Erlangen, and devoted himself as much to philosophy as to theology. He finally desired to enter the ministry, and became catechite at the St. James's Church in his native place. In 1797 he was made pastor at Eltersdorf and Tannenlohe. During the Prussian-Nuremberg controversy he  was dismissed, but the Prussian government gave him an appointment as pastor at Baireuth. He died Nov. 15, 1815. Panzer wrote several valuable monographs treating of chapters in the history of the Reformation.

## Panzi, Solomon Ben-Elijakim[[@Headword:Panzi, Solomon Ben-Elijakim]]

             of Rovigo, a Jewish writer noted as the author of מפתח הגמרא, or Claris Gemarica, or rather methodology of the Talmud, in six chapters. It was translated into Latin with notes by Chr. Hen. Ritmeier (Helmstadt, 1697), and republished in Hnr. Jak. Bashuysen's Claris Talmudica maxima (Hanau, 1714). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:281; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei (Germ. transl. by Hamburger), p. 256; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. vol. i and iii, No. 1958; Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, continued by Rottermund, v. 1516.

## Paoletti, Ferdinando[[@Headword:Paoletti, Ferdinando]]

             an Italian theologian of note, was born at Alla Croce, in Tuscany, in 1717. He studied theology at Florence, and in 1746 was made rector in Villamagna, where he labored for the remainder of his life. He died in 1801. Paoletti several times refused episcopal dignity, preferring the quiet labors of his parish to the exacting work of a diocese. He was noted not only as a devoted priest, but also as a most zealous promoter of agricultural science in his rural district.

## Paoli, Sebastian[[@Headword:Paoli, Sebastian]]

             an Italian ecclesiastic, was born in 1684 at Lucca: entered the Order of the Mother of God; in 1729 was appointed general procurator of the congregation; afterwards rector of the college of St. Brigitta at Naples, where he died in 1751. He was one of the most famous antiquarians of his times. He wrote: Della poesia de' S. Padri Greci e ‘Latini ne' primi secoli della chiesa (Naples, 1714): — Codice diplomatico del sagre militare ordine Gerosolemitano oggi di Malta, etc. (Lucca, 1733-1738, 2 vols. fol), which is very important for the history of the Knights of Malta. He also published a good edition of the Orations of Peter Chrysologus (Venice, 1750).

## Paolini, Pietro[[@Headword:Paolini, Pietro]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Liicca in 1603. He went early to Rome, where he entered the school of Angelo Caroselli. Under him Paolini  acquired a manner that shows correct drawing, and a style of coloring more resembling that of the Venetian than the Roman school, uniting the richness and harmony of Titian and Pordenone. Lanzi says his Martyrdom of St. Andrew, in the church of S. Michele at Lucca, and the grand picture, sixteen cubits long, in the library of S. Frediano, would alone be sutfficient to immortalize this painter. The latter work represents the pontiff St. Gregory entertaining some Pilgrims. It is a magnificent picture, ornamented in the style of Veronese, with a grand architectural perspective, full of figures, and possessing a variety, harmony, and beauty that have induced many to extol it. He also excelled in cabinet pictures of conversations and rural festivals, which are numerous at Lucca. Baldinucci especially commends two pictures of the Massacre of Valdestain, in the possession of the Oresetti family, and remarks that he had a peculiar talent for tragic themes. He was accused of being too energetic, and censured for making the action of his females too strong. To prove the contrary, and to show that he pursued his method from choice, and that he was not inferior to his rival Biancucci in his own' style, he painted his large work in the church of the Trinity in the graceful style.

## Paolini, Pio Fabio[[@Headword:Paolini, Pio Fabio]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Udine. He early went to Rome to study under Pietro da Cortona, and there acquired considerable reputation for some historical works, especially for his fine fresco of San Carlo, which adorns the Corso. In 1678 he was elected a member of the Academy of St. Luke. He afterwards returned to his native city, where he executed several altar-pieces and other works for the churches, which Lanzi says entitled him to a high rank among the followers of Cortona. He also painted much for the collections.

## Paolo Cagliari[[@Headword:Paolo Cagliari]]

             SEE PAOLO VERONESE.

## Paolo Veronese[[@Headword:Paolo Veronese]]

             (or PAOLO CAGLIARI), a very noted Italian painter who belonged to the Venetian school of the 16th century, was a native of Verona. whence his surname. He was born, according to Ridolfi, in 1532, though others say in 1528. His father was a sculptor, and afforded the boy all the art-training that he seemed so much to seek after. When quite young he moved to Venice, where he soon developed talents which placed him on an equality with Titian. As colorists the two men differ considerably. Titian's colors are strong and bright, Veronese's are toned down, less gorgeous, more delicate. Paolo was eminently successful in a certain style of painting, and adhered to it through a long and active life. Most of his pictures represent scenes in the life of Christ, in which the personages appear in Venetiani costumes of the 16th century, and in which are introduced portraits of contemporaries. It is useless to criticize such a phase of art, or to approach it with the same laws with which we judge pure artistic conception.

Veronese's art is ornamentation carried to its highest perfection, but neither admitting nor asking comparison. with the art of the Florentine or Roman schools. His pictures all present the same qualities of exquisite grace and refinement full of what modern artists call “style.” The mind never tires of these paintings, but rests upon them with pleasure and content. No great effort is necessary to enjoy them; they leave a pleasurable sensation, as if we too had been enjoying the culture and luxuries of Venetian life. His best works are his four great paintings in the Venetian churches. The first was painted for the refectory of S. Giorgio Maggiore, and is now in the Louvre at Paris. The subject is The Marriage at Cana; it is over twenty-five feet wide, and contains an immense number of figures, many of which are portraits. It is said that he received only ninety ducats for this immense work, which is accounted for by the fact that he never accepted more. remuneration from the convents than the expense of his materials. The second, painted in 1570 for S. Sebastino, represents The Feast of Sinmon, with Magdalene washing the feet of  Christ. The third, executed for SS. Giovanni and Paolo, is The Savior at Supper with his Disciples. The fourth (which is perhaps his masterpiece): is the same subject as the second, but quite differently treated; it was painted for the refectory of the Padri Servi, and in 1665 was presented by the republic to Louis XIV. There are a few masterly etchings marked “P. C.” and “P. A. cal.,” which are attributed to Paolo, among which are The Adoration of the Magi, “Paolo Veronese fee.;” and Two Saints Sleeping (no mark). See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 1:156; Ruskin, Modern Painters; Rudolfi, Vita di P. Cagliari (1648); Lecarpentier, Notice sur P. Cagliari (1816); Zabeo, Elogio di P. Cagliari (1813). (J. H.W.)

## Paolo, Maestro[[@Headword:Paolo, Maestro]]

             of Venice, a noted painter, much devoted to sacred art, Lanzi says is the earliest painter in the national manner (i.e. different from the Greek artists of the time), of whom there exists a work with the indisputable name of its author. It is in the church of S. Marco at Venice, consisting of a tablet. or, as it is otherwise called, ancona, divided into several compartments,  representing the figure of a dead Christ, with some of the Apostles, and historical incidents from the holy evangelists. There is inscribed underneath, “Magister Paulus cum Jacobo et Johanne filiis fecit hoc opus.” There is no date upon it, but Zanetti found his name recorded in an ancient parchment bearing the date 1346. Sig. Morelli also discovered a painting in the sacristy of the conventual at Vicenza, inscribed “Paulus de Venetiis pinxit hoc opus, 1333.”

## Pap[[@Headword:Pap]]

             (שִׁד, shad, Eze 23:21; “teat,” Isa 22:12; μαστός, Luk 11:27; Luk 23:29; Revelations 1:13), the breast (as the Hebrew word is elsewhere rendered), especially of a female.

## Papa[[@Headword:Papa]]

             (Πάππας), a name originally given to the bishops of the Christian Church, is now the pretended prerogative and sole privilege of the pope, or bishop of Rome. The word signifies no more than father. Tertullian, speaking indefinitely of any Christian bishop who absolves penitents, gives him the name of Benedictus Papa. Heraclas, bishop of Alexandria, has the same title given him. Jerome gives the title of Papa to Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Paulinus; and, writing often to Augustine, he always inscribes his epistles Beatissimo Papoe Augustino. The name Papa was sometimes given to the inferior clergy, who were called Papa Pisinni, that is, little fathers; in comparison with whom Balsamon calls presbyters Protopapae i.e. chief fathers. The Greek Christians have continued to give the name Papa to their priests. There is at Messina, in Sicily, an ecclesiastical dignitary styled Protopapa, who, besides a jurisdiction over several churches, has a particular reverence paid him by the cathedral; for upon Whitsunday the prebendaries go in procession to the Protopapa's church (called the Catholic), and attend him to the cathedral, where he sings solemn vespers, according to the Greek ritual, and is afterwards waited upon back to his own, church with the same pompous respect. As a title, the word papa appears to have first been used by bishop Siricius in the 4th century; its use became more frequent in the course of the 5th century, and since the 7th century it disappears for all ecclesiastical officers except the bishop of  Rome; and Gregory VII expressly claimed it as an exclusive prerogative of the Roman see. SEE POPE.

## Papa, Simone (1)[[@Headword:Papa, Simone (1)]]

             called II Vecchio (the eldet), an Italian painter, was born about 1430 at Naples. He studied under Antonio Solario, called II Zingara whose works were then held in high estimation. He excelled in painting altar-pieces with few figures, grouped in a pleasing style and finished with exquisite care, in which he sometimes equaled Zingara himself. His chief works are the Triumph of St. Michael over the Apostate Spirits, in the church of S. Maria Nuova — his greatest effort; The Annunciation, in S. Niccolo alla Dogana; The Virgin and Infant Savior; with several Saints, in St. Lorenzo. Papa died in 1488.

## Papa, Simone (2)[[@Headword:Papa, Simone (2)]]

             called II Giovine (the younger), a Neapolitan painter, born in 1506. He was the son of a goldsmith, who desired to bring him up in his own business, but showing an early passion for painting, Papa was placed under the instruction of Gio. Antonio d'Amato. He acquired distinction, and executed several works for the churches, the principal of which are the Annunciation and the Assumption of the Virgin, in S. Maria la Nuova. Papa died in 1569. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:651.

## Papabiles[[@Headword:Papabiles]]

             (i.e. eligible to the pontificate of Rome). According to the regulations of Stephen III, made in 769, only the cardinals are eligible, but according to established custom, any one is papabilis who is capable of elevation to the episcopate. In a more restricted sense, it admits only those cardinals who are in papal interests and free from all foreign political influence. SEE POPE.

## Papacy[[@Headword:Papacy]]

             We give under this head a historical review of the rise and development of papal claims spiritual, ecclesiastical, and political; referring the dogmatic treatment to INFALLIBILITY, SUPREMACY, and TEMPORAL POWER, and leaving the import of the name to PAPA, and all that relates to the official or personal treatment to POPE. In the history of the papacy four great periods may be distinguished:

(1) The history of the bishops of Rome from the earliest times to the establishment of the States of the Church in the 8th century;

(2) the history of the popes during the Middle Ages until the Reformation of the 16th century;

(3) the papacy from the 16th century to the Vatican Council in 1870;

(4) the era of Papal Infallibility, beginning in 1870.

I. Early Period. — The history of the Church of Rome during the first century is involved in an obscurity which is not likely to be ever fully cleared up. As the entire edifice of Roman Catholicism rests upon the supposition that the pope is the successor of St. Peter, as bishop of Rome- the Roman Catholic historian can take part in the researches concerning the origin of the Church of Rome only for the purpose of defending the Roman episcopate of St. Peter. Until quite recently, the statement of Eusebius and Jerome respecting a twenty or twenty-five years' episcopate of Peter in Rome was very generally accepted by Catholics historians; at present the only fact which they find themselves able to prove from the much-disputed testimonies of ancient writers is the presence on two different occasions of St. Peter in Rome, which they think is compatible with the. old tradition of a long missionary episcopate. Among non-Catholic writers there is an entire agreement that the legend of a Roman episcopate rests on a great chronological mistake. A large number of historians of note (among them Baur and Zeller) altogether deny that Peter was ever in Rome; and even those who concede a sufficient importance to the testimonies of ancient writers to regard a visit of St. Peter to Rome as probable, are equally positive in rejecting the Roman Catholic tradition concerning his episcopate. SEE PETER.

Moreover, the origin of episcopacy itself dates, according to most Protestant, writers, from the 2d century of the Christian era, making a Roman, like any other bishopric during the 1st century, an impossibility. Of the actual exercise of anything like primatial or papal jurisdiction on the part of St. Peter, even Roman Catholic writers have been unable to discover a vestige .

As immediate successors to St. Peter, as bishops of Rome, a number of men are mentioned by the Catholic tradition of whom so little is known that the ancient papal catalogues even disagree as to their order of succession and terms of office. Hegesippus (in Euseb. Eccles. Hist. 4:22) gives the following list, which is regarded as the most probable: Linus,  Anencletus (or Cletus), Clemens Romanus, Evarestus Alexander, Xystus (or Sixtus) I, Telesphorus, Hyginus, Pius I, Anicetus, Soter, Eleutherius, Victor, Zephyrinus, Calixtus, etc. The years of their administration, as given in different lists, are entirely irreconcilable. There is no reason to doubt their existence; but they were probably only prominent members of the Roman presbytery. The first name in the list which is celebrated in Christian antiquity is Clement, to whom two of the most famous among the works of the apostolic fathers are ascribed. But notwithstanding his celebrity in the Church, traditions is much divided as to the time of his administration, now making him the first, and now the third successor of Peter. It is a disputed point whether he is identical with the noble Roman, Flavius Clemens, who is said to have suffered martyrdom under Domitian. One of the principal writers on the earliest history of the Church of Rome, Lipsius, who in his first works had assumed the identity, adduces in his work, Chronologie der rimischen Bischlef (Kiel, 1869), cogent reasons against it. The first letter of Clement to the Corinthians is an important document in the history of the papacy, for in it Catholic historians find the first example of the exercise of a sort of papal authority. But, as the very introduction shows, this epistle is not sent at all in Clement's own name, but in that of the Roman congregation, and the tone pervading it is anything but hierarchical. The epistle may, however, justly be quoted as an indication of the high esteem in which the Church of Rome was held at a very early period. This prominent position is easily explained by the political preeminence of the city, which was the capital of the Roman world-empire, and by the high antiquity of the Roman Church, to which Paul had addressed one of his epistles, and which the churches of Italy, Gaul, and Spain looked upon as their mother Church. There is only one other passage in the writings of the apostolic fathers which is adduced as an argument for the existence of the papacy at that time. Ignatius of Antioch (died 107), in his epistle to the Roman Church, calls her προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης, which Mohler (Patrologie, 1:144) and other Catholic scholars explain as “head of the love-union of Christendom,” while Protestant writers understand it as only meaning “taking the lead in love.” It is at all events significant that in the whole epistle the bishop of Rome is not even mentioned.

With Xystus I (about 115 to 125) a second division in the oldest papal catalogues begins. It is regarded as probable that he was the first who occupied in the presbyterial college of Rome an episcopal position,  although his fellow-presbyters may have only regarded him as primus interpares. With Hyginus (about 135 to 139), Pius I (died about 154), Anicetus (died 166 or 167), and Soter (died 174 or 175), the history of the Roman bishopsbegins to be better authenticated. The names which have just been mentioned are closely united in history with the names of the Gnostics Cerdon, Valentinus, and Marcion. “The Shepherd of Hermas,” one of the celebrated writings of the apostolic fathers, is ascribed to a brother of Pius I; and during the administration of Anicetus, bishop Polycarp came to Rome to discuss with the Roman bishop the first Easter controversy. Under Eleutherius, towards the close of the 2d century, Ireneus came to Rome as the delegate of the congregation of Lyons in affairs relating to Montanism. Irenuses is the first Church writer who unquestionably mentions an honorary pre-eminence of the Roman Church. He calls her (Adv. Haer. 2:2) the greatest, the oldest, Church, acknowledged by all, founded by the two most illustrious apostles, Peter and Paul, the Church “with which, on account of her more important precedence, all Christendom must agree” (“Ad hane enim ecclesiam propter potentiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est eos, qui sunt undique fideles, in qua semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quxa est ab apostolis traditio”).

The famous passage is only extant in Latin translations, and is of somewhat disputed interpretation, but it is not doubted that Irenaeus meant to place the Church of Rome above the other enostolic churches, to which likewise a precedence of honor is allowed. It is to be observed, however, that this passage altogether speaks of a precedence of the ‘Roman Church,' not of the Roman bishop, and that there is no indication that anything beyond a mere precedence of honor is meant. That this was really the idea of Ireneusis confirmed by the fact that when about 190, bishop Victor of Rome broke fellowship with the churches of Asia Minor for the only reason of their peculiar Easter usages, Irenaeus rebuked Victor for troubling the peace of the Church, and declared himself against a forced uniformity in such non-essential matters. The Asiatic churches emphatically refused to comply with the demand of the Roman bishop, and the controversy remained unsettled until the 4th century when the Council of Nice decided in favor of the Roman practice. Tertullian also gave prominence to Rome among the apostolic mother churches, but after joining the Montanists he ridiculed the Roman bishop by calling him in irony “pontifex maximus” and “episcopus episcoporum.” At the beginning of the 3d century Hippolytus censured the Roman bishops Zephyrinus and  Calixtus for the lax discipline of their Church. It appears from his work that these bishops claimed an absolute power within their own jurisdiction, and that Calixtus established the principle that a bishop can never be deposed or compelled to resign by the presbytery. Cyprian (died 258) is the first who asserts in clear words the fundamental idea of the papacy, claiming superiority for the bishop of Rome as the successor of Peter, and. accordingly calling, the Roman Church the chair of Peter, the found it of priestly unity, and the root and mother of the Catholic Church. It is, however, only an ideal precedence which Cyprian concedes to the bishop of Rome, for in the controversy concerning heretical baptism, Cyprian, at the head of the African Church, and in union with the bishops of Asia Minor, opposed the position taken by the Roman bishop Stephen, and accused him of error and abuse of power.

A retrospect of the history of the Church during the first three centuries shows a gradually increasing readiness to concede to the Church, and at a later period to the bishop of Rome, some kind of honorary supremacy, and an eagerness of the bishops of Rome to use this disposition of other churches for enlarging their jurisdiction, and for asserting a real superiority over other bishops — a claim which, as has been shown, was promptly and emphatically denied in all parts of the Christian world; and it is a most remarkable circumstance that almost every writer of this period whose words can be used as a testimony in favor of proving the existence of a germ of papacy, also mentions — and personally endorses — the stanch opposition made to the first claims of the Roman bishops. The first oecumenical Council of Nice (325), in its sixth canyon, makes only an incidental mention of the Roman bishop. It confers upon the bishops of Antioch and Alexandria metropolitan rights over the churches of their several provinces, “since the same belongs also to the bishop in Rome.” The boundaries of the Roman diocese are, perhaps intentionally, not defined, but it appears certain that the Roman diocese comprised, in the opinion of the Nicene Council, only the ten suburbicarian provinces, or nearly the whole of Central Italy and the islands. SEE PATRIARCHATE.

Nothing certainly indicates that at this period anyone conceded to the Roman bishop a jurisdiction over all the Occidental churches; and not only the Church of North Africa, in the following century, but also the diocese of Milan and the Church of Arelate at a much later period repelled any claim of the Roman bishop to a jurisdiction over them. The canons of the Nicene Council were, however, forged at Rome in the interest of the  papacy at an early period, and the words Ecclesia Romnana semper haquit primatum were inserted. At the Council of Calcedon (451) the Roman- legate, Paschasinus, read the canon with the forged addition, but the council protested at once, and opposed the genuine to the forged version of the Nicene canon. The Synod of Sardica (q.v.), held in 343, conceded to the Roman bishop, Julius I (337-352), a really superior jurisdiction over other bishops, as canons 3 to 5 provide that in case a sentenced bishop desired to obtain a new decision from another synod, his judges must apply to Julius, bishop of Rome, who would decide whether a new synod was to be called or the judgment of the former was to be ratified, and until his decision was made the see of the sentenced bishop must not be filled. Julius might decide the case of the appealing bishop either through the bishops of the ecclesiastical province, or through his delegates, or in the exercise of his own power. It was, however, only one party among the bishops which conceded to the bishop of Rome these excessive powers, for the other party, embracing the Oriental bishops, seceded from the synod, and held distinct sessions in the neighboring city of Philippopolis. The wording of the resolutions appears, moreover, to indicate that the movers of the resolutions were aware that the latter were an innovation, and moreover that the superior jurisdiction which was accorded to the bishop of Rome was intended for bishop Julius personally, not for his office. That at this time large portions of the Church did not know of, or at least did not recognize any claim of the Roman bishop to superior jurisdiction, is easily proved. The synods of the Church, even the oecumenical synods, were convoked, without any cooperation on the part of the Roman bishop, by imperial decree. At none of these synods did the bishop of Rome or his legates preside, and for no dogmatic decision did the ancient Church appeal to Rome. The bishops of Rome, however, with great consistency and prudence, knew how to enlarge the precedence which had been accorded to the Church of the Imperial City, and the honors which for personal merits had been conferred upon individual occupants of the see into a permanent ascendency, for which a divine origin was .claimed, in order to make it an organic part of the doctrinal system of the Church. Innocent I (402-417) endeavored to put upon the canons of Sardica a far-reaching construction, and appealed to them for claiming a right of cognizance in all important ecclesiastical questions. Zosimus (417-418) asserted that the fathers had conferred upon the Roman see the prerogative that his decision should be the last and decisive one. ‘The fraudulent habit. of ascribing the canons of the Synod of Sardica to the first oecumenical Council of Nice  became quite general in Rome. At the Synod of Ephesus, in 431, the Roman legates declared that Peter, to whom Christ had given the power of binding and unbinding, was continuously living and judging through his successor.

The first pope, in the real sense of the word, was Leo I (440-461). Being endowed by nature with the old Roman spirit of dominion, and being looked upon by his contemporaries, in consequence both of his character and his position, as the most eminent man of the age, he developed in his mind the ideal of an ecclesiastical monarchy, with the pope at the head, and endeavored with great energy to transform the constitution of the Church in conformity with his ideal. As a theological writer, he used nearly all the arguments which the defenders of the papacy up to the present time have adduced from the Bible. As bishop of Rome, he carried through his claims to supreme power over the whole Church with a greater energy than any of his predecessors. The bishops of the African and Spanish churches submitted to his demands. Bishop Anastasius of Thessalonica applied to him to be confirmed. and when Leo granted his prayer, and extended his jurisdiction over all the Illyrian churches, Roman supremacy thereby gained an important foothold even in the East. In Gaul, however, he met with a most determined resistance on the part of Hilarius, the metropolitan of Arles; and though he procured from the emperor Valentinian III an edict which unconditionally subjected all bishops of the West Roman Empire to the primacy of Rome, he obtained only a partial victory. At the fourth oecumenical Council of Chalcedon (451) Leo's legates protested against the famous twenty-eighth canon, which elevated the patriarch of New Rome, or Constantinople, to official equality with the pope. But this protest, as well as that of Leo's successors, remained without effect, and the Eastern half of the Christian Church learned to look upon the bishop of Constantinople as its highest dignitary, whose claims were supported by a council which Rome herself recognizes as oecumenical. After the death of Leo, the papal chair was for nearly one hundred and fifty years filled by weak, insignificant men, who reasserted the papal claims of Leo without possessing his energy to enforce them, and who encountered the unanimous resistance of the Eastern patriarchs. When Felix II (483-492) ventured to excommunicate the patriarch of Constantinople, a complete ‘schism between the Western and Eastern Church took place, which lasted over thirty years. Gelasius I (492-496) mockingly called the patriarch of Constantinople the bishop of the παροικία of Heraclea, and proclaimed  the principle that the pope's authority was higher than that of kings and emperors. When pope Symmachus (501 or 503) was acquitted by a synod held in Rome of the charges of adultery, of squandering the property of the Church, and other crimes, the partisans of the pope at this council declared that it did not behoove the council to pass judgment respecting the successor of St. Peter; and one deacon, Ennodius (subsequently bishop of Padua), vindicated this decision by asserting that the Roman bishop is above every human tribunal, and is responsible only to God himself.

Facts like these prove the existence at this early period of the germs of the extremest papal theory, but how little foundation they had in the real sentiments of the Church may be seen from the fact that for many centuries afterwards, even late in the Middle Ages, emperors and general councils deposed and appointed popes, and that the bulk of the Church, clergy as well as laity, felt no scruple in submitting to the popes thus set up. The struggle about Roman supremacy in this period was, however, chiefly a question of power. The orthodoxy of the popes was occasionally, without hesitancy, called into doubt by their own partisans. Anastasius II (496-498) was suspected of consenting to monophysitism, and the strictly papal writer, Baroinius ascribes his sudden death to an evident judgment of God. Vigilius (540-554) owed his elevation to the papal see to Eutychian promises, and his entire administration is characterized by vacillation between Eutychianism and orthodoxy. His successor, Pelagius (554-560), so greatly alienated by his Eutychian tendencies some of the Western and even Italian bishops (like those of Aquileja and Milan) that for some time they suspended all connection with Rome. Gregory I (590-604) was, next to Leo I, the greatest of the Roman bishops during this first period of their history. His claims in some respects appeared to be more moderate, and especially more modest, than those of Leo. He protested against the adoption by the Constantinopolitan patriarch of the title of “universal bishop,” and is said to have been the first among the Roman bishops who, with a humility strangely contrasting with the papal claims to a rule over the entire world, added to his name the title of Servus Servorum Dei. Gregory marks the transition of the patriarchal position of the Roman bishops into the strict papacy of the Middle Ages. He saw that the bishops of Rome could no enjoy the ecclesiastical supremacy at which they aimed until they threw off their political dependency, and he skillfully used the settlement of the Longobards in Italy to prepare the way for their independence. The triumph of the Catholic Church over Arianism in Spain,  and the success of the Roman mission in England, greatly promoted the plans of Gregory; but he did not as yet actually possess the power of the mediaeval popes, and we therefore prefer to place him at the close of the first, and not, as is done by many historians, at the beginning of the second period in the history of the papacy. The last century of this first period of the papacy is also characterized by the beginning of that system of stupendous forgeries which furnished during the following period the chief support of the boundless claims of the papacy, and the origin and tendency of which have only quite recently been fully explained by modern criticism. The conversion and baptism of Constantine by Sylvester; the inviolability of the pope in the pretended acts of a Synod of Sinuena, with the fabulous history of pope Marcellinus; the Constitutum Sylvestri, the Gesta Liberii, the Gesta Xysti III, and towards the close of the 6th century the forged additions to Cyprian's De unitate ecclesice, to the Liber pontificalis, etc., all have the same tendency.

II. The Papacy of the Middle Ages. — In the 7th and 8th centuries a series of important events added to the ecclesiastical ascendency of the popes a high and influential position among the secular governments of the world. In proportion as the Byzantine emperors lost their hold of Italy, and especially the city of Rome, the actual power in the latter passed over into the hands of the pope the he head of an aristocratic municipal government. Pope Zacharias I (741-752) sanctioned the dethronement of the weak Merovingian dynasty by the revolutionary declaration “that whoever possessed the power should have also the name of the king,” and his successor, Stephen III (752-757), anointed the usurper Pepin as king of the Franks. In return for these services, Pepin readily complied with the invitation of the pope to come to the aid of Rome against the Longobards, and, after obtaining a decisive victory, committed, as Roman Patricius, to the pope the provinces which the exarch had governed, alleging that the Franks had shed their blood not for the Greeks, but for St. Peter, and for the good of their own souls. Charlemagne confirmed and enlarged the donation which his father had made, and on Dec. 25, 800, laid the deed of the enlarged donation on the tomb of St. Peter. SEE TEMPORAL POWER.

Thus the popes became secular princes, though at first vassals of the Carlovingian emperors; and they were led to conceive the plan of restoring the old world-empire of the Romans by the rule of the pope over the entire world. Soon after the establishment of the temporal power the popes availed themselves of the weakness of the Carlovingian emperors to  emancipate themselves from their authority; and, in order to efface the recollection that the secular power of the popes was the gift of the German princes, the story was started that Constantine the Great had given Rome and Italy to pope Sylvester, and that this was the reason why the imperial capital had been removed to Constantinople. The actual power of the popes was, however, for several centuries not commensurate with their claims and aspirations. When the imperial dignity passed from the weak Cariovingiaiis of France to the energetic rulers of Germany, the emperors in many cases: asserted and enforced the right to depose and appoint popes, to prescribe laws for the Church, and to govern it according to their own views rather than those of the popes. These imperial rights were carried out by strong emperors in spite of the powerful support which the papal claims received theoretically from the famous collection of forged documents, known under the name of the Isidorian or pseudo-Isidorian decretals. The popes, from Clement I (91) to Damasus I (384), are there represented as ruling over a Church in which the clergy were. disconnected with the State, and unconditionally subordinate to the pope. Episcopacy appears for the first time as an emanation from the papacy; synods are regarded as valid only when they have been called by the popes, and all their resolutions are said to need a confirmation by the popes, who appear vested with the supreme legislative, supervisory, and judicial powers. For many centuries this collection was the storehouse from which popes and papal writers took the most efficient weapons in the conflicts respecting the ecclesiastical claims of the papacy; but Protestant criticism so irrefutably established its spuriousness that the advocates of the papacy now content themselves with attempting to prove that the deception was not of a criminal character or of much consequence, and that its primary object was not to enlarge the papal power, but to secure the independence of the Church against secular rulers.

The first half of the 10th century is known as the period of “pornocracy,” during which the papal chair was filled by a succession of reprobates for which the history of few, if any, episcopal sees of the Christian world furnishes a parallel. Two Roman families strove to obtain permanent control of the papal chair, and to convert it into a family benefice; and even some of the unworthy occupants of the chair appear to have familiarized themselves with this idea, which was thwarted by the revolt of the public sentiment against the papal scandals. The vigorous interference of emperor Otho I, who had the last papal representative of “pornocracy,” John XII,  cited before a synod at Rome (963), which convicted him of murder, blasphemy, and all kinds of lewdness, and deposed him from his office, actually arrested the total decay of the papal dignity. The influence of the following emperors, especially of Henry III, secured the election of a number of popes (among them several Germans) who were of unimpeachable morality, and sincerely anxious to deliver the Church from the almost universal simony and licentiousness of the clergy. Their reformatory efforts were seconded by several new organizations which had arisen in the Church. The congregation of Clugny endeavored to find for the higher claims which the papal writers derived from the Isidorian decretals a new religions basis, and congregations of hermits in Middle and Upper Italy developed a new taste for the most rigid kind of asceticism, the principal representative of which is Petrus Damiani.

About the middle of the 11th century a Roman monk, Hildebrand, who was a pupil of Clugny and a friend of Damiani, succeeded in effecting a complete change in the internal and external relations of the papacy. In order to emancipate the papal chair from the influence of the German emperors, he prevailed upon pope Leo IX (1048-1054), who owed his election to his cousin, emperor Henry III, to go to Rome in the character of a pilgrim, and to be there once more elected by the Roman clergy and people. One of the following popes, Nicholas II (1058-1061), committed the power of choosing the pope almost entirely to the College of Cardinals. In 1073 Hildebrand, after being for about twenty-five years the guide of the papal policy, ascended himself the papal chair under the name of Gregory VII. He is commonly regarded as the greatest pope of all times. He clearly and boldly set forth the theory of a theocratic rule of the pope over all nations of the world. The priesthood was regarded by him as the only power directly instituted by God, the power of secular rulers as the product of human agencies. The pope, as vicar of God, was to stand in times of violence between princes and their people, enforcing the law of divine right by his spiritual power, and able either to humble the people or to depose princes. The papacy he represented as the sun from whom all secular authority, also the empire, derived their light like the moon. He sternly .enforced the law of priestly celibacy, in order that all priests, by renouncing the delights and cares of domestic life, might devote their exclusive labors to promoting the cause of the Church. To the claims which his predecessors had based upon the Isidorian decretals, Gregory added the doctrine of the infallibility and sanctity of the pope, and his right to depose princes and absolve subjects from the oath of loyalty. The period from Gregory VII to Innocent III and  Innocent IV is an almost continuous conflict between the popes and the secular governments, during which the former, with an iron firmness, endeavored at first to destroy the direct influence of princes upon the government and offices of the Church, and secondly to subject all secular governments to the pope and the Church. Only two years after his elevation to the papal see (1095) Gregory held a synod in Rome, which- condemned all simony, and laid every one under excommunication who should confer or receive an ecclesiastical office from the hands of a layman. After lasting about fifty years, the controversy regarding the investiture of bishops was ended by the Concordat of Worms (1122), by which emperor Henry V, after the precedence of the governments of England and France, surrendered “to God, to St. Peter and Paul, and to the Catholic Church, all right of investiture by ring and crosier,” and granted that elections and ordinations in all churches should take place freely in accordance with ecclesiastical laws. These provisions were confirmed as valid for the entire Church by the-first General Council of Lateran, and completed the emancipation of the Church from secular governments. The struggle now following for the supremacy of the popes over secular governments was chiefly carried on by the popes Alexander III, Innocent III, and Innocent IV against the emperors of the house of Hohenstaufen. In the progress of this conflict the papacy obtained grand triumphs the extinction of the house of Hohenstaufen, the penance of Henry II of England at the tomb of Becket, the oath of homage taken by John Lackland and a number of petty princes, the foundation of the Latin empire at Constantinople. Boniface VIII (1294-1303), in his struggle against Philip IV of France, meant to crown this edifice of papal absolutism by the bull Unam sanctanz (Nov. 18, 1302), which declared that “for every human creature it is a condition of salvation to submit to the Roman pontiff” (subesse Romano pontifici onzni humance creaturae declaramus esse de necessitate salutis).

This excess of daring arrogance brought on a fatal collapse. As in England the nobility and commons had extorted from their cowardly king the Magna Charta as a bulwark against royal and popish presumption, so in France the Assembly of Estates derided the papal excommunication; and when Boniface himself was imprisoned, aid his successors compelled to reside at Avignon in slavish dependence upon the French kings, the papal authority received in the public estimation a staggering blow from which it has never recovered. The residence of the popes at Avignon, or, as it was called even before the times of Luther; the Babylonian exile of the popes,  was followed by the great Schism (1378-1409), when Christendom was scandalized by the rival claims of two or, at times, of three vicars of God, who hurled against each other frightful anathemas. The papal theory that the papal see shall not be judged of by any one was thus most completely exploded, for the secular governments, the schools, the clergy, and the laity all had to make their choice between the rival claimants. The clamor for a radical reformation of the Church in its head and members met with the heartiest responses from all sections of the Church, and led to the convocation of the general councils of Pisa (1409), Constance (1414- 1418), and Basle (1431-1433), which asserted the superiority of oecumenical councils over the popes, and did not hesitate to depose popes and elect new ones. The principles which guided these councils were radically and irreconcilably at variance with the theories of papal absolutism which Gregory VII and his successors had so boldly proclaimed. How general the acquiescence of the leading men in the reformatory attempts of these councils was may be inferred from the fact that when the Council of Pisa was called both the rival popes were abandoned by their cardinals, who united with two hundred bishops, three hundred abbots of monastic institutions, many hundred doctors of theology and canon laws, and the envoys of the secular governments in the deposition of the popes. If the central idea of these councils, the superiority of the oecumenical councils over the popes, could have been carried through, the development of the Roman Catholic Church would have taken a radically different turn. But unfortunately the cunning of pope Martin V (1417-1431), who had been elected by the Council of Constance, knew how to thwart the general demands for a reformation by separate treaties with the principal Christian nations; and his successor, Eugenius IV (1431- 1447), gained a complete victory over the Council of Basle, which, after being gradually abandoned by the Church, by' the very pope whom it had opposed to Eugenius, and finally by its own members, closed its sessions after 1443 without a formal adjournment. The power of the papacy was now gradually restored, and at the close of the 15th century Innocent VIII (1484-1492) and Alexander VI (1492-1503) once more attained the highest climax of depravity which has ever disgraced any episcopal see.

III. The Papacy since the Reformation. — By the Reformation of the 16th century a considerable portion of Christian Europe totally broke off its connection, not only with the papacy, but with the entire Church system, over which the popes, in the course of the last thousand years, had  gradually obtained an absolute power. Though arising from a theological controversy of so small dimensions that pope Leo X regarded it as a monkish quarrel, the Reformation at once gathered a gigantic strength from the latent contempt of the papacy which animated millions of minds. The efforts of Leo X and his immediate successors to crush the spreading secession by the secular arm were unsuccessful; and although the new order of the Jesuits succeeded in arresting its progress in some of the European countries, the Scandinavian kingdoms, Great Britain, Holland, Switzerland, and many of the German states were permanently lost. The fear of further losses led, however, to the removal of some of the grossest abuses in the Church; and characters like Innocent VIII and Alexander VI have not occupied the papal chair since the beginning of the Reformation. With great reluctance the popes consented to the convocation of a general council, which had long been called for by the nations of Europe, to restore peace to the Church, and to reform the existing abuses in a manner sanctioned by ecclesiastical traditions. The Council of Trent (15451563) did not succeed in reconciling the Protestants with the papacy, but it adopted some salutary rules for the government and the discipline of the Church. It had not, however, the courage to assume, with regard to the papal power, the position of the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, amid after its adjournment the popes again claimed and exercised the dangerous prerogative of explaining its decrees.

Within the Church the order of the Jesuits, in consequence of its admirable organization, obtained an influence which had never before been possessed by any monastic order or other association. What the popes themselves, in default of their former power, could no longer obtain from secular governments by threats of excommunication, the Jesuits endeavored to achieve by means of education and by court influence. But while accommodating to the wishes, and sometimes even the vices of powerful princes, from whom they expected a furtherance of the interests of the Church and their own order, they tried with the most uncompromising consistency to make the popes the absolute rulers of the Catholic hierarchy in matters of faith as well as of ecclesiastical administration. Everywhere they stand forth as the advocates of an unconditional submission to papal decisions in doctrinal controversies, and of the abolition of all the independent rights formerly possessed by the bishops, who were more and more to be converted into subaltern offices of a papal monarchy. The great popes of the Middle Ages, Gregory VII, Alexander III, Innocent III and IV, and Boniface VIII, had clearly and boldly traced the boundary-lines of the papal theocracy to  which the entire human race was to be subjected; but the Jesuits have done more than all popes and bishops for developing the principles according to which the administration of such an empire must be carried on, in order to be consistent and effective. It was to be expected that an organization like the Jesuits should obtain an all powerful influence at Rome. The other religious orders naturally felt jealous at the new-comer, by whom they were totally eclipsed; not a few of the bishops rebelled against being stripped of the more extensive authority of their predecessors; the majority of Catholic scholars chafed against the condition of abject servitude which the papal hierarchy, as it was understood by the Jesuits, assigned to them; and many governments became alarmed at the excessive claims, in behalf of the papacy which were set up in the schools and the books of the Jesuits; but public sentiment in Catholic countries was, on the whole, in their favor. Thus, the popes were emboldened to reassert from time to time the mediaeval ideas of their predecessors, the most significant fact in this respect being the famous bull In Caena Domini, to which Urban VIII (1623-1644) gave its final form, and in which not only Saracens, pirates, and princes, who impose arbitrary taxes, but Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists were anathematized.

The Peace of Westphalia (1648) demonstrated, however, anew that the actual influence of the popes upon the secular affairs, even in Catholic states, had irretrievably departed. The representatives of Protestant and Catholic governments met in common council to deliberate upon the peace of the world; the legal existence of Protestantism was recognized by all Catholic governments; while the pope, by his solitary and entirely ineffectual protest, revealed to the world, in a very conspicuous manner, that however obstinately the theocratic ideas of the Middle Ages might still be adhered to by the ecclesiastical functionaries and devoted theologians, he had lost all control of the political world. In fact, the popes, from a political point of view, more and more appeared as the rulers of a petty Italian state (the states of the Church) rather than as the heads of a grand theocratical world-empire. Even in the College of Cardinals this view gradually gained strength; and While none of the old claims of the papacy were discarded, many popes appeared to care as such for their particular state. The greater importance which now attached to the pope's character, as secular prince, manifests itself in the habit of selecting nearly all the occupants of the papal chair from among the great Italian families, and in the fact that none but Italians have been elected popes since Adrian VI  (1522, 1523), who was a native of Holland. At the same time a tendency showed itself at times among the cardinals to increase ,the influence of their college by electing popes who were chiefly remarkable for the absence of energy and any prominent qualities of mind. Thus it was said that Innocent X (1644-1655) was made pope on the ground that he never said much, and had done still less; Clement X (1670-1676), a feeble octogenarian, “did nothing except to weep over the administration of his family favorites;” Benedict XIII (1727-1730) seemed always to regard the convent of the Dominicans as his world; while his hypocritical favorite, Coscia, bartered away both Church and State, until primitive Christian simplicity became utterly ridiculous in a court so recklessly conformed to the world;” and Clement XII -(1730-1740) “was raised to the throne when old and blind'' (Hase, Church History).

The episcopal tendencies in the Catholic Church which had made such a gallant struggle against the absorption of the old rights of the episcopacy by papal absolutism at the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, and which even at Trent had been sufficiently powerful to thwart a part of the papal designs, made at the close of the 17th century a grand demonstration. An assembly of French bishops and barons, which was convoked by Louis XIV in 1682, defined the views of the Gallican Church in regard to the prerogatives of the papacy in the four following famous propositions: 1. That Peter and his successors have received power from God in spiritual, but not in secular affairs; 2, That this power is limited, not only by the decrees of the Council of Constance relating to the authority of general councils, but, 3, by the established prescriptions and usages of the Gallican Church; and, 4, That the decisions of the pope, when not sustained by the authority of the Church, are not infallible. This was one of the grandest and most important manifestoes on the part of the bishops of the Catholic world against the papal theories of Gregory VII and his successors. The bishops of France, with but few exceptions, concurred in these resolutions; and thus one of the largest and oldest Catholic countries bore a unanimous, and therefore so significant a testimony, that France and the popes were radically disagreed as to the powers which in the Catholic Church belong to the papacy. The pope, Innocent XI (16761682), parried the dangerous blow with courage and skill. He had the proposition of the Gallican Assembly publicly burned at Rome by the common hangman. and refused to sanction the consecration of any newly-appointed bishops until the revocation of the four propositions. The bishops in this conflict showed  themselves as cowardly as the pope was resolute, and the king likewise soon effected a reconciliation by complying with the pope's demand. The bishops of France for a long time remained divided into a Gallican and a papal or Ultramontane party, but the latter steadily gained ground.

A still greater triumph was gained by the papacy in the long doctrinal controversies caused by a posthumous work of bishop Jansenius of the Netherlands. The views on grace which were propounded in this work were accepted by many of the most eminent theologians of France and other countries, but the Jesuits caused five of its propositions to be condemned. The friends of Jansenius contended that the five propositions had been misunderstood at Rome, and had a sense different from the one in which they were condemned by the pope. It was the first time that the question came up whether the pope had not only the right to make decisions in doctrinal controversies, but could also demand that his interpretation of any theological work must be accepted as correct. Alexander VII (1655-1667) made this demand, and assured the world that the propositions of Jansenius were actually condemned in the sense intended by Jansenius. The Catholic world was for a long time agitated by this question; but as the French government was determined upon the extermination of the Jansenists even more than the pope, the novel demand of the papacy for an acknowledgment of its right to give an infallible interpretation of any theological work was tacitly acquiesced in. Only a small body in the Netherlands, the so-called Jansenists, persisted, under an archbishop of Utrecht and two bishops, in their resistance to this papal claim, maintaining to the present day, in spite of the oft-repeated papal anathemas, an independent ecclesiastical organization.

About the middle of the 18th century a violent tempest began to collect throughout Catholic Europe against the papacy. The educated classes of these countries were very largely pervaded by a disbelief in the entire doctrinal system of the Catholic Church and regarded the papacy as the chief obstacle-to. the progress of enlightenment and culture among the masses of the population. The Jesuits were viewed as the worst outgrowth of the papal system, and became as such the objects of intense hatred. In 1759 Pombal excluded them from Portugal and confiscated their property; and when the pope interceded for them all connection with Rome was broken off. The example of Portugal was followed by the Bourbon courts of France, Spain, Parma, and Naples, all of which expelled the Jesuits, and ridiculed the threats of excommunication with which the pope threatened  some of them. When the papal chair became vacant, in 1769, the combined influence of these courts secured the election of cardinal Ganganelli as pope Clement XIV (1769-1774), who, after some hesitation, yielded to their urgent demands for the abolition of the Jesuits, which he announced by the brief called Dominus ac Redemptor noster, on Aug. 16, 1773, and represented as a step, which was required by the peace of the Church. About the same time a German bishop, Nicholas of Hontheim, resumed the work of the Gallican Assembly of 1682. Under the name of Justinus Febronius he published a book (1763), in which the superiority of general councils over the popes, and the divine and independent rights of the bishops, were defended with great vigor and scholarship. The book created an immense sensation, but the author recanted on his death-bed (1778). Soon after (1786), the archbishops of Mayence, Tryves, Cologne, and Salzburg agreed at Ems upon the so-called Emser Punctation, which demanded the establishment of an independent national Church of Catholic Germany. But as the majority of the German bishops sided with the pope against the archbishops, this attempt likewise proved a complete failure. The same fate awaited the radical measures by which the emperor Joseph II of Austria endeavored to disconnect the Roman Catholic Church of his dominions from the pope, and to convert it into a strictly national agency for the education of the masses of the population. Although pope Pius VI (1774-1799), by a personal visit, in vain endeavored to make an impression upon the emperor, public opinion, as well as the bishops, opposed the efforts for reform, and the emperor lived long enough to see their failure.

The French Revolution of 1789 threatened the papacy with as great territorial losses as the Reformation of the 16th century. For a time France appeared to be lost to the papacy. Christianity itself was abolished by the National Convention, and though the Directory (17951799) again permitted the exercise of Christian worship, French armies proclaimed in Rome the Roman republic, and carried pope Pius VI as a prisoner to France, where he died. His successor, Pius VII (18001823), was the first pope for many centuries whose election did not take place in the city of Rome. A concordat concluded with Napoleon Bonaparte in 1801 restored to the pope his ecclesiastical and temporal power; but when he revived all the old hierarchical claims of the papacy, the emperor again (1808) occupied the papal territory, and revoked the donation of his predecessor Charlemagne (1809); and when he was excommunicated by the pope, he carried the latter as a prisoner to Fontainebleau. — The downfall of the  Napoleonic rule and the Congress of Vienna put an end to the endangered position of the papacy. The ruling monarchs of Europe, the emperors of Austria and Russia, and the king of Prussia, desired the cooperation of the papacy for the suppression of liberal ideas. Although the protest of the papal delegate, Consalvi, against the work of the Congress of Vienna was smiled at by the diplomatists, the governments of Europe generally, even those of the Protestant states, not only consented to the restoration of the temporal power of the popes, but regulated the affairs of the Catholic Church in the several states by means of Concordats (q.v.), which, though proceeding from the assumption that the secular governments were at least a coordinate, and not, as the mediaeval popes claimed, a subordinate power, conceded to the papacy a far-reaching influence, and even a vigorous support in ecclesiastical and educational matters. The concessions thus made were skillfully used by Pius. VII and his successors, Leo XII (1823-1829), Pius VIII (1829-1830), and Gregory XVI (1831-1846), to extend again the spiritual influence of the Church upon the Catholic population of Europe, and to recover part of the lost ground. Immediately after his return to Rome (1814) Pius VII restored the order of the Jesuits, who were once more, as in the days before their suppression, the boldest champions of all the claims of the papacy, especially in the Catholic countries, and the violent opposers of liberal institutions.

The most notable success which was won during the first half of the 19th century by the papacy was the great decline and almost complete extinction of the Gallican and Episcopalian tendencies among the bishops and clergy. Even governments which might have been expected to oppose with all their might the spread of ultra-papal tendencies, as the Orleans dynasty in France, and the Protestant governments of Germany, made little or no effort to prevent the elevation of the most zealous adherents of the papal theories to the episcopal sees, and the coercion of the lower priesthood to the same views. It soon became apparent that in the Catholic Church of the 19th century councils like those of Pisa, Constance, and Basle would be impossible, and the papacy, in its conflicts with the secular governments, the representative assemblies, and the liberal spirit of the age, could at least rely on an almost unanimous support of the episcopacy and the lower clergy. But the masses of the population in a number of Catholic countries, as was shown by elections and by revolutionary movements, preferred liberal institutions in spite of all declarations and even excommunications of the papacy. This was especially apparent in the states of the Church, where  only Austrian bayonets could prevent the people from overthrowing the temporal power of the popes. — The elevation of Pius IX to the papal chair (June 16, 1846) not only encouraged the hopes of those who believed that some concessions to the liberal tendencies of the political world would be compatible with the true interests of the papacy, but even called forth Utopian dreams of advanced liberals like the Italian priest and philosopher Gioberti, who enthusiaistically maintained that the papacy, at the head of a confederacy of liberal Italian states, might bring about a full reconciliation between political liberalism and the papal creed, and might place Italy in the front rank of Christian nations. These hopes were bitterly disappointed when the pope first hesitated, and finally refused, in 1848, to take part in the Italian uprising against Austrian rule, and the republican government was established in Rome which decreed the deposition of the pope. It needed an interference of the French army to restore him to his throne (1850); but in 1859 and 1860 the larger part of the states of the Church concluded by popular vote to join: the new kingdom of Italy, and the city of Rome itself was only prevented from following this example by French troops until 1870, when the withdrawal of the French garrison was at once followed by the declaration of the Romans in favor of annexation to Italy, and by the cessation of the temporal power of the pope,

IV. The Papacy since the Declaration of Infallibility. — Only one year before the downfall of the temporal power, the pope convoked a general council at Rome, which was to elevate the ultra-papal theory to its climax by proclaiming the papal infallibility as a dogma of the Catholic Church. For many centuries, even before the times of Gregory VII, the popes had actedas if they were infallible. They had not only demanded, but, as far as lay in their power, enforced submission to their doctrinal decisions. They had forbidden appeals from their tribunal to a general council, and even disallowed the plea of the Jansenists and other censured schools that the popes had erred in understanding the right sense of the censured books. The Church had practically submitted to these claims, but only from want of organized and efficient opposition, not from doctrinal concurrence, as the councils of the 15th century and the Gallican Assembly of the 17th irrefutably prove. SEE INFALLIBILITY.

The Jesuits, since the days of Bellarmine, have been foremost in discussing and defending the infallibility theory, but no pope until Pius IX had dared to solemnly declare it as a doctrine of the Church. Pius IX had given some indication of what might be expected from him by proclaiming, in 1854, the opinion held by many  Catholic theologians of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary as a doctrine of the Church, and by the syllabus of 1864 — the most sweeping condemnation of the principles of modern civilization and progress that has emanated from any pope. Nevertheless, when the, design of the pope to proclaim papal infallibility as a Church doctrine became known, many bishops, especially in the Teutonic countries; earnestly declared against the intended measure, not so much because. they professed a personal disbelief in the doctrine, but because they regarded its promulgation: as extremely inopportune, and fraught with dangers to the best interests of the Church. The Vatican Council acceded, however, on July 18, 1870, to the wishes of the pope, 536 members of the council voting for, 2 against the proposition, and 106 being absent, most of whom were unwilling to vote-favorably. SEE VATICAN COUNCIL.

All the bishops of the opposition gradually submitted to the promulgated doctrine, except a few of the United Eastern churches. In Germany and Switzerland, however, a number of distinguished theologians persisted in their opposition, and originated the Old Catholic movement. SEE OLD CATHOLICS.

The membership of the Old Catholic Church amounted at the close of 1876 to .only about 200,000, a small number in proportion to the 200,000,000 at which the nominally Catholic population of the globe is estimated. But the papacy, with its new claims no less than with its old, lacks the recognition of the largely Catholic countries, as has been abundantly proved by the history of the years since the Vatican Council. Only a few months after the proclamation of the new doctrine, the city of Rome defied the papal excommunication by voting for the abolition of the temporal power and annexation to the kingdom of Italy. The Italian government an Parliament have established their seat in the former capital of the Romish Church, and, notwithstanding all the censures of the Church, the Italian people, in October, 1876, once more elected a Parliament pledged to defend the national unity against the pretensions of the papacy. In France, where the Ultramontane party- has undoubtedly made great progress:even among the laity, the elections to the General Assembly held in 1875 gave a majority which is openly unfavorable to the temporal power and other papal claims. In Austria, next to France the largest among the Catholic countries, the lower house of the Vienna Parliament has declared its sympathy with the principle of religious liberty, and even with the Old Catholics. In all the other Catholic countries of Europe and America the papacy has but an uncertain hold of governments and parliaments. It has had, since 1870, more or less serious conflicts with Spain, Mexico, Brazil, Venezuela, and  the United States of Colombia, and, except in the little kingdom of Belgium, where the Parliament is under the complete control of the Ultramontane party, it cannot rely on the subserviency of a single secular government. And even Ultramontane Belgium finds it necessary to accredit an ambassador at the court of the Italian king, though he is under papal excommunication for having overthrown the temporal power of the papacy. — The relations of the papacy to non-Catholic governments have been seriously affected by the Vatican Council. In view of the past history of the papacy, the governments. of Germany and Switzerland have deemed it necessary to introduce new laws on the administration of the property of the Church and on public education, which have kindled new and bitter conflicts with the papacy. Russia remains in the attitude of open hostility to the papacy in which it had been for a considerable time previous to the Vatican Council. SEE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Although stripped of his secular power, the pope, in 1876, was still treated by most of the Catholic and some non-Catholic governments as a sovereign, the following states having diplomatic agents accredited near the papal chair: Bavaria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, the German Empire, Ecuador, France, Guatemala, Monaco, the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, Peru, Portugal, San Salvador, and Spain.

Literature. — The chief sources for the history of the Roman bishops until the 6th century are the papal catalogues. They are divided into two. classes, the Greek and the Latin. Of the former, only those found in Irenaeus (Adv. Haereses, 3:3,3) and in Eusebius are of importance. Of the latter writer we have a double list, one in the Chronicles (only in the Armenian translation, not in the Latin translation by Jerome), from Peter to Gains (died 296); the other in his Church History, from Peter to Urbanus (230). Jerome, who, in his free translation of the Chronicles of Eusebius, continues the list of Roman bishops down to his contemporary and patron Damasus, leans, on the whole, more on the statements of the Eccles. History of Eusebius, but has also availed himself of another Roman catalogue, which is closely related to the so-called Liberian Catalogue. The most important among the Latin catalogues for the history of the first three centuries is the so-called Catellogus Liberianus, which is found in the collective work of the chronographist of 354, and extends to Liberius. Upon it the so-called Felician Catalogue, as far as Felix IV (died 530), is based, which, in turn, may be regarded as the first edition of the Liber Pontificalis (q.v.). For the bishops from Peter to Pontianus the Catalogus  Liberianus substantially followed the chronicles of Hippolytus (beginning of the third century). The Catalogus Liberianus was followed by the Catalogus Leoninus, compiled under Leo the Great (440-461), and other continuations. A thorough and exhaustive work on all papal catalogues is Lipsius's Chronologie der romischen Bischofe (Kiel, 1869). — The earliest history of the popes is the Liber Pontificalis, which was long ascribed to Anastasius, abbot and librarian at Rome (died about 886), who, however, is the author of the last biographies of the work only. It was edited by Busaeus (Mentz, 1602); Fabrotti (Paris, 1649); Bianchini (Rome, 1718 sq., 4 vols.); Muratori (in the three volumes of the Script. Rer. Ital.); Vignoli (Rome, 1724 sq., 3 vols.). — Among the very numerous histories of the popes we quote the following: F. Petrarca, Fite dei Pontifici et Imperatori Romani (Florence, 1478); Panvini, De Vitis Romans Pontificum (ibid. 1626); Sacchi di Palatina, Hist. de Vitis Pontificum Romans (ibid. 1626); Tempesta, Vite Sumum. Pontificum (Rome, 1596); Ciacconi, Vitoe et gesta Romans Poantij: et Cardin. (ibid. 1677, 4 vols.; continued by Pide Cinque and Fabrino, 1787); Palazzi, Gesta Pontif. Romana (Ven. 1687 sq., 5 vols.); Pagi, Breviarium gest. Pont. Romans (6 vols.); Bower, The Lives of the Popes (Lond. 1730, 7 vols.); Bruys, Hist. des Papes (Hague, 1732 sq., 5 vols.); Walch. Gesch. der romischen Papste (Gottingen, 1758); Spittler, Vorlesungen-uber die Geschichte des Papstthums (Hamb. 1828); Smets, Geschichte der Papste (Cologne, 1829,4 vols.); P. Muller, Die romischen Papste (Vienna, 1847-1857, 17 vols.); Artaud de Montor, Hist. des sotuv. Pontifes Romans (Paris, 1848 sq., 8 vols.); Haas, Geschichte der Papste (Tubing. 1859 sq.); Grone, Papst-Gesch. (Ratisbon, 1864). — Among the best works treating only of a part of the history of the papacy are Ranke, Die romischen Papste. ihre Kirche und ihr Staat im 16th u. 17th Jahrhundert (Berlin, 1834 sq., 3, vols.; 6th edit. 1874,4 vols.; translated into English and other languages, and generally regarded as the best among all works on the papacy); Baluze, Vitae Paparum Avinionensiumn (Paris, 1693, 2 vols.); Hofler, Die deutschen Papste (Ratisbon, 1839); Christophe, Histoire de la Papaute pendant le xiv siecle (Par. 1852); Jaffa, Regesta Pontif. Romans (Berlin, 1851; as far as 1198). Special works on the ecclesiastical supremacy claimed by the popes are: Duval, De suprema Rom. Pontif. in Ecclesia potestate; Bellarmine, Depotestate Romans Pontif. (Rome, 1610); Leitam, Impenetrabilis pontificiae dignitatis clypeus; L. Veith, De primatu et infallibilitate Rom, Pontif.; J. a Bennettis, Privilegiorum S. Petri vindicci (Rome, 1756, 6 vols.); Orsi, De irreformabili Romans Ponif. judicio; Scardi, De Supsrena  Romans Pontif. auctoritate; Chalco, De Rom. Pontif. (ibid. 1837); Kempeners, De Romans Pontif. prim. (ibid. 1839); Kenrick, The Primacy of the Apostolic See Vindicated (Phila. 1845); Ballerini, De vi ac ratione primatus (Augsb. 1770, 2 vols.); Barruel, Du Pape et ses droits (Par. 1803); Roscovany, De primatu Romans Pont. ejusque juribus (Augsb. 1834); Le Maistre, Du Pape (Par. 1820; one of the principal works from an Ultramontane point of view); Rothensee, Der Primat des Papstes (Mentz, 18301834, 4 vols.); Ellendorf, Der Primat der rom. Papste (Darmstadt, 1841 sq., 2 vols.); Gosselin, Pouvoir du Pope au Moyen Age (Louvain, 1845, 2 vols.; also transl. into German and English); Schulte, Die Stellungder Concilien, Papste und Bischofe vonm historischen und canonistischen Standpuncte (Prague, 1871); Baxmann, Gesch. der. Politik der Papste (Leips. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Lanfrey, Hist. Politiqe des Papes (Paris, 1873, new ed.); Wattenbach, Gesch. des romischen Papstthums (Berlin, 1876). See also English Rev. 6:188 sq.; Blackwood's Mag. March, 1868, p. 289 sq.; Amer. Presb. Rev. Jan. 1864, art. i; Kitto, Journ. of Sac. Lit. Jan. 1855; Edinb. Rev. July, 1858, art. i; New-Englander, July. 1869, p. 552; Lond. Qu. Rev. Jan. 1875, art. viii; Brit. Qu. Rev. Jan. 1875, art. i; April, 1875, art. 6 For the infallibility of the pope, SEE INFALLIBILITY. (A. J. S.)

## Papadopoli, Niceola Commenus[[@Headword:Papadopoli, Niceola Commenus]]

             a noted Italian theologian, was born Jan. 6, 1655, in the isle of Candia. When eleven years old he came to Rome, where he was educated in the college of St. Athanasius. In 1672 he joined the Order of the Jesuits, whom he afterwards left. In 1688 he was appointed professor of canon law in the University of Padua, and died in 1740 (Jan. 20). Besides a number of dissertations on ecclesiastical law, he wrote, De diferentia Graecorum et Latinorum episcoporum: — Proenotationes mystagogicao exjure canonico (Venice. 1697), in which two works he endeavors to show that the difference between the Latin and Greek churches is only a very small matter. He also left in MS. Instituta Graeco-Latina divisa in iv libros; and a voluminous work of thirteen volumes entitled Opus armorum, in which he treats of the saints in the Greek Church. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. (ed. Harles), vol. xi;. Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, 3:1232; continued by Rottermund, v. 1519; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.

## Papaeus[[@Headword:Papaeus]]

             a Scythian name of Zeus (Jupiter).

## Papal Catalogues[[@Headword:Papal Catalogues]]

             are the principal source for the history of the Roman bishops down to the 6th century. These catalogues are divided into two classes, the Greek and the Latin. Of the earliest Greek are the lists given by Irenaeus (Adv. Hoeres. 3:3, 3) and by Eusebius (Chronica and Hist. Eccles.). Jerome has depended altogether on Eusebius, and is therefore of importance only in so far as he supplements or corrects Eusebius. Of the later Greek chronicles are to be regarded the Χρουγαφειου συτομον of the year 853; George Syncellus, and his continuator Theophanes, the chronography of patriarch Nicephorus; all based for the first three centuries on Eusebius. Of the Latin, and the most important for the first three centuries, is the so-called Catalogus Liberianus, which is found in the collection by the chronograph of the year 354, and goes down to the time of Liberius (352-356). On it is based the so-called Felician catalogue (till Felix IV, † 530), also the Liber Pontificalis. The Catalogus Liberianus was followed by the Catalogus Leoninus (composed under Leo the Great), which comes down to Sixtus III. Further cataloguing progressed down to the popes of the 6th century (among them one in several handwritings comes to Hormisdas, † 523). These are followed by the Catalogus Felicianus, of which the Vitae Paparum, together with a Codex Canonum, coming down to Felix IV, are the first four of the Liber Pontificalis (q.v.). See Lipsius, Chronologie der romischen Bischofe (Kiel, 1869).

## Pape, Gabriel[[@Headword:Pape, Gabriel]]

             an American rabbi, was born in Germany about 1813. He came to this country about 1843, and, though then a young man, found favor at Philadelphia, and was at once made rabbi of the congregation Beth Israel. Arriving in Philadelphia when the Jews were few in number, he was enabled to continue his ministrations to a time when the local Jewish population was extensive and influential, possessing a half-dozen spacious synagogues, many charitable institutions, and a name for probity and intelligence unexcelled by any in the land. He died in 1872. In his last years of the ministry Mr. Pape did not appear much in public, limiting his efforts to mere congregational work; but he was always one of the most energetic and useful of the Jewish citizens of Philadelphia. He figured prominently in  the Board of Jewish Ministers, and, was beloved by his flock and esteemed by the entire community. He was a mild, estimable, and pious gentleman, of deep erudition, unaffected worth, and unobtrusive ways. See Jewish Messenger, N. Y., Jan. 8,1872. (J. H. W.)

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

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Bremen in 1745. He studied at Gottingen, was preacher at different places in the duchy of Bremen, and died April 17,1805. He is the author of, Das 53. Capitel Iesaid uber-setz und erklart (Bremen, 1777): — Das Evangeliun Luca umschrieben und eralutert (1777-81, 2 volumes); besides, he wrote some ascetical works, for which see Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Papebroch, Daniel[[@Headword:Papebroch, Daniel]]

             (more correctly Papebroek), DANIEL, a learned Belgian Jesuit, was born at Antwerp March 17, 1628, entered the Society of Jesus in 1645, and was by that body educated. He then became a teacher for a while, but finally decided to study theology, and went to Louvain. In 1658 he was ordained priest, but instead of taking a pastorate he taught philosophy in his native place, until Bolland employed him as assistant in the Acta Sanctorum. In 1660 the learned editor of the Acta sent Papebroch to Italy to search the archives, and there he was engaged until 1662. After his return home Papebroch wrote the biography of St. Patricius, and later, with Henschen, composed the Acta of the month of March, then April all alone; and the first three volumes, and finally four volumes with Baert and Jenning, writing May and part of June. As Papebroch denied the pretended origin of the Carmelite Order from the prophet Elias, he was severely attacked by that order. He was also subjected to trial by the Inquisition, and its tribunal at Toledo condemned, in 1695 and 1697, the fourteen volumes of the Acta SS. as heretical. At Rome, however, only the chronology of the popes in the Propylum ad SS., month of May, eighth volume, was condemned. A controversy resulted, and continued until 1698, when the Congregatio Indicis commanded both parties to be silent, and threatened with excommunication the disobedient. This ended the strife. Papebroch died June 28, 1714. His biography is in Acta SS., month of June, vol. 6:(J. H. W.)

## Papellards[[@Headword:Papellards]]

             a term used in the 13th century to designate the party which uncompromisingly supported the papacy. It was applied chiefly to the mendicant friars and their adherents, and with special reference to their pietistic affectation of poverty and their arrogant pretense of humility. William of St. Armour (A.D. 1255) uses it not only in reference to the mendicant friars, but applies it also to “those young men and maidens. itinerating about in France, who under pretense of living only for prayer, had really no other object in view than to get rid of work and live on the  alms of the pious.” When Louis IX was almost persuaded: by the Dominicans to enter their order, he was nicknamed Rex Papellardus (comp. William of St. Amour, De periculis novissimorum temp., quoted in Neander's Ch. Hist. 7:396, Bohn's ed.). It was also a name given to the Beguins. See Robert de Sorbonne in Biblioth. Max. Lugd. 25:350.

## Papendrecht, Cornelius P. Von[[@Headword:Papendrecht, Cornelius P. Von]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Dort in the year 1686, and died in 1753, as canon of Mechlin, after having occupied for twenty-four years the office of secretary to the cardinal d'Alsace, archbishop of Mechlin. Papendrecht wrote a History of the Church of Utrecht since the Change of Religion (Mechlin, 1725), and Analecta Belgica (Hague, 1743, 6 vols.), a collection of records bearing upon the history of Belgium, enriched by his comments.

## Paper[[@Headword:Paper]]

             SEE WRITING.

## Paper-reed[[@Headword:Paper-reed]]

             is the false translation in the A.V. of the Heb. עָרָה, ‘arah, a naked place, referring to the meadows on the banks of the Nile, which were for the most part destitute of trees. SEE NILE.

By the “paper-reed” the translators of the A.V. doubtless intended: to designate the famous Egyptian papyrus, of which we borrow the following account chiefly from Chambers's Cyclop. s.v. The papyrus is a genus of plants of the natural order Cyperacis, of which there are several species, the most important being the Egyptian papyrus, or “papyrus of the ancients” (Papyrus antiquorum, the Cyperus papyrus of Linnaeus), a kind of sedge, from eight to ten feet high, with a very strong woodvy aromatic, creeping root; long, sharp-keeled leaves; and naked, leafless, triangular, soft, and cellular stems, as thick as a man's arm at the lower part, and at their upper extremity bearing a compound umbel of extremely numerous drooping spikelets, with a general involucre of eight long filiform leaves, each spikelet containing from six to thirteen florets, By the ancient Egyptians it was called papu, from which the Greek papyrus is derived, although it was also called by them byblos or deltos.

The Hebrews called it gome, a word resembling the Coptic gom, or “volume;” its modern Arabic  name is berdi. So rare is the plant at the present day in Egypt, that it is supposed to have been introduced either from Syria or Abyssinia; but it has been seen till lately in the vicinity of the lake Menzaleb, and specimens have been sent to England; and as it formerly was considered the emblem of Northern Egypt or the Delta, and only grown there, if introduced it must have come from some country lying to the north of Egypt. It has been found in modern times in the neighborhood of Jaffa, on the banks of the Anapus, in the pools of the Liane, near Syracuse, and in the vicinity of the lake Thrasymenus. It is represented on the oldest Egyptian monuments, and as reaching the height of about ten feet. It was grown in pools of still water, growing ten feet above the water and two beneath it, and restricted to the districts of Sais and Sebennytus. The papyrus was used for many purposes both ornamental and useful, such as crowns for the head, sandals, boxes, boats, and cordage, but principally for a kind of paper called by its name. Its pith was boiled and eaten, and its root dried for fuel. The papyrus, or paper of the Egyptians, was of the greatest reputation in antiquity, and it appears on the earliest monuments in the shape of long rectangular sheets, which were rolled up at one end, and on which the scribe wrote with a reed called kash, with red or black ink made of an animal carbon. When newly prepared, it was white or brownish-white and lissom; but in the process of time those papyri which have reached the present day have become of a light or dark brown color, and exceedingly brittle, breaking to the touch.

While papyrus was commonly used in Egypt for the purposes of writing, and was, in fact, the paper of the period, although mentioned by early Greek authors, it does not appear to have come into general use among the Greeks till after the time of Alexander the Great, when it was extensively exported from the Egyptian ports under the Ptolemies. Fragments, indeed, have been found to have been used by the Greeks centuries before. It was, however, always an expensive article among the Greeks, and a sheet cost more than the value of a dollar. Among the Romans it does not appear to have been in use at an early period, although the Sibylline books are said to have been written on it, and it was cultivated in Calabria, Apulia, and the marshes of the Tiber. But the staple was no doubt imported from Alexandria, and improved or adapted by the Roman manufacturers. So extensive was the Alexandrian manufactory that Hadrian, in his visit to that city, was struck by its extent; and later in the empire an Egyptian usurper (Firmus, A.D. 272) is said to have boasted that he could support an army off his materials. It continued to be employed in the Eastern and Western Empire till the 12th century,  and was used among the Arabs in the 8th, but after that period it was quite superseded by parchment. At the. later periods it was no longer employed in the shape of rolls, but cut up into square pages and bound like modern books. See Wilkinson. Anc. Egypt. 2:95, 96. SEE REED; SEE RUSH.

## Paphia[[@Headword:Paphia]]

             a surname of Aphrodite (Venus), derived from a temple in honor of this goddess at Paphos, in Cyprus.

## Paphnutius Of Thebais[[@Headword:Paphnutius Of Thebais]]

             a noted martyr of the early Church, flourished near the opening of the 4th century as bishop of a city in the Upper Thebais. During the Maximian persecutions he lost an eye, and was sent into the mountains. Paphnutius's ascetical life and martyrdom made him notorious, and he was brought to the attention of the emperor Constantine, who learned to highly esteem him. When quite aged he attended as delegate the Nicaean Council (A.D. 325), and there opposed the proposition for the celibate life of the clergy. The doubts as to the authenticity of Paphnutius's opposition are dispelled by Lea in his Hist. of Sacerdotcl Celibacy (p. 54). See also Neale; Hist. of the Eastern Church (patriarchate of Alexandria), 1:147 sq.; Socrates, Hist. Eccles. I, 11. Paphnutius probably attended also the synod at Sardica in A.D. 343. He died after that event. Another Paphnutius was a follower of Theophilus, and an opponent of the extravagant anthropomorphism. He flourished about the close of the 4th century.

## Paphos[[@Headword:Paphos]]

             (Πάφος, of unknown etymology), a city of Cyprus, at the western extremity of the island, of which it was the chief city during the time of the Roman dominion, and there the governor resided. This functionary is called in the Acts of the Apostles (Act 13:7) “deputy,” and his name is said to have been Sergius Paulus. The word deputy signifies proconsul, and implies that the province administered by such an officer was under the especial rule of the senate. SEE DEPUTY.

Cyprus had originally been reserved by the emperor to himself, and governed accordingly by a propragator; but finding the island peaceful; and troops wanted in other parts of the empire, Augustus exchanged it with the senate for a more distant and troubled province, and the governor is therefore correctly styled in the Acts deputy or proconsul. At this time Cyprus was in a state  of considerable prosperity; it possessed good roads, especially one running from east to west through the whole length of the island, from Salamis to Paphos, along which Paul and Barnabas traveled; an extensive commerce, and it was the resort of pilgrims to the Paphian shrine from all parts of the world (Fairbairn). The two missionaries found Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of the island, residing here, and were enabled to produce a considerable effect on his intelligent and candid mind. This influence was resisted by Elymas (or Bar-Jesus), one of those Oriental “sorcerers” whose mischievous power was so great at this period, even among the educated classes. Miraculous sanction was given to the apostles, and Elymas was struck with blindness. The proconsul's faith having been thus confirmed, and doubtless a Christian Church having been founded in Paphos, Barnabas and Saul crossed over to the continent and landed in Pamphylia (Act 13:13). It is observable that it is at this point that the latter becomes the more prominent of the two, and that his name henceforward is Paul, and not Saul (Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος, Act 13:9) (Smith). SEE PAUL.

The name of Paphos, without any adjunct, is used by poets and by writers of prose to denote both Old and New Paphos, but with this distinction, that in prose writers. it commonly means New Paphos, while in the poets, on the contrary — for whom the name Palae-Paphos would have been unwieldy — it generally signifies Old Paphos, the more peculiar seat of the worship of Aphrodite. In inscriptions also both towns are called “Paphos.” This indiscriminate use is sometimes productive of ambiguity, especially in the Latin prose authors.

1. Old Paphos (Παλαίπαφος), now Kuk'a or Konuklia (Engel, Kypros, 1:125), was said to have been founded by Cinyras, the father of Adonis (Apollod. iii 14); though, according to another legend preserved by Strabo (11:505) — whose text, however, varies — it was founded by the Amazons. It was seated on an eminence (‘celsa Paphos,” Virgil, AEn. 10:51), at the distance of about ten stadia, or 11 miles, from the sea, on which, however, it had a roadstead. It was not far distant from the promontory of Lephyrium (Strabo, 14:683) and the mouth of the little river Bocarus (Hesych. s.v. Βώκαρος). — The fable ran that Venus had landed there when she rose from out thesea (Tacit. Hist. 2:3; Mela, 2:7; Lucan, 8:456). According to Pausanias (i 14), her worship was introduced at Paphos from Assyria; but it is much more probable that it was of  Phoenician origin. SEE PHOENICIA. It had been very anciently established, and before the time of Homer, as the grove and altar of Aphrodite at Paphos are mentioned in the Odyssey (8:362). Here the worship of the goddess centred, not for Cyprus alone, but for the whole earth. The Cinyradae, or descendants of Cinyras — Greek by name, but of Phoenician origin — were the chief priests. Their power and authority were very great; but it may be inferred from certain inscriptions that they were controlled by a senate and an assembly of the people. There was also an oracle here (Engel, I, 483). Few cities have ever been so much sung and glorified by the poets (comp. AEschylus, Suppl. 525; Virgil, AEn. 1:415; Horace, Od. 1:19, 30; 3:26; Stat: Silv. 1:2, 101; Aristoph. Lysis. 833, etc.). The remains of the vast temple of Aphrodite are still discernible, its circumference being marked by huge foundation-walls. After its overthrow by an earthquake, it was rebuilt by Vespasian, on whose coins it is represented, as well as on early and later ones, and especially in the most perfect style on those of Septimius Severus (Engel, 1:130). From these representations, and from the existing remains, Hetsch, an architect of Copenhagen, has attempted to restore the building (Miiller's Archaol. § 239, p. 261; Eckhel, 3:86). SEE VENUS.

2. New Paphos

(Πάφος Νέα), now Baffa, was seated on the sea, near the western extremity of the island, and possessed a good harbor. It lay about sixty stadia, or between seven and eight miles, northwest of the ancient city (Strabo, 14:683). It was said to have been founded by Agapenor, chief of the Arcadians at the siege of Troy (Homer, II. 2:609), who, after the capture of that town, was driven by the storm which separated the Grecian fleet on the coast of Cyprus (Pausan. viii, , § 3). We find Agapenor mentioned as king of the Paphians in a Greek distich preserved in the Analecta: (I, 181, Brunk); and Herodotus (vii- 90) alludes to an Arcadian colony in Cyprus. Like its ancient namesake, Nea Paphos was also distinguished for the worship of Venus, and contained several magnificent temples dedicated to that goddess. Yet in this respect the old city seems to have always retained the pre-eminence; and Strabo tells us, in the passage before cited, that the road leading to it from Nea Paphos was annually  crowded with male and female votaries resorting to the more ancient shrine, and coming not only from the latter place itself, but also from the other towns of Cyprus. When Seneca says (Nat. Quest. 6:26, ep. 91) that Paphos was nearly destroyed by an earthquake, it is difficult to say to which of the towns he refers. Dion Cassius (54:23) relates that it was restored by Augustus, and called Augusta in his honor; but though this name has been preserved in inscriptions, it never supplanted the ancient one in popular use. Tacitus (Hist. 2:2,3) records a visit of the youthful Titus to Paphos before he acceded to the empire, who inquired with much curiosity into its history and antiquities (comp. Suetonius, Titus c. 5). Under this name the historian doubtless included the ancient as well as the more modern city; and among other traits of the worship of the temple, he records with something like surprise that the only image of the goddess was a pyramidal stone a relic, doubtless, of Phoenician origin. There are still considerable ruins of New Paphos a mile or two from the sea, among which are particularly remarkable the remains of three temples which had been erected on artificial eminences (Engel, Kypros, Berlin, 1841, 2 vols.). See Pococke, Disc. of the East, 2:325-328; Ross, Reise nach Kos, lalikarnasssos, Rhodos, u. Cyprus, p. 180192; Conybare and Howson, Life and Epistles of St. Paul (2d ed.), 1:190, 191; Lewin, St. Paul, 1:130 sq.; and the works cited above. SEE CYPRUS.

## Papias Of Hierapolis[[@Headword:Papias Of Hierapolis]]

             in Phrygia, a noted Christian writer and prelate of the patristic period, is one of the most important witnesses to the authenticity of John's Gospel. Papias flourished in the 2d century, and finally suffered martyrdom. According to Irenaeus he was a disciple of the apostle John; but Eusebius, who quotes (Hist. Eccles. ch. 39) the words of Irenaeus, immediately subjoins a passage from Papias himself, in which the latter distinctly states that he did not receive his doctrines from any of the apostles, but from the “living voice” of such followers of theirs as “are still surviving.” He was an intimate associate of Polycarp, a bishop in the same province of proconsular Asia; and as the latter was a disciple of the apostle John, it is probable that Irenaeus — a somewhat hasty writer — inferred that his companion must have been the same. The Paschal or Alexandrian Chronicle states that Papias suffered martyrdom at Pergamus, A.D. 161; others put the date 165. Eusebius describes him as “well skilled in all manner of learning, and well acquainted with the Scriptures;” but a little farther on he speaks of him as a man “of limited understanding,” and a very  credulous chronicier of “unwritten tradition,” who had collected “certain strange parables of our Lord and of his doctrine, and some other matters rather too fabulous” The work in which these were contained was entitled Αογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις (Five Books of Commentaries on the Sayings of our Lord). It is now lost, but fragments of it have been preserved by Ireneus, Eusebius, Anastasius Sinaita, Andreas of Caesarea, Maximus Confessor, and Ecumenius. These fragments are extremely interesting, because of the light which they throw on the origin of the New- Testament Scriptures, and their importance may be estimated from the fact that they contain the earliest information which we possess on the subject. Papias is our authority for the statement that the evangelist Matthew drew up a collection of Christ's sayings and doings in the Hebrew (probably Syro-Chaldaic) dialect, and that every one translated it as he was able. There can be no doubt that this is a perplexing statement, suggesting as it does the delicate question: “If Papias is correct, who wrote our present Matthew, which is in Greek, and not in Hebrew?” SEE MATTHEW, GOSPEL OF.

Papias also tells us, either on the authority of John the Presbyter, or more probably on that of one of his followers, that the evangelist Mark was the interpreter (ἑομηνευτής) of Peter, and wrote “whatsoever he [Peter] recorded, with great accuracy.” The passage, however, is far from implying that Mark was a mere amanuensis of Peter, as some have asserted, but only, as Valesius has shown, that Mark listened attentively to Peter's preaching, culled from it such things as most strictly concerned Christ, and so drew up his Gospel. According to Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 3:39), Papias was an extreme Millenarian. — S. Cave, Hist. Litterae. Papias; Herzog, Petrologie, § 17; Neander, Hist. of Dogmas; Holtzmann, Die synoptischen Evangel. (Leips. 1863), p. 248-251; Limbach, Das Papias Fragment (1875). See also Studien u. Kritiken, 1870; 1875; Meth. Qu. Rev. 1853, p. 487; 1866, p. 605; Theological Eccles. Rev. 3:241; Christ. Remembrancer, July, 1853, p. 218.

## Papillon du Rivet, Nicolas-Gabriel[[@Headword:Papillon du Rivet, Nicolas-Gabriel]]

             a French Jesuit, was born in Paris January 19, 1717. He early entered the Society of Jesus, and gained a reputation by his eloquence in most of the pulpits of the capital. He retired to Tournay after the suppression of his order, and died there in 1782. The Latin poems of which he is the author are Templum assentationis (1742, 12mo) and Mundus physicus, effiges mundi moralis (1742, 12mo), in which he pretends to find in morals the image of Descartes's vortices. Among his French poems, we select the  Epitaph de. Voltaire and the Epitre au Comte de Falkenstein. His sermons, of a correct and pure style, have, been printed in Tournay (1770, 4 vols. l2mo), and a selection from his ouvres was given in vol. 59 of the Orateurs sacres by the abbe Migne. (1856). Papillon had entrusted to father Veron two MS. volumes containing some fugitive pieces, which are entirely lost. One peculiarity worthy of remark in the life of Papillon is, that his constitution was so delicate that for thirty years he lived only upon a little milk and white bread. See Feller, Dict. Hist. s.v.; Querard, La France Litter. s.v.

## Papin, Isaac[[@Headword:Papin, Isaac]]

             a noted divine who flourished first in the Protestant, but later in the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Blois, France, March 24, 1657. He was a student for a while at. Geneva, and slater at Saumur. At the former school the professors were then divided into two parties upon the subject of grace, called “Particularists'“ and “Universalists” of which the former were the most numerous, and the most powerful. The Universalists tried simply toleration; and M. Claude wrote a letter to M. Turretin, the chief of the predominant party, exhorting him earnestly to grant that favor. But Turretin gave little heed to it, and M. de Maratiz, professor at Groningep, who had disputed the point warmly against M. Daill, opposed it zealously; and supported his opinion by the authority of those synods who had determined for intolerancy. There was also a dispute upon the same subject at Shumur, where M. Pajon, who was Papin's uncle, and was then one of the professors of theology, admitted the doctrine of efficacious grace, but explained it in a different manner from the Reformed in general, and Jurieu in particular; and though the synod of Anjou, in 1667, after many long debates upon the matter, had dismissed Pajon, with leave to continue his lectures, yet his interest there was none of the strongest; so that his nephew, who was a student in that university in 1683, was pressed to condemn the doctrine, — which was branded with the appellation of Pajonism (q.v.).

Papin declared that his conscience would not allow him to subscribe to the condemnation of either party; whereupon the university refused to give him the usual testimonial. All these disagreeable incidents estranged him not only from the author of them, but also from his. Church, and brought him to take a favorable view of the Roman Catholic religion. In this disposition he wrote a treatise, entitled The Faith reduced to its just Bounds; wherein he maintained that, as the Papists professed that they embraced the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, they ought to be tolerated by  the most zealous Protestants. He also wrote several letters to the Reformed of Bordeaux, to persuade them that they might be saved in the Romish Church, to which they were reconciled. This work, as might be expected, drew upon him the intense displeasure of the Protestants, and in 1686 he crossed the water to England, where James II was then endeavoring to reestablish popery. Papin was granted deacon's and priest's orders from the hands of Turner, bishop of Ely. In 1687 Papin published a book against Jurieu. This exasperated that minister so much that, when knew Papin was attempting to obtain some employment as a professor in Germany, he dispatched letters everywhere in order to defeat Papin's applications; and. though the latter procured a preacher's place at Hamburg, Jurieu found means to get him dismissed in a few months.

About this time his Faith reduced to its just Bounds coming into the hands of Bayle, that writer added some pages to it, and printed it: but the piece was ascribed by Jurieu to Papin, who did not disavow the principal maxims laid down in it, which were condemned in a synod. Meanwhile, an offer being made him of a professor's chair in the church of the French refugees at Dantzic, he accepted it: but after some time, it being proposed to him to conform to the synodical decrees of the Walloon churches in the United Provinces, and to subscribe them, he refused to comply; because there were some opinions asserted in those decrees which he could not assent to, particularly that doctrine which maintained that Christ died only for the elect. Those who had invited him to Dantzic were highly offended at his refusal; and he was ordered to depart as soon as he had completed the half year of his preaching which had been contracted for. This occurred in 1689. Not long after he embraced the Roman Catholic religion, putting his abjuration into the hands of Bossuet, bishop of Meaux, Nov. 15, 1690. Upon this change Jurieu wrote a pastoral letter to those of the Reformed religion at Paris, Orleans, and Blois, in which he asserts that Papin had always looked indifferently upon all religions, and in that spirit had returned to the Roman Church. In answer to this letter, Papin drew up a treatise, Of the Toleration of the Protestants, and Of the Authority of the Church (printed in 1692). He afterwards changed its title, which was a little equivocal, and made some additions to it; but while he was employed in making collections to complete it farther, and finish other books upon the same subject, he died at Paris, June 19, 1709. His widow, who also embraced the Roman Catholic religion, communicated these papers, which were made use of in a new edition printed at large in 1719 (12mo). M. Pajon, of the Oratory, his relative, published all his Theological works (1713, in 3 vols.  l2mo). They contain, besides his biography, Essais ‘de theologie sur la providence et sur la grace; Lafoi reduitee a ses veritibles principes et renformee dans sesjustes bornes; La tolerance des Protestans, afterwards under the title of Les deux voyes oppssees enz matiere de religion. They are all very solidly written. Among other things Papin declares that, if the authority of a synod, as that of Dort (q.v.), has to be acknowledged, the same authority must be accorded to that of Trent (q.v.) also. See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. (Index in vol. ii); id. Kirchengesch. vol. v.

## Papist[[@Headword:Papist]]

             (Lat. papista, i.e. an adherent of the pope) is generally applied with some admixture of contempt to Roman Catholics. Of itself, the name Papist implies nothing more than that he is an adherent of the pope; but in its popular use it includes all the distinctive doctrines of the Roman Catholics, and especially those which are supposed to be peculiarly cherished by the supporters of the papal authority. It is therefore, in many cases, held to be synonymous with the profession of the most extreme opinions permitted in the Church of Rome, and even those which are popularly regarded as superstitious. Understood literally, no consistent Roman Catholic would disclaim it; but in the imputed signification explained above it is held to be offensive.

## Pappati[[@Headword:Pappati]]

             a name for the New-Year's-day festival among the Parsees, which is celebrated in honor of Yezdegird, the last king of the Sassanide dynasty of Persian monarchs, who was dethroned by caliph Omar about A.D. 640. The ancient Persians reckoned a new aera from the accession of each successor, and as Yezdegird had no successor, the date of his accession to the throne has been brought down to the present time, making the current year (1876) the year 1236 of the Parsee chronology. On the Pappati, the Parsees rise early, and either say their prayers at home or repair to their fire temples, where a large congregation is assembled. After prayers they visit their relations and friends, when the Hamma-i-jour, or joining of hands, is performed. The rest of the day is spent in feasting and rejoicing, till a late hour at night. It is customary on this day to give alms to the poor and new suits of clothes to the servants.

## Pappelbaum, Georg Gottlieb[[@Headword:Pappelbaum, Georg Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Stargard, March 16, 1745, and died at Berlin, March 6, 1826, doctor, of theology and archdeacon. He published, Untersuchungder rauischen Handschrift des Neuen Testaments (Berlin, 1785): — Codicis Novi Testamnenti Raviani in Bibliotheca Regia Berolinensi Publica Asservati Examenz etc. (Leipsic, 1796): — Codicem Graecus Apostolorum Acta et Epistolas Continens Berolini in Bibliotheca Viri Generosissimi, etc. (Berlin, 1815). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:100, 101; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:973. (B.P.)

## Pappenheim, Salomon Ben-Seligmann[[@Headword:Pappenheim, Salomon Ben-Seligmann]]

             a very eminent Hebrew grammarian and lexicographer, was born in 1740 at Breslau, where his distinguished attainments and great piety secured for him the rabbinate of the Jewish community. He died March 4, 1814. The work which has immortalized his name is a lexicon of the Hebrew synonyms of the Bible, entitled The Curtains of Solomon (יריעות שלמה) (3 vols. 4to). The first volume, which was published at Dyhrenforth in 1784, consists of an introduction and three parts or sections, subdivided into forty-nine paragraphs. The introduction (i-xi) contains a grammatical dissertation (אותיות האמנתיו ובסבח וא 8ו המהפכת תוספת); the first part (p. 1-33), consisting of seven paragraphs, treats on those words which denote time, or on such substantives, adjectives, and verbs as express the idea of beginning, end, hurrying, tarrying, youth, age; the second part (p. 33-66), consisting of eleven paragraphs, treats on those words which denote space, or on expressions conveying the idea of place, even, straight, uneven, crooked, way, neighborhood, etc.; while the third part (p. 66-118), consisting of thirty-one paragraphs, embraces words which convey the idea of motion in its various modifications, et. going, springing, flowing, etc. The second volume, which was published at Redelheim in 1831, after the death of the author, with notes by the celebrated Wolf Heidenheim (q.v.) consists of an introduction and four parts, subdivided into twenty-six paragraphs.

The introduction (p. 1-8) contains a psychological treatise (הגוŠ על אופן התקשרות הנפש עם); the first part (p. 9-39), consisting of fourteen sections, treats on words which express the idea of speaking or utterance in its various modifications; the second part (p. 39, 40) discusses words which denote hearing; the third part (p. 40-57), consisting of twelve sections, treats on words which refer to sight; while the fourth part (p. 57-75), consisting of twenty-three sections, treats on words which relate to the touch and smell. The third volume, which was published at Dyhrenforth in 1811, consists of a general introduction and one part, subdivided into fifty-seven sections, and treats on (שמות נרדפים המתיחסות אל המלאכה) those synonyms which convey the idea of action. The importance of this work can hardly be overrated. It is the only lexicon which embraces the synonyms of the whole Biblical Hebrew, as the contributions of Wessely, Luzzato, and others to this department are confined to single groups of words. Pappenheim's marvelous mastery of the Hebrew style, his keen perception,  refined taste, critical acumen, and his philosophical mind, pre-eminently fitted him for this task. He also wrote a lexicon, or treatise, embracing those words and particles which are formed from the letters האמנתיו, entitled חשק שלמה, The Delight of Solomon, of which, however, only one part appeared (Breslau, 1802); and he has left in MS. A Critico- etymological and Synonymical Hebrew Lexicon, which has not as yet been published. See Geiger, in the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenldandischen Gesellschaff (Leipsic, 1863), 17:325 sq.; Furst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 3:64, etc.

## Pappus, Johann, Dr[[@Headword:Pappus, Johann, Dr]]

             a Lutheran divine, was born Jan. 16, 1549, at Lindau, on the Bodensee. He studied theology at Tubingen and Strasburg. In 1570 he was appointed professor in Hebrew and minister in Strasburg; in 1578 professor of theology and pastor of the Munster. After the death of Dr. Marbach, his former teacher, he was appointed president of the church-convents, and in this position he succeeded in causing not only a Lutheran liturgy, but also the Formula of Concord (q.v.) to be adopted, thus giving the Lutheran doctrine a strong footing in Strasburg. For twenty-nine years he presided over the Strasburg Church, but he was more feared than loved. He was as severe against Papists as against Calvinists, and against the former he wrote Contradictiones doctorum nunc Romanoe ecclesie, judice et teste Rob. Bellarmino (Strasburg, 1597). His motto was Ad finem si quis separat, ille sapit. He died July 13, 1610. He is the author of an excellent hymn, Ich hab' mein' Sach Gott heimgestelit (Engl. transl. by Miss Winkworth, Lyra Germanica, 2:273, “My cause is God's, and I am still”). See Fechtus, Hist. Colloquii Emmendingensis (Rostock, 1709); Rutelmeyer, Die evangel. Kirchenlieder'des Elsasses (Jena, 1855, in the Beitragen zur theolog. Wissenschaft, by Reuss u. Canitz, 6 vols.); Melch. Adami, Vita Germ. theologorum; Theologisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v., Koch,- Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes (Stuttgard, 1867), 2:176. (B. P.)

## Papremis[[@Headword:Papremis]]

             the god of war among the ancient Egyptians, who was worshipped under the figure of the hippopotamus. At Heliopolis and at Butos sacrifices are said to have been offered to this deity; and at Papremis, which was called after him, there was a festival celebrated every year in honor of him.

## Papst, Johann Georg Friedrich[[@Headword:Papst, Johann Georg Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Ludwigstadt, Bayreuth, October 21, 1754. He studied at Leipsic and. Erlangen, was in 1783 professor of philosophy at the latter place, in 1794 dean at Zirndorf, near Nuremberg,. in 1818 doctor of theology, and died June 7, 1821. He wrote, De Authentia Copitis XXI Joannis (Erlangen,. 1779): — De Faustis Christiana Religionis Initiis (1786): Geschichte der christlichen Kirche (1787): — De Ipsorum Christianorum Culpa in Vexationibus Motis a Romanis (1789-90): — De Apostolicae Ecclesiae Exenmplo Caute Adhibendo (1790): — Commentar uber die Geschichte der christl. Kirche nach dem schrockh schen Lehrbuch (1792-1801). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:536, 591; 2:24; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Papua[[@Headword:Papua]]

             or, as the Dutch navigators called it, New Guinea, from a fancied resemblance of its inhabitants to those of the coast of Guinea in Africa, is, if we except Australia, the largest island on our globe. Papua lies in the Australian Archipelago, in 0° 30'-10° 4' S. lat., and 131°-151. 30' E. long., and is about 1400 miles in length from the Cape of Good Hope on the north-west to South-east Cape. In outline it is very irregular, the western part being nearly insulated by Geelvink Bay, entering from the north, and the Gulf of M'Clure from the west, while in the south it ends in a long and narrow peninsula of lofty mountains. It is indented by numerous gulfs and bays, besides the two already mentioned, and a large number of rivers, none of which have as yet been much explored. Indeed the country is still largely closed to the whites. Our knowledge has only in very recent times become definite even of the coast lines (see below). Papua is very mountainous, except certain tracts of swampy land which have been formed by the river deposits. The southern part is hardly anything else than a mountain range. It has peaks far surpassing those of Australia in altitude, Mount Owen Stanley being 13,205 feet; Obree, 10,200; Yule Mountain, 9700; and many others of the same range approaching similar elevations. The south-west coast is chiefly composed of lofty limestone hills.Along the south-west shore are many coral-banks. Nothing is accurately known of either the mineral or vegetable wealth of the interior, the hostile and retiring nature of the mountaineers having hitherto closed it to the naturalist. It has been said that Papua produces gold, but it is as yet uncertain, and the natives possess no ornaments or tools, except of wood, stone, and bone, but what are brought to them from Ceram. Papua is clothed with the most luxuriant vegetation, cocoa-nut, betel, sago, banana, bread-fruit, orange, lemon, and other fruit-trees that line the shores; while in the interior are reported to be an abundance of fine timber trees, as the iron-wood, ebony, canary-wood, the wild nutmeg, and the masooi, the fragrant bark of which is a leading article of export from the south-west coast. In some districts sugar-cane, tobacco, and rice are cultivated.

The flower-garlanded and fruit-bearing forests are filled with multitudes of the most beautiful birds, of which are various kinds of birds-of-paradise, the crown-pigeon, parrots, lories, etc. Fish are plentiful, and are either speared or shot with the arrow, except at Humboldt Bay, where they are caught  with nets made from vegetable fibres, with large shells attached as sinkers. The larger animals are unknown, but wild swine, kangaroos, the koesi- koesi (a kind of wood-cat), are plentiful, as also a small kind of domesticated dog used in hunting. Only in the trackless wilds of Papua and the adjacent islands are found the birds-of-paradise, with their marvelous development of plumage and incomparable beauty. The exports are masooi bark, trepang or boche-de- mer, tortoiseshells, pearls, nutmegs, birds-of- paradise, crown-pigeons, ebony, resin, etc., which are brought to the islands of Sirotta, Namatotte, and Adi, on the southwest coast, where they are bartered to the traders from Ceram for hatchets, rice, large beads, printed cottons, knives, earthenware, iron pans, copper, tobacco, sago, and other necessary articles. The produce is carried to Singapore and the Arroo Islands. The climate of Papua, so far as it can now be determined, is not very unhealthy, though the temperature varies greatly, the thermometer sometimes indicating 95° Fahr. by day and falling to 75° at night. On the south-west coast the east monsoon or rainy season begins about the middle of April, and ends in September; the dry season is from September to April; and on the north coast they are just reversed. Fever and ague abounds all along the coast, especially in the southern portion. The most healthful place thus far found is Port Moresby, now occupied as a mission station. It is said to be free from malaria. Papua is surrounded by countless islands, some of which are of considerable size. Towards the south is the Louisiade Archipelago, stretching over several degrees of longitude, out of which Aignan rises to the height of 3010 feet, and South-east Island to 2500. Near the Great Bight is Prince Frederik Hendrik Island, separated from the mainland by the Princess Marianne Strait. Namatotte, a lofty island in Speelman Bay, in 3° 50' S. lat. and 133° 56' E. long., having good anchorage on the west side, and one of the chief trading-places on the coast; Aidoena, at the entrance of Triton Bay, in 134° 20' E. long.; and Adior Wessels, to the southeast of Cape Van den Bosch, are the principal islands on the south-west coast. On the north, at the mouth of Geelvink- Bay, lie the Schouten Islands, in 135°137° 50' E. long., Mafor, Jobi, and many of less importance. Salawatti is a large and populous island to the west of Papua, and further west is Batanta, separated from Salawatti by Pitt Strait; west and south is the large island of Misool, or Waigamme, in 1° 45'-2° 3' S. lat. and 129° 30'-130°- 31' E. long., having an area of 780 square miles, and a large population. It is highly probable that at no very distant geological period the Arroo, Misool, Waigion, Jobi, and other  islands formed part of the mainland of Papua, banks and soundings reached by the 100-fathom line connecting them with it.

This country was first discovered by the Portuguese commanders Antonio d'Abrew and Francisco Serram in 1511. It was in part visited by the Dutch under Schouten in 1615; in 1828 their government built a fort, called Du Bus, in Triton Bay, 3° 42' S. lat. and 133° 51' 5” E. long., but it had to be abandoned after a few years on account of the unhealthy climate. In 1774 an English officer, captain Forrest, was sent by the East India Company to search for spice-producing districts, and he took up his residence at Port Davey, on the north-east coast, and there maintained constant friendly intercourse with the natives. Captain Cook, who visited the south-west coast in 1770, was the sole authority respecting the natives till 1828. In 1845 a British man-of-war surveyed a part of the Great Bight; in 1848 others surveyed the Louisiade. In 1871 the exploration of the southern part was undertaken by captain Moresby, and to him we now owe most of our knowledge of the east end of New Guinea and its adjacent islands (see our reference to his work below). Many explorations have also been made and are now making by the missionaries. The Italian naturalist D'Albertis, who returned from Papua in 1876, is now preparing reports of his observations, and they are to be supplemented by the observations of the English naturalist Octavius Stone; but none of these explorers will and can do so much to enlighten us in respect to New Guinea as the missionaries who have recently gone there. The population of Papua and the immediately adjacent islands cannot of course in our present unsettled knowledge of it be definitely stated. From what has been seen of the country it is supposed to have about 800,000 natives. The northern part of the island has been for many years occupied by the Dutch settlers from the West Indies, and is claimed by the Netherlands. It is that part of Papua which was formerly tributary to the sultans of Tidore, stretching from Cape Bonpland, on the east of Humboldt Bay, in 140° 47' E. long., to the Cape of Good Hope, and farther west and south-west to 131° E. long., with the islands on the coast, and is estimated to have a population of about 200,000. The natives of the interior have never acknowledged the supremacy of the sultans of Tidore, but the coasts and islands are governed by rajahs and other chiefs appointed by them to certain districts or kingdoms. This power is still exercised by the sultan of Tidore, but subject to the approval of the Netherlands resident at Ternate. The southern part of Papua, as we have seen above, is not as yet claimed by any civilized power. The Australians  are very much agitated about its possession, and strong colonial influence is now seeking to further the annexation scheme in Great Britain. The English press is questioning the project, and it is doubtful whether the occupation by the Dutch will be disputed. The possession of Papua by some European power seems almost a necessity if the country is ever to be reclaimed from barbarism.

According to the system of Bory de St. Vincent the natives of Papua are a race sprung from Neptunians and Oceanians, — in character, features, and hair standing between the Malays and Negroes. Dr. Latham places them under the sub-class Oceanic Mongolidae. D'Albertis believes with Moresby and Gill that the people of Eastern New Guinea are of Polynesian origin along the coast, but that the indigenous Papuans are morally and physically inferior to the invaders of their land. Those who live on the coast and islands now go by the name of Papuans, probably from the Malay word Papoewah or Poewah-Poewah, which signifies curly or woolly; the inhabitants of the interior are called Alfoers. The Papuans are of middle stature and well made, have regular features, intelligent black eyes, small white teeth, curly hair, thick lips, and large mouth; the nose is sharp, but flat beneath, the nostrils large, and the skin dark brown. Around Humboldt Bay the men stain their hair with the red earth which is abundant in that locality. Generally the men are better-looking than the women, but neither are repulsively ugly, as has been repeatedly said. The Papuans of the coast are divided into small distinct tribes frequently at war with each other, when they plant the paths to their villages with pointed pieces of bamboo or Nipa palm, called randjoes, which run into the feet of a party approaching to the attack, and make wounds which are difficult to cure. The men build the houses, hollow the trunks of trees into canoes, hunt and fish; while the women do all the heaviest work, cultivating the fields, making mats, pots, and cutting wood. Their food consists of maize, sago, rice, fish, birds, the flesh of wild pigs, and fruits. The Alfoers of the interior do not differ much in appearance from the Papuans, but, lower sunk in the savage life, are independent nomades, warlike, and said to be in some districts cannibals. They are called by the coast people Woeka, or mountaineers, and bring down from their forest retreats the fragrant Masooi bark, nutmegs, birds-of-paradise, and crown-pigeons to the coast, bartering them for other articles. The natives of the Arfak and Amberbakin ranges are more settled in their habits, and also cultivate sugar-cane and  tobacco as articles of commerce, but never build their houses at a lower level than a thousand feet from the base of the mountains.

The people of the south-west coast are perfectly honest, open-hearted, and trustworthy. They have no religious worship, though some idea of a Supreme Being, according to whose will they live, act, and die, but to whom no reverence is offered. They reckon time by the arrival and departure of the Ceram traders, or the beginning and ending of the dry and rainy seasons, and number only up to ten. Their dead are buried, and after a year or more the bones are taken up and placed in the family tomb, erected near the house, or selected from the natural caverns in the limestone rocks. The women cover the lower part of the body; the men go all but naked, have their hair plaited or frizzled out, and ornamented with shells and feathers. Marriages are contracted early, and are only dissolved by death, and the women are chaste and modest. At Doreh, on the north coast, the bridegroom leads the bride home, when her father or nearest male relative divides a roasted banana between them, which they eat together with joined hands, and the marriage is completed. They have no religion, but believe that the soul of the father at death returns to the son, and that of the mother to the daughter. The Papuans of Humboldt Bay are farther advanced than those of any other part of the island, carve wood, make fishing-nets; build good houses above the water of the bay, and connect them with the mainland by bridges; each village has also an octagonal temple, ornamented within and without with figures of animals and obscene representations, though nothing is known of their religion. The largest temple, that of Tobaldi, received in 1858 the present of a Netherlands flag, which is flying from its spires, the natives little suspecting that it is a sign of asserted foreign supremacy. The religion of these Papuans seems to consist mainly in the adoration of Karowaro, wooden idols, of which one is solemnly consecrated whenever a member of the household dies. Their temples are full of images, apparently symbolical of rude nature worship. They have charmed talismans which derive their efficacy from being talked to.

All attempts of the sultans of Tidore to introduce the Mohammedan religion into Papua have failed. Christianity was first introduced in the northern portion in 1855, on the island of Massanama, to the east of Doreh harbor, by the German missionaries Ottow and Gieszler. They did not, however, remain long and New Guinea may be said to be dependent for Christian teaching on the missionaries sent thither by the London Church Missionary Society since 1871. The founder of this mission is the Rev. A.  W. Murray, for many years a laborer in the Polynesian country. He began the work at Darnley Island July 3, 1871, and the mission there has prospered beyond the most sanguine expectations. The people now generally observe the Sabbath and attend service, and the gross and superstitious practices of heathendom have disappeared from among the inhabitants of that island. On Aug. 24, 1873, a school was opened. Many of the natives, however, still continue the peculiar disposition of their departed — customs which seem to link them to countries far remote and ages long gone by. Instead of burying their dead out of their sight, they are accustomed to preserve them. The more corruptible parts are removed, and the body is stretched upon a wooden frame, to which it is fastened, and this is placed in an erect position and smoked till all the juices of the body are dried up; and when this is effected it keeps for generations. Missions are now established also at the adjoining islands Stephen and Murray, Bampton and Tanau. At Murray Island the first Christian church in Papua was erected in 1874. The headquarters of this mission is at Port Moresby, and there the work has prospered gloriously. Another important place on the mainland is Mamunanu, but the work has had to be temporarily abandoned there on account of the unwholesome climate. At Katau, where a mission was begun in 1871, the laborers were murdered, and there has not yet been any attempt made to renew the work. The Revs. S. Macfarlane and W. G. Lewes are now the principal missionaries in New Guinea, and they are active in explorations as well as in Christian labors. Very interesting reports from these men may be read in the London Academy, Dec. 18, 1875; April 15, 1876. See Moresby, New Guinea and Polynesia (Lond. 1876); Murray, Polynesia and New Guinea (New York, 1876, 12mo); The Leisure Hour for August, etc., 1875. These descriptions supersede all former writings on Papua, and we therefore do not refer to older publications. Lawson's Wanderings in the Interior of New Guinea (Lond. 1875) is regarded as a fraud. The author probably never saw Papua or its inhabitants (see Edinb. Rev. Oct. 1875, art. vii; July, 1876, art. ix).

## Papyrus[[@Headword:Papyrus]]

             SEE PAPER-REED.

## Para (du Phanjas), Francois[[@Headword:Para (du Phanjas), Francois]]

             a philosophical writer of France, was born in the castle Phanjas, Dauphine, in 1724. He joined the Jesuits of Embrun, and soon distinguished himself as a philosopher and mathematician. Para died at Paris in 1797. Of his works; we mention, Elements de Metaphysiques Sacrae et Profane (2d ed. Paris, 1779, 3 volumes): — Les Principes de la Saine Philosophie Concilies avec Ceux de la Religion (1774, 2 volumes): — Institutiones Philosophicae (published posthumously, in 1800): — Tableau Historique et Philosophique de la Religion (1784). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Parabaptism[[@Headword:Parabaptism]]

             (παραβάπτισμα), baptism in private houses or conventicles, which is frequently condemned in the canons of ancient councils under this name.

## Parable[[@Headword:Parable]]

             a word derived from the Greek verb παραβάλλω, which signifies to set side by side, and thus comes easily to have attached to it the idea of doing so for the purpose of comparison. A parable therefore is literally a placing beside, a comparison, a similitude, an illustration of one subject by another. Parables or fables are found in the literature of most nations. They were called by the Greeks αι῏νοι, and by the Romans fabuloe. In the following discussion we treat the whole subject from a Scriptural as well as rhetorical point of view, as developed by modern criticism. SEE FIGURE.

I. Signification of the Terms in the Original. — “Parable” is the rendering in the A.V. of the following Hebrew and Greek words.

1. In the Old Testament it answers to מָשָׁל, mashal, usually rendered “proverb,” which denotes

(a) an obscure or enigmatical saying, e.g. Psa 49:4 :

“I will incline mine ear to a parable; I will open my dark saying upon the harp;”  Psa 78:2.

“I will open my mouth in a parable; I will utter dark sayings of old.”

(b) It signifies a fictitious narrative invented for the purpose of conveying truth in a less offensive or more engaging form than that of direct assertion. Of this sort is the parable by which Nathan reproved David (2Sa 12:2-3); that in which Jotham exposed the folly of the Shechemites (Jdg 9:7-15); and that addressed by Jehoash to Amaziah (2Ki 14:9-10). To this class also belong the parables of Christ.

(c) A discourse expressed in figurative, poetical, of highly ornamented diction is called: a parable. Thus it is said, “Balaam took up his parable” (Num 23:7); and, “Job continued his parable” (Job 27:1). Under this general and wider signification the two former classes may not improperly be included. SEE PROVERB.

2. In the New Testament it is employed by our translators as the rendering of παραβολή (derived as above), a word which seems to have a more restricted signification than the above Hebrew term, being generally  employed in the second sense mentioned above, viz to denote a fictitious narrative, under which is veiled some important truth. It has been supposed, indeed, that some of the parables uttered by our Savior narrate real and not fictitious events; but whether this was the case or not is a point of little consequence. The fact that in one instance only (the parable of Lazarus and “Dives”) an actual name is given — though probably but a conventional one commonly indicative of a class — is evidence that our Lord had no particular individual in view. Each of his parables, however, was essentially true; it was true to human nature, and nothing more was necessary. Another meaning which the word occasionally bears in the New Testament is that of a type or emblem, as in Heb 9:9, where: παραβολή is rendered in our version figure. According to Macknight, the word in Heb 11:19 has the same meaning, but this is probably incorrect. SEE EMBLEM.

The word παραβολή therefore does not of itself imply a narrative. The juxtaposition of two things, differing in most points, but agreeing in some, is sufficient to bring the comparison thus produced within the etymology of the word. The παραβολή of Greek rhetoric need not be more than the simplest argument from analogy. You would not choose pilots or athletes by lot; why then should you choose statesmen?” (Aristot. Rhet. 2:20). In Hellenistic. Greek, however, it acquired a wider meaning, coextensive with that of the above-mentioned Hebrew mashal, for which the Sept. writers, with hardly an exception, make it the equivalent. That word (=similitude), as was natural in the language of a people who had never reduced rhetoric to an art, had a large range of application, and was applied (as seen above) sometimes to the shortest proverbs (1Sa 10:12; 1Sa 24:13; 2Ch 7:20), sometimes to dark prophetic utterances (Num 23:7; Num 23:18; Num 24:3; Eze 20:49), sometimes to enigmatic maxims (Psa 78:2; Pro 1:6), or metaphors expanded into a narrative (Eze 12:22). In Ecclesiasticus the word occurs with a striking frequency, and, as will be seen hereafter, its use by the Son of Sirach throws light on the position occupied by parables in our Lord's teaching. In the N.T. itself the word is used with a like latitude. While attached most frequently to the illustrations which have given it a special meaning, it is also applied to a short saying like “Physician, heal thyself” (Luk 4:23), to a mere comparison without a narrative (Mat 24:32), to the figurative character of the Levitical ordinances (Heb 9:9), or of single facts in patriarchal history (Heb 11:19). The later history of  the word is not without interest. Naturalized in Latin, chiefly through the Vulgate or earlier versions, it loses gradually the original idea of figurative speech, and is used for speech of any kind. Mediaeval Latin gives us the strange form of parabolare, and the descendants of the technical Greek word in the Romance languages are parler, parole, parola, palabras (Diez, Roman. Worterb. s.v. Parola). SEE SIMILE.

II. Definition and Distinctions. — From the above examinations we are prepared to find the word frequently used both by the evangelists and by the disciples of Jesus, with reference to instructions of Christ which we should call simply figurative, or metaphorical, or proverbial. In Luk 6:39 we read. “And he spake a parable unto them, Can the blind lead the blind? Shall they not both fall into the ditch?”(comp. Mat 15:14-15, where Peter speaks of the saying as “this parable”). In Mar 7:17, after Jesus had taught that not the things entering into, but those coming out of a man defile him, we are told that, “when he was entered into the house from the people, his disciples asked him concerning the parable;” and, in Luk 14:7, the warning against taking the chief seats at table is introduced as “a parable put forth to those which were bidden.” In all these sayings of our Lord, however, it is obvious that the germ of a parable is contained. We have only to work upon the hint given us, and we have the perfect story. Two blind men, for example, are seen leading each other along the road, and, after struggling for a time with the difficulties, of doing so, both fall into the ditch by the wayside. A pure and noble-spirited man takes his food with unwashed hands, while a hypocrite and oppressor of the poor is careful to cleanse them before he eats; both rise up from table and return, the one to his career of benevolence, the other to his wrongs land his injustice: which is the one deserving condemnation? The banquet is spread, a vain guest enters, and takes the highest seat, a meritorious but humble one follows and takes the lowest, the master of the house notes the impropriety, and requests the former to go down, the latter to come up, the attention of the whole company is directed to them, the one is shamed, the other is honored. Thus in each case we have the substance, although not the form, of the parable; in each an incident of common life is employed for the illustration of higher truth. But while comparison is thus the general meaning of the word before us, it has acquired a special sense in distinction from those other words, similitude, metaphor, allegory, fable, etc., which also imply comparison. Let us endeavor to distinguish it from these.

1. The parable is not a mere similitude, in which the mind rests simply upon the points of agreement between two things that are compared, and experiences that pleasure which is always afforded by the discovery of resemblances between things that differ. In such a case both terms of the similitude must be enunciated, and the pleasure springing from their agreement is all that the speaker or writer looks to as what will lend force to his instructions. SEE SIMILITUDE.

2. Nor is the parable a mere metaphor, in which a word familiar to us in the region of sensible experience, and denoting some object possessed of particular properties, is transferred to another object belonging to a more elevated region, in order that the former may impart to us a fuller and. livelier idea of the properties which the latter ought to possess. Were we to speak of the Word of God as a seed we might be said to use a metaphor, but in that case we transfer the properties of the seed to the Word; the seed itself, having suggested the particular property upon which we wish to dwell, vanishes from our thoughts. But when as a part of instruction by parable we use the same expression, the idea of the seed abides with us, and, the keeping before our minds of its actual history, that we may ascend from it into another sphere, is a necessary part of the mental process through which we pass. SEE METAPHOR.

3. It is more difficult to draw the distinction between parable and allegory. It can hardly be (as in Trench, On the Parables, p. 8) that in the latter there is a transference of the qualities and properties of the thing signifying to the thing, signified, so that the mind blends the two together, while in the former it keeps them separate. This distinction proceeds upon the idea that an allegory is only an extended metaphor, an idea which cannot be regarded as correct, for the allegory seems to differ from the metaphor especially in this, that no transference of qualities, and properties takes. place. In the allegory the circumstances employed for, the purpose of comparison remain in their real or supposed existence; the mind does not, as in metaphor, rest at once in the final object of thought, and only travel backwards to the figure employed for giving liveliness to the representation, in order that it may fill out its idea of the higher by recalling the attributes of the lower. It starts from the facts, whether real or imaginary, which form the basis of the similitude it employs; it leaves them as they are; and only hastens to the conclusion that a corresponding order of things is to be found in the other sphere to which it ascends. The allegory thus corresponds, strictly to what is involved in the derivation of  the word. It is the teaching of one thing by another thing, of a second by a first a similarity of properties is supposed to exist, a like course of events to be traceable in both; but the first does not pass off in the second; the two remain distinct. Viewed in this light, allegory, in its widest sense, may be regarded as a genus, of which the fable, the parable, and what we commonly call allegory are species. It only remains for us, therefore, to note the differences of these.

4. Between fable and parable the difference appears to be determined by the object which they severally propose. It is the business of the fable to enforce only some prudential maxim, some common-sense principle, some wise saw founded on the experience of the world, and to do this in such a way as shall awaken surprise and pleasure. Hence it deals. mainly with plants or the lower animals, and, by clothing them with all the powers of reflection which lie within the compass of its aim, it gives not only interest but force to its lesson. If even animals or plants, we reason, can display such prudence or be the victims of such folly, how much more ought we, with our higher powers, to exhibit the one or to avoid the other? The parable has a nobler end. It would teach either religious or high moral truth. It deals with the loftiest aspect of man's being, with the nobler side of his character, with his relation not to mere earthly experience, but to a spiritual, an ideal world. Hence it cannot admit into its story those actors in which the fable mainly delights. The lesson which it would enforce is too solemn for that. It would jar upon our sense of propriety and would be unnatural. That such actors should appear in the fable produces no feeling of incongruity, because we know that there is a side of our nature which is possessed in common with us by the beasts of the field. But it is not so with that side of it which the parable would instruct, and to introduce therefore the lower animals as our instructors there would be to destroy our sense of what chiefly distinguishes us from them, and would only produce disgust. The correctness of what has been said may still further appear if we consider that we would take no offense at a parable in which angels were actors, because, whatever points of difference there may exist between the human and angelic nature, they agree in this, that they are fitted for moving amid the same spiritual realities, and cherishing the same spiritual emotions. These considerations will also show us that, while a fable may proceed upon facts palpably fictitious, the parable can only proceed upon those which are or may be true. It deals so much with the severe majesty of truth that it cannot accept the aid of anything plainly  false. It is the truthfulness, in short, of the lower side of the representation that makes it the fitting vehicle for the conveyance of the higher. Thus also we remark, in conclusion upon this point, that the parable might take the place of the fable, but not the fable of the parable. As to the distinction again between the parable and the allegory commonly so-called, it is probably to be sought in this, that the latter is the offspring simply of a poetical imagination, while the former is conversant with the actual realities of life. SEE FABLE.

Thus, distinguished both from similitude and metaphor, and regarded as a species of allegory, the parable may be said to be a story which, either true or possessing all the appearance of truth, exhibits in the sphere of natural human life a process parallel to one which exists in the ideal and spiritual world. It differs from the “story” of the modern romantic tale chiefly in the fact that its incidents are. drawn from ordinary life, while the latter deals with unusual and marvelous conjunctures, such as rarely if ever occur in reality. The moral effect therefore is very different. SEE ALLEGORY.

III. Use of Parables by our Lord. — It will help us, however, still further to understand the meaning of the parable, and its high significance as a method of tuition, if we consider the grounds upon which its power to instruct us rests. For that power is not simply dependent upon the pleasure which an aptly chosen similitude always affords. It is rather dependent upon the truth, of which we become gradually more sensible as our views of religion rise, that the whole of nature and providence, the whole constitution of human life, and the laws which regulate the progress both of the individual and of society, spring. from one God, and are maintained by him. All outward things thus become transfigured to us — are not merely what they are to the bodily eyes, but are pregnant with a fuller meaning, colored with a richer light to the eye of faith. Beneath the outward we see the inward; beneath the material, the spiritual; beneath the visible, the invisible; beneath the temporal, the eternal. Everywhere the same perfections of God's being, the same rules of his government appear. We feel ourselves placed in the midst of a grand harmonious system, all the lines of which spring from the same center, and return to it again. Whatever lesson, therefore, is associated with any one part of the Almighty's works or ways, comes to us with the weight, not of that one part only, but of all. If God reveal himself in this way here, he will reveal himself, we reason, in this way elsewhere. We call in the universe to bear witness to the truth which we may be considering; and we rest in the  assurance that, could we explore it all, we should find analogous principles at work in it.

It may be said indeed that this view of parables is Christian, and that our Lord's parables were addressed to Jews. The statement is true. The feeling which we have expressed belongs, in its most developed form, to Christianity alone. In its thoroughness and completeness it was first revealed in Christ. He alone has taught us to behold in everything the tokens of our heavenly Father's presence, and yet to avoid the pantheistic error of merging the Father in his works. But although fully developed only in Christianity, this lesson was one also of Judaism. The Jew believed in a personal God, and looked upon the world as his handiwork. What he lacked was that well-grounded belief in the love of God which could alone guide him through the many perplexities and reconcile the many apparent contradictions by which he was surrounded. Still he knew enough to make him in a great degree alive to this power of the parable. Further, we must bear in mind that our Lord, as the great Teacher of man, could not, while he sought to be understood by the Jew, be limited in his teaching by the capacity of the Jew to understand. He had to speak for all ages, and all stages of advancement; for the spiritual as well as for the carnal, for full- grown men as well as babes. More than all, we must remember that in his teaching the Savior had to present himself — that his lessons were not like those of an ordinary teacher, who may be more or less taught by others to speak what he himself is not. Christ was to embody in himself the highest conception of Christianity. He was to exhibit our faith in living reality, by showing how he himself felt and lived — how he himself looked on heaven and earth, on God and man. Therefore, even although the Jew might have been less favorably situated than he was for owning this particular element of the parable's power, such a method of instruction would still have possessed a divine and beautiful appropriateness in the lips of Jesus.

To understand the relation of the parables of the Gospels to our Lord's teachings, we must go back to the use made of them by previous or contemporary teachers. We have sufficient evidence that they were frequently employed by them (see Horwitz, Hebrew Tales, Lond. 1826; N. Y. 1847; Levi, Parabole dai libri Talmudici, Florence, 1861). They appear frequently in the Gemara and Midrash (comp. Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Mat 13:3; Jost, Judenthum, 2:216), and are ascribed to Hillel, Shammai, and other great rabbins of the two preceding centuries. The panegyric passed upon the great rabbi Meir, that after his death men ceased  to speak parables, implies that upon that time there had been a succession of teachers more or less distinguished for them (Sota, fol. 49, in Jost, Judenthum, 2:87; Lightfoot, l.c.). Later Jewish writers have seen in this employment of parables a condescension to the ignorance of the great mass of mankind, who cannot be taught otherwise. For them, as for women or children, parables are the natural and fit method of instruction (Maimonides, Porta Mosis. p. 84, in Wetstein, On Matthew 13), and the same view is taken by Jerome as accounting for the common use of parables in Syria and Palestine (Hieron. In Mat 18:23). It may be questioned, however, whether this represents the use made of them by the rabbins of our Lord's time. The language of the Son of Sirach confines them to the scribe who devotes himself to study.

They are at once his glory and his reward (Sir 39:2-3). Of all who eat bread by the sweat of their brow, of the great mass of men in cities and country, it is written that “they shall not be found where parables are spoken” (38:33). For these, therefore, it is probable that the Scribes and teachers of the law had simply rules and precepts, often perhaps burdensome and oppressive (Mat 23:8; Mat 23:4), formulae of prayer (Luk 11:1), appointed times of fasting and hours of devotion (Mar 2:18). They, who would not even eat with common people (comp. Wetstein and Lampe, On Joh 7:49), cared little to give even as much as this to the “people of the earth,” whom they scorned as “knowing not the law,” a brute herd for whom they could have no sympathy. For their own scholars they had, according to their individual character and power of thought, the casuistry with which the Mishna is for the most part filled, or the parables which here and there give tokens of some deeper insight. The parable was made the instrument for teaching the young disciple to discern the treasures of wisdom of which the “accursed” multitude were ignorant. The teaching of our Lord at the commencement of his ministry was in every way the opposite of this. The Sermon on the Mount may be taken as the type of the “words of grace” which he spake, “not as the Scribes.” Beatitudes, laws, promises, were uttered distinctly, not indeed without similitudes, but with similitudes that explained themselves. So for some months he taught in the synagogues and on the seashore of Galilee, as he had before taught in Jerusalem, and as yet without a parable. But then there comes a change. The direct teaching was met with scorn, unbelief, hardness, and he seems for a time to abandon it for that which took the form of parables. The question of the disciples (Mat 13:10) implies that they were astonished. Their Master was no longer proclaiming the Gospel of the kingdom as before. He was falling  back into one at least of the forms of rabbinic teaching (comp. Schottgen's Hor. Heb. vol 2 “Christus Rabbinorum Summus”). He was speaking to the multitude in the parables and dark sayings which the rabbins reserved for their chosen disciples. Here, for them, were two grounds for wonder. Here, for us, is the key to the explanation which he gave, that he had chosen this form of teaching because the people were spiritually blind and deaf (Mat 13:13), and in order they might remain so (Mar 4:12). Two interpretations have been given of these words.

(a.) Spiritual truths, it has been said, are in themselves hard and uninviting. Men needed to be won to them by that which was more attractive. The parable was an instrument of education for those who were children in age or character. For this reason it was chosen by the Divine Teacher, as fables and stories, “ad minicula imbecillitatis” (Seneca, Epist. 59), have been chosen by human teachers (Chrysostom, Hom. in Johann. 34).

(b) Others, again, have seen in this use of parables something of a penal character. Men have set themselves against the truth, and therefore it is hid from their eyes, presented to them in forms in which it is not easy for them to recognize it. To the inner circle of the. chosen it is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God. To those who are without, all these things are done in parables. Neither view is wholly satisfactory. Each contains a partial truth. All experience shows, first, that parables do attract, and, when once understood, are sure to be remembered; secondly, that men may listen to them and see that they have a meaning, and yet never care to ask what that meaning is. Their worth, as instruments of teaching, lies in their being at once a test of character, and in their presenting each form of character with that which, as a penalty or blessing, is adapted to it. They withdraw the light from those who love darkness. They protect the truth which they enshrine from the mockery of the scoffer. They leave something even with the careless which may be interpreted and understood afterwards. They reveal, on the other hand, the seekers after truth. These ask the meaning of the parable, will not rest till the teacher has explained it are led step by step to the laws of interpretation, so that they can “understand all parables,” and then pass on into the higher region in which parables are no longer necessary, but all things are spoken plainly. In this way the parable did its work, found out the fit hearers and led them on. It is also to be remembered that even after this self-imposed law of reserve and reticence, the teaching of Christ presented a marvelous contrast to the narrow exclusiveness of the Scribes. The mode of education was changed,  but the work of teaching or educating was not for a moment given up, and the aptest scholars were found in those whom the received system would have altogether shut out.

If we test the parables of the Old Testament by the rules above laid down, we shall not find them wanting in any excellence belonging to this species of composition. What can be more forcible, more persuasive, and more beautiful than the parables of Jotham (Jdg 9:7-15), of Nathan (2Sa 12:1-14), of Isa 5:1-5, and of Eze 19:1-9? There are other illustrations, like that of the city delivered by one wise inhabitant (Ecc 9:14-15), which are substantially parables, although not in express form. But the parables uttered by our Savior claim pre-eminence over all others on account of their number, variety, oppositeness, and beauty. Indeed, it is impossible to conceive of a mode of instruction better fitted to engage the attention, interest the feelings, and impress the conscience than that which our Lord adopted. Among its advantages may be recapitulated the following:

(1.) It secured the attention of multitudes who would not have listened to truth conveyed in the form of abstract propositions. It did so in virtue of two principles of human nature, viz. that outward and sensible objects make a more vivid impression than inward notions or ideas; and that the particular and the concrete affect the mind more than the general and the abstract. Thus a virtue or vice may be held up for abhorrence or admiration far more successfully by exhibiting its effects on the character of an individual than by eulogizing or declaiming against it in the abstract.

(2.) This mode of teaching was, as we have seen, one with which the Jews were familiar, and for which they entertained a preference. They had been accustomed to it in the writings of their prophets, and, like other Eastern nations, listened with pleasure to truths thus wrapped in the veil of allegory.

(3.) Some truths which, if openly stated, would have been opposed by a barrier of prejudice, were in this way insinuated, as it were, into men's minds, and secured their assent unawares.

(4.) The parabolic style was well adapted to conceal Christ's meaning from those who, through obstinacy and perverseness, were indisposed to receive it. This seems to be the meaning of Isaiah in the passage quoted in Mat 13:13. Not that the truth was ever hidden from those who  sincerely sought to know it; but it was wrapped in just enough of obscurity to veil it from those who “had pleasure in unrighteousness,” and who would not “come to the light lest their deeds should be reproved.” In accordance with strict justice, such were ‘ given up to strong delusions, that they might believe a lie.” SEE BLINDNESS, JUDICIAL.

Accordingly, from the time indicated in the passage just cited, parables enter largely into our Lord's recorded teaching. Each parable of those which we read in the Gospels may have been repeated more than once with greater or less variation (as, e.g., those of the pounds and the talents, Mat 25:14; Luk 19:12; of the supper, in Mat 22:2, and Luk 14:16). Everything leads us to believe that there were many others of which we have no record (Mat 13:34; Mar 4:33). In those which remain various writers have thought it possible to trace something like an order; but as these classifications must be in any case somewhat subjective and arbitrary, we refrain from presenting them, and give simply a complete list in tabular form (p. 647).

Lastly, it is to be noticed, partly as a witness to the truth of the four Gospels, partly as a line of demarcation between them and all counterfeits, that the apocryphal Gospels contain no parables. Human invention could imagine miracles (though these too in the spurious Gospels are stripped of all that gives them majesty and significance), but the parables of the Gospels were inimitable and unapproachable by any writers of that or the succeeding age. They possess a life and power which stamp them as with the “image and superscription” of the Son of Man. Even the total absence of any allusion to them in the written or spoken teaching of the apostles shows how little their minds set afterwards in that direction, how little likely they were to do more than testify what they had actually heard.

IV. Rules of Interpretation. — It has been usual to consider the parable as composed of two parts: viz. the protasis, conveying merely the literal sense; and the apodosis, containing the mystical or figurative sense. It is not necessary, however, that this second part should always be expressed. It is frequently omitted in the parables of our Lord, when the truth illustrated was such as his disciples were unable at the time fully to comprehend, or when it was his design to reveal to them something which was to be hidden from the unbelieving Jews (comp. Mat 13:11-13). The excellence of a parable depends on the propriety and force of the comparison on which it is founded; on the general fitness and harmony of  its parts; on the obviousness of its main scope or design; on the beauty and conciseness of the style in which it is expressed; and on its adaptation to the circumstances and capacities of the hearers. The scope or design of Christ's parables is sometimes to be gathered from his own express declaration, as in Luk 12:16-20; Luk 14:11; Luk 16:9. In other cases it must be sought by considering the context, the circumstances in which it was spoken, and the features of the narrative itself, i.e. the literal sense. For the right understanding of this, an acquaintance with the customs of the people, with the productions of their country, and with .the events of their history, is often desirable. Most of our Lord's parables, however, admit of no doubt as to their main scope, and are so simple and perspicuous that “he who runs may read.”

It has been urged by some writers, by none with greater force or clearness than by Chrysostom (Rom. in Matthew 64), that there is a scope or purpose for each parable, and that our aim must be to discern this, not to find a special significance in each circumstance or incident. The rest, it is said, may be dealt with as the drapery which the parable needs for its grace and completeness, but which is not essential. It may be questioned, however, whether this canon of interpretation is likely to lead us to the full meaning of this portion of our Lord's teaching. True ,as it doubtless is that there was in each parable a leading thought to be learned, partly from the parable itself, partly from the occasion of its utterance, and that all else gathers round that thought as a center, it must be remembered that in the great patterns of interpretation which he himself has given us there is more than this. Not only the sower and the seed and the several soils have their counterparts in the spiritual life, but the birds of the air, the thorns, the scorching heat, have each of them a significance. The explanation of the wheat and the tares, given with less fullness — an outline as it were, which the advancing scholars would be able to fill up — is equally specific. It may be inferred from these two instances that we are, at least, justified in looking for a meaning even in the seeming accessories of a parable. If the opposite mode of interpreting should seem likely to lead us, as it has led many, to strange and forced analogies and an arbitrary dogmatism, the safeguard may be found in our recollecting that in assigning such meanings we are but as scholars guessing at the mind of a teacher whose words are higher than our thoughts, recognizing the analogies which may have been, but which were not necessarily those which he recognized. No such  interpretation can claim anything like authority. The very form of the teaching makes it probable that there may be in any case more than one legitimate explanation. The outward fact in nature or in social life may correspond to spiritual facts at once in God's government of the world, and in the history of the individual soul. A parable may be at once ethical, and in the highest sense of the term prophetic. There is thus a wide field open to the discernment of the interpreter. There are also restraints upon the mere fertility of his imagination. (1.) The analogies must be real, not arbitrary. (2.) The parables are to be considered as parts of a whole, and the interpretation of one is not to override or encroach upon the lessons taught by others. (3.) The direct teaching of Christ presents the standard to which all our interpretations are to be referred, and by which they are to be measured. He interpreted two parables, that of the sower (Mat 13:3-8; Mat 13:18-23; Mar 4:3-8; Mar 4:14-20; Luk 8:5-8; Luk 8:11-15) and that of the tares. and the wheat (Mat 13:24-30; Mat 13:36-43). These interpretations must suggest the further rules of which we are in search.

1. Each parable has one leading idea to which all its parts are subordinate. For example, in the parable of the sower, this idea is the manner in which we ought to hear the Word of God. In that of the tares and the wheat, it is the struggle of the good with the evil, till the day when both shall be finally and forever parted. In subordination to these two ideas all the different incidents of the two parables are explained. It is always the same; and when we succeed in forming to ourselves such a conception of the leading idea of the narrative that all its parts easily and naturally arrange themselves around it, we have good reason to believe that our conception is correct. This idea, it may be further remarked, is to be sought in the relation of the human heart to God, and not in any local or temporary circumstances. It was so in the cases before us. Doubtless it would have been possible for the Savior to have specified many causes which specially hindered, in those who then heard him, the true reception of his word. But he does not so. Those which he mentions were not peculiar to that age and country; they belong to every land and to all time. The devil, tribulation, and persecution, the cares of this world, the deceitfulness of riches; how general are they! they embrace the widest and most universal relations between the human heart and outward circumstances. So with the other. The field is not Judaea, but “the world;” “the good seed are the children of the kingdom, but the tares are the children of the wicked one.” Again, how general! we, as well as Christ's immediate hearers, are included there. The lesson is  important. What more common than for preachers to find the meaning of a parable, first in the circumstances of the time-for example, in the calling of the Jews and the rejection of the Gentiles — and then to proceed to a more general view of the truth contained in it, thus leaving upon the minds of their hearers the impression that the first is the correct interpretation, the second the wise and happy application of it? The very opposite is the case. The general is the true meaning; the. particular is only one of its applications suitable at the time, just as other applications might be suitable to any age if drawn from the circumstances by which the age is marked. How completely is the beautiful parable of the prodigal son ruined when we are told that the elder son is the Jew, the younger the Gentile. The instinct of a congregation which repels such a method of interpreting is more true to the nature of the parable than the would be archaeological explorations of the pulpit.

It is possible, no doubt, that the individual parts of a parable may be full of instruction. In that of the sower, what a field of thought is opened by the expression, “The seed is the Word of God” (Luk 8:11). In that of the prodigal son, the description of the younger son's wandering from his father's house, of the famine that came upon him in the strange land, of his want and misery, and of the degrading service to which he was subjected, form a striking representation of the nature and consequences of sin, which it is impossible to pass over. But in both cases, as in all others, the particular point to be observed is this, that such lessons must be kept subordinate to the main drift of the parable, and must be so treated as to bring more powerfully home to us its one leading idea. That in themselves they may teach more is possible. Who shall measure the infinite extent of the wisdom of Christ, or the inexhaustible meaning which may lie in the simplest utterance of him “in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,” who is “the same yesterday, to-day, and forever?” But, considered as parts of the parable in which they occur, such separate clauses or incidents are to be looked at in the light of the general lesson which it teaches, and may only be so treated as to lend that lesson force. This is the one great principle by which we are to be guided; and, when we hold it fast, we may at once admit that the fuller the meaning which can be naturally imparted to each individual portion of the parable the more justice do we do to it. The danger of forgetting this has been frequently illustrated. It has led to an undue and unscriptural pressing both of specific traits of parables and the want of them. Thus, in that of the laborers in the market-  place, we might be easily led, by the last part of it (Mat 20:8-14), to the supposition that in the heavenly state the rewards of all Christ's servants will be equal — a supposition at variance with many other passages of Scripture. How often has it been argued that the doctrine of the atonement was not taught by the Redeemer, because in the parable of the prodigal son there is no mention made of expiation or intercession before the wanderer is welcomed to his father's house, and embraced in the arms of his father's love. It is of the utmost importance, therefore, to fix clearly in the mind the general lesson of a parable, and to keep everything subservient to it.

2. While there is thus one leading idea in each parable, the explanations already referred to as given by our Lord further show that there are even few of its smallest particulars which have not a meaning. The difficulty, indeed, of determining what then meaning in each case is, and the extravagant and fanciful lengths to which some interpreters have gone, has generally led to an opposite conclusion. It has been urged, and not wholly without reason, that every story must have some things in it which serve only to give liveliness and force to the delineation, which are mere transition points from one part of the narrative to another; and that to assign a meaning to these is to substitute simply human fancies for the teaching of God. To this the only reply is that there is danger in either extreme; but that our tendency ought to be to seek a meaning in such traits, rather than the reverse, seems clear. For, in the first place, the aim of the parable is not poetical, but ethical. The story is not told for its own sake, but for the sake of the lesson; and it is reasonable, therefore, to infer that it will be constructed in such a manner as to answer this end as far as possible in all its traits. In the second place, the course followed by our Lord is conclusive upon the point. In the parable of the sower, the field, the birds of the air, the heat of the sun, the thorns and brambles of the bad ground, the thirty, sixty, and hundred fold of the good ground, have all a meaning. Nor is it otherwise in that of the tares and the wheat. How readily might we suppose that the reapers were only subordinate to the harvest. There cannot be a harvest without reapers. Yet “the reapers are the angels;” while the field itself, the man who sowed good seed, the enemy who sowed tares, and the harvest, are each explained. There is hardly a trait in either parable that is destitute of force. The conclusion is irresistible.However difficult it may be to make the application of each, the attempt is to be made, and our main object must be to discover the limits beyond which we may not go.  Here, again, we cannot offer rules which promise to be of much use, but attention to the following principles may help us.

(a) Traits which cannot be applied to the relation between God and man belong only to the coloring. In the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, we read that the Master said to one-class of the workers, “Take that thine is, and go thy way” (Mat 20:14). Words like these cannot be literally applied to the relation between God and man. We have nothing of our own, no' claim of our own to reward. After we have done all, we are unprofitable servants. “The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” This trait, therefore, is simply a part of the filling out of the narrative.

(b) Traits which, if interpreted, would lead to conclusions contrary to the analogy of faith belong only to the coloring. In the parable of the unmerciful servant we read, “But, forasmuch as he had not to pay, his lord commanded him to be sold, and his wife and children, and all that he had and payment to be made.” (Mat 18:25). Shall we infer that wives are to suffer for their husbands', children for their fathers' sins? The analogy of faith answers, No. Such a lesson, then, cannot be associated with the particulars referred to. They spring only from the fact that, after the manner of Eastern nations, the wife and children were considered to be the husband's and father's property. Again we have simply a part of the filling out of the narrative (comp. Scholten, quoted in Lisco, On the Parables [Clark's translation], p. 105).

(c) Traits which, if interpreted, would teach doctrines not elsewhere taught in Scripture belong only to the coloring. In the parable of the ten virgins, we are informed that “five of them were wise, and five were foolish” (Mat 25:2). Give a meaning to this, and we must infer that the number of the saved and of the lost will be the same. Such a doctrine is nowhere taught us in the Bible, and again we conclude that the circumstance mentioned only fills out the narrative.

(d) Traits to which an interpretation cannot be given without indulging in fancies and conceits belong only to the coloring. In the parable of the prodigal son, ‘ the father said to his servants, Bring forth the best robe and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet” (Luk 15:22). To see in this the general tokens of restoration to all the privileges of a son in his father's house is evidently required. But, to understand by the “best robe” the robe of the Savior's righteousness, by the “ring” the gift  of the Spirit whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption, and by the “shoes” those works of our calling whereby “the penitent shall be equipped for holy obedience” (Trench, On the Parables, p. 412), seems to be pushing interpretation to a fanciful extent. The same thing may be said of Trench's interpretation of Mat 13:33, “The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal,” where he makes the three measures of meal represent the three parts of the then known world, or the three sons of Noah, or the three elements, spirit, soul, and body, which together make up the man (On the Parables, p. 114, 115).

Bearing these cautions in mind, the more minute our interpretation of a parable is, the more do we conform to the example of Him whose parables we interpret. Our great guide, however, must be a spiritual tact and discernment cultivated by close communion with Christ himself, an intelligent perception of Christian principles, a rich experience of the practical power of the divine life as it works in ourselves, and a knowledge of the world and its working there. We must constantly bear in mind that the parables of Christ teach. directly neither history nor doctrine nor morals nor prophecy. They express directly only certain great principles of the Savior's divine kingdom, of the kingdom of heaven or of God, when that kingdom comes into contact with the human heart. History, doctrine, morals, prophecy, may be deduced from them, because the truth of God and the human heart are essentially the same in all ages. But it is with principles alone that the parables deal; with principles which imply doctrines, which result in morals, which appear in the history of the past, and will reappear in the future. To set forth these principles in a sphere which is wider than that of either individuals or churches, in the sphere of divine truth in contact with the heart of man, is the object of the New Testament parables. SEE INTERPRETATION.

V. Literature. — The following are strictly exegetical works on all the parables of our Lord exclusively; we designate a few of the most important by prefixing an asterisk: Roger, Parables (Lond. 1690, 4to; in Germ. Hafn. 1648, 4to); Keach, Exposition (Lond. 1701, fol.; 1856, 8vo);: Bragge, Discourses (ibid. 1711, 2 vols. 8vo); Lyncken, Parabelen (Utrecht, 1712, 8vo); Vitringa, Parabelen (Amst. 1715, 4to; in Germ. Leips. 1717, 4to); Dodd, Discourses (Lond. 1751, 2 vols. 8vo); Bulkley, Discourses (ibid. 1771, 4 vols. 8vo); Gray, Delineation (ibid. 1777, 1818; in Germ. Hanov.  1781, 8vo); Bauer, Parabeln (Leips. 1781, 8vo); Eylert, Homilien (Halle, 1806, 1818, 8vo); Farrer, Sermons (Lond. 1809, 8vo); Collyer, Lectures (ibid. 1815, 8vo); Grinfield, Sermons (ibid. 1819, 8vo); Kromm, Parabeln (Fulda, 1823, 8vo); Upjohn, Discourses (Wells, 1824, 3 vols. 8vo); Mount, Lectures (Lond. 1824, 12mo); Lonsdale, Exposition (ibid. 1825,12mo); Baily, Exposition (ibid. 1828, 8vo); Knight, Discourses (ibid. 1830, 8vo); \*Lisco, Parabeln (Berlin, 1832, and often later, 8vo; in Engl. [Clark's Bibl. Cab.] Edinb. 1840,12mo); Mackenzie (Mary), Lectures (Lond. 1833, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Greswell, Exposition (Oxf. 1834, 5 vols. 8vo); Cubitt, Conversations (Lond. 1840,18mo); Zimmermann, Gleichnisse (Darmst. 1840-42,2 vols. 8vo); \*Trench, Notes (Lond. 1841, and often later; N. Y. 1861, 8vo); Mrs. Best, Tracts (Lond. 1841, 12mo); De Valenti, Parabeln (Basle, 1841, 2 vols. 8vo); Close, Discourses (London, 12mo); \* Arndt, Gleichnissreden (Magdeb. 1842-47,1846-60, 6 vols. 8vo); Horlock, Ersition (vol. i, Lond. 1844, 12mo); Burns, Sermons (ibid. 1847, 12mo); Krummacher, Parables (from the Germ. ibid. 1849, 12mo; 1853, 4to); Lord Stanley (Earl of Derby), Conversations (ibid. 1849,18mo); Cumming, Lectures (ibid. 1852, 12mo); Newland, Postils (ibid. 1854, 12mo); Stevens, Parables (Phila. 1855, 8vo); Kirk, Lectures (N. Y. 1856, 12mo); Oxenden, Parables (Lond. 1865,1866, 8vo); Machlachlan, Notes (ibid. 1870, 8vo); De Teissier, Parables (ibid. 1870, 12mo). For treatises and discussions on the nature and other relations of the miracles, and for practical expositions of particular miracles, see the references in Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 34; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 33; Danz, Worterbuch, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. (see index); Malcolm, Theological Index, s.v.

## Parabolani[[@Headword:Parabolani]]

             a term applied in the ancient Christian Church to those who employed themselves in visiting the sick. The name may have been given to them because they exposed παρέβαλον themselves to danger by such services, just as the Greeks applied a kindred term (πάραβολοι from παραβάλλεσθαι τὴν ζωήν to put one's life in jeopardy; comp. Php 2:30) to those who hired themselves out to fight with wild beasts in the amphitheater; and the former office was considered, especially in times of public pestilence, as a work of similar danger. The Parabolani belonged to the inferior clergy, and consisted of a kind of brotherhood, who were under the supervision of the bishop. They seem to have originated at Alexandria. They did not confine themselves to their legitimate sphere, but took an interest in ecclesiastical matters, frequently  as supporters of the bishops to whose diocese they belonged. Thus the Parabolani appeared at the Robber Synod in Ephesus (449). At Alexandria they were, during the 4th century, in a sense the bodyguard of the patriarch. By imperial edict their number was limited there to five hundred, which was, however, in 418, during an epidemic, temporarily increased to six hundred. See Julius, An Essay on the Public Care for the Sick as produced by Christianity (1825).

## Parabrahma[[@Headword:Parabrahma]]

             a term often used to denote Brahm (q.v.), the supreme divinity of the Hindûs.

## Paracelsus, Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Bombastus[[@Headword:Paracelsus, Philippus Aureolus Theophrastus Bombastus]]

             an eccentric character of the 16th century, who as physician, magician, and theosophist exercised no inconsiderable influence on certain branches of science and theology. His father was a physician, a native of the Swiss canton of Appenzell, and bore the name William Hechener, but his more ambitious son claimed descent from a noble Suabian family, Von Hohenheim, and changed his patronymic by an odd Graeco-Latin translation into the appellation of Paracelsus, by which he is generally known. His mother had been matron in the hospital of a convent at Einsiedeln. He was an only child, born in 1493 in that small town, in the canton of Schwytz, nine miles from Zurich, famous for a cloister and shrine of St. Mary, to which thousands of pilgrims still flock. Einsiedeln in German meaning hermitage, be sometimes added “Ereinita” to his name, to designate his native place. It is related that as an infant of three years he had the misfortune to be mutilated by a sow in his private parts; his portrait (in Mackay's Extraordinary Delusions, p. 143) shows him indeed without beard, nor was he fond of female society; yet there is no mention made of a mutation of voice usually the consequence of castration. This sexual defect, however, seems not to have impaired the development of his mental faculties. He received his first instruction from his father, who tried to prepare him for the medical profession. Young Theophrastus proved an apt scholar in all that he was taught, and as he was desirous of further accomplishments, especially in alchemy,, then the rage of the age, he was placed in tuition with Trithemius, the celebrated abbot of Sponheim, and later with Sigismund Fugger, who in Schwatz (Tyrol) carried on a large laboratory; and there, Paracelsus assures us, he learned spagyric operations  effectually. Imbued with a most ardent desire for information of every kind, he spent several years in traveling, during which he applied to all eminent masters of alchemical philosophy, and visited the universities of Germany, France, Italy, and Spain; he even ventured to the less civilized countries of Northern Europe and Asia, and tried to gather from all sorts of people some knowledge which he might turn to advantage for his own purposes. In this pursuit of “secrets,” often under difficulties, he was once taken prisoner on the confines of Russia, and brought before the khan of the Tartars.

This barbaric potentate he succeeded in so impressing, and so ingratiated, himself with him, that he was sent in the train of the khan's son on an embassy to Constantinople. It was there, according to his statement, that Paracelsus, in his twenty-eighth year, was initiated into the secret of the philosopher's stone. He was frequently retained as surgeon to armies in battles and sieges. Returning to Switzerland, he soon became renowned by. his wonderful cures, and was introduced to such men as Erasmus, the printer Froben, OEcolampadius, and other distinguished personages. In his thirty-third year he boasted of having cured thirteen princes whose cases had been declared hopeless. By such recommendations he obtained in 1526 the appointment as professor of physic and surgery at the University of Basle. He commenced his course of lectures by denouncing Galen and Avicenna, then standard authorities, as corrupters of medicine, and, taking a brazen chafing-dish, lighted some sulphur and threw their works into the flames, exclaiming, “Sic vos ardebitis in Gehenna.” For Hippocrates, on the contrary, he professed great respect. For a while the singular manners and the novelty of his opinions rendered Paracelsus extremely popular, and his room was thronged with students; but his extravagances and self- glorification soon disgusted not a few of the more sober-minded. Among other things, he declared before his audience that he would even consult the devil, if God would not assist him in finding out the secrets of physic. He pretended to have invented an elixir of life which would insure to the happy partaker the age of Methuselah, and dealt in other wonderful preparations, to which he gave pompous and strange names. An outburst of passion deprived him of his professorship. A certain canon Von Lichtenfels, afflicted with gout in the stomach, given over by his physicians, applied to Paracelsus, and promised him one hundred florins for a cure. Paracelsus gave him three small pills of his laudanum, and relieved him. When he demanded his fee, the canon refused so large a sum, as it had taken so little medicine and time to cure him.

He sued the churchman; the magistrate favored the canon, and adjudged Paracelsus only a trifle of the  amount; whereupon Paracelsus reproached the justice with ignorance and partiality. The insult was reported to the city council, who pronounced a verdict of expulsion. Paracelsus, urged by his friends,had anticipated the sentence by a precipitate flight, in 1528. Henceforth his career was a downward course. He recommenced a wandering life in Alsace, and other parts of Germany and Switzerland, rarely staying long in any one place. He associated with low company, abandoned himself to intemperance, and when in his cups would threaten to summon a million of souls to show his power over them. By occasional extraordinary cures he measurably maintained his reputation. In the summer of 1541 he was called by the archbishop of Salzburg to that city. Here too he ranted against the old- fashioned regular doctors. In revenge he was by the servants of the aggrieved party thrown out of the window of an inn. The fall proved fatal, and thus, Sept. 24, 1541, he ended his erratic life. He was buried in the cemetery of the hospital of St. Sebastian, to which he bequeathed the inconsiderable remnant of his property. It would be here out of place to descant on the merits or demerits of his medical practice. His epitaph tells perhaps all that can be said in commendation of it: “Lepram, podagram, hydropsin aliaque insanabilia corporis contagia mirifica arte sustulit,” including his treatment of syphilis and obstinate ulcers, in which he excelled. Though Paracelsus pretended to be guided by Hippocratic principles, his action appears more that of an empiric. He taught rather a trust in experience and experiment, and ascertaining the nature of the drugs and specific application of them, than a dependence on obsolete theory, and thus he encouraged independent observation and research. His knowledge of chemistry was equal, if not superior, to that of any adept of his time. As regards his theosophical views, they are a quaint medley of the metaphysical and physical, and it is difficult to determine them, on account no less of the subject-matter than by reason of the obscure, singular language he invented, and the peculiar sense he put upon words different from their common signification. He supposed an analogy between the universe (macrocosmus) and the human system (microcosmus, or little world).

He gave currency to the opinion, still indicated in our popular almanacs, that the principal parts of a man's body stand in some relation with and under control of the planets; e.g. the heart with the sun, the brain with the moon, the spleen with Saturn, the lungs with Mercury, the kidneys and genital organs with Venus, etc., and extended this influence also to plants, minerals, and animals. He maintained a prima materia, whence spring, among other things, the seeds of plants, animals, and minerals;  generation, he asserts, is only the exit of the seed from darkness to light. Besides the so-called four elements (fire, earth, air, and water), and three principles (salt, sulphur, and mercury), he taught that there is in all natural bodies something of a celestial nature, a quintessence, a substance corporeally drawn from bodies that increase, and from everything that has life, free from all impurity and mortality, the highest subtlety separated from all elements. This he calls by several names: philosophical tincture, philosopher's stone, the flower, the sun, heaven, and ethereal spirit. He believed in an internal illumination, an emanation from Divinity, and in the universal harmony of all things. His mysticism is a kind of pantheism, for which he was decried as an infidel, heretic, and atheist. He was decidedly in favor of the Reformation, as of a tendency to liberate and liberalize the mind from superstition and bigotry. Paracelsus was a contemporary of Luther, and already half a Protestant. He regarded Christ as the light of nature as well as of man, and sought to show the inward relation between the revelation given in Christianity and that manifested in nature. He also held that there is an inward relation between nature and man. Everything is contained in each individual man: he is a microcosm; he has within him even all the spirits of the stars; the only question is how to arouse them. He admitted no astrological fate over man, nor any objective magic; magic is to be found in man himself; it is the power of a man united to God by faith. Faith is omnipotent; it effects what it conceives, what it chooses. In his view, magical power, properly so called, is the imagination of faith, for God also created all things by means of imagination.

He has but little to say of sin and justification, but much of the sickness of the body and the reason; this, however, is healed by the imaginative power of the spirit which has placed itself in relation to Christ, and received his Spirit. As our souls were poured into our bodies by God himself in unfathomable love, so do we also receive from Christ, through the Holy Spirit, and by means of the imagination of faith, the seed of a heavenly and spiritual body. This takes place especially in the Lord's Supper, so that Christ has his incarnations in all believers through the Spirit. A tendency towards forming spirit and corpority into a unity is here unmistakable; but this mysticism does not see its way to such a unity except in the case of Christ's glorified body and our resurrection body. Here it finds that union of spirit and nature which it does not extend to the earthly body. This it regards as rejected and a prey to death by reason of its material nature, in which notion a still unsurmounted remnant of dualism, is apparent (Dorner, Hist. of Prot. Theol. 2:179). In spite ,of his abhorrence of book-learning, and his  many peregrinations, which would not allow him much time for studied compositions, there are quite a large number of treatises extant which claim Paracelsus as their author; but they are so manifold and so unequal that it is hardly possible to believe that they proceeded from the same brain. The most of them may rather be denominated Paracelsiana — works and interpolations of Paracelsists, his disciples. During his lifetime only a few of them were printed: the first three books of his Chirurgia magna (Ulm, 1536): — De natura rerum (1539): — perhaps also De compositionibus, De gradibus, De Tartaro the explanation of which constituted the subject of his lectures. The following are deemed genuine: Chirurgia magna: — Chirurgia minor: — Depeste: — Archidoxa medicinoe: — De ortu rerum naturalium: — De vita rerum naturalium: — De transformatione rerum naturalium: — De vita longa: — De mineralibus. Many of the theological essays passing under his name are regarded as spurious. The most complete collection of his writings is the one edited by Dr. Huser in Strasburg (1616-18, 3 vols. fol.); the earliest and best is in German (Basle, 1589-90, 10 vols. 4to), followed by that in Latin (Frankf. 1603, 10 vols. 4to; Geneva, 1658, 3 vols. fol.).

## Paraclete[[@Headword:Paraclete]]

             (Παράκλητος, lit. one called near for aid; A.V. “Comforter”). This word is applied in the original to Christ in 1Jn 2:1, where it is translated “advocate” (q.v.). Indeed, in that famous passage in which Christ promises the Holy Spirit as a paraclete (“comforter”) to his sorrowing disciples, he takes the title to himself: “I will send you another paraclete” (Joh 14:16). The question then is, In what sense does Christ denominate himself and the Spirit sent from him and the Father, παράκλητος, paraclete? The answer to this is not to be found without some difficulty. and it becomes the more difficult from the fact that in genuine Greek the verb παρακαλεῖν has a variety of significations: (1) To call to a place, to call to aid; (2) to admonish, to persuade, to incite; (3) to entreat, to pray. To these may be added the Hellenistic signification, “to console;” “to soothe;” “to encourage.” Finally. the rabbins also in their language use the word פְּרִקַלַיט (peraklit) for the Angel of Intercession (Job 43:23), a fact which must be taken into consideration. In the explanation of the word the leading circumstance to guide us must be to take that signification which is applicable to the different passages in which it occurs. For we may distinguish three interpretations:

(1.) Origen explains it where it is applied to the Holy Spirit by “Consolator” (παραμυθητής), while in 1Jn 2:1 he adopts the signification of “Deprecator.” This is the course taken by most of the Greek commentators: (Suicer, Thesaur. s.v.), — and which has been followed by Erasmus, Luther, and others. But to this Tholuck and others object that, not to insist that the signification cannot be grammatically established (for no admissible instance can be adduced where the passive παράκλητος is used in an active sense for παρακλήτωρ), it is suitable to a very few passages only, while to others it is either too circumscribed or altogether inappropriate.

(2.) Aware of this, others, after the example of Theodore of Mopsuestia, sanctioned by Mede, Ernesti, and others, would translate it teacher. But neither does this sense seem adapted to all the passages. It would also be difficult to deduce it from the usages of the language; for — not to mention that in this case also the active signification would be assumed for the passive form — we are pressed with the question whether the verb παρακαλεῖν can anywhere in the New Testament be found in the sense of “to teach,” as this hypothesis assumes. It is at least very certain that this sense never was transferred to the rabbinical פְּרִקַלַיטָא, the peraklita, advocate or interpreter. (Buxtorf, Lex. Talmudicum, col. 1843).

(3.) The considerations which tell against these views incline the balance in favor of a third sense, which is that of assistant, “helper,” coadjutor; hence “advocate” (intercessor). Demosthenes uses it with this force in a judicial sense (see Index, ed. Reiske); and it occurs in the same sense in Philo (see Loesner, Observatt.), and in the rabbinlical dialect. It is supported by Rom 8:26, and, which is still more to the purpose, is appropriate to all the passages in the New Testament where the word occurs. After the example of the early Latin fathers, Calvin, Beza, Lampe, Bengel, Knapp, Kuinil, Tittmann, and many others, have adopted this sense. Tertullian and Augustine have advocate. The A.V. renders the word by “advocate” in 1Jn 2:1, but in other places (Joh 14:16; Joh 14:26; Joh 15:26; Joh 16:7) by “comforter.” How much better, however, the more extensive term “helper” (including teacher, monitor, advocate) agrees with these passages than the narrow term “comforter” may be shown by a single instance. Jesus says to his disciples, “I will send you another paraclete” (Joh 14:16), implying that he himself had been such to them. But he had not been in any distinguishing sense a “comforter” or “consoler,” because, having him present with them, they had not mourned (Mat 9:15). But he had  been eminently a helper, in the extensive sense which has been indicated; and such as he had been to them — to teach, to guide, and to uphold — the Holy Spirit would become to them after his removal (see the commentators above named, particularly Tholuck and Tittmann on Joh 14:16; also Knapp, De Sp. S. et Christi Paracletis, Halle, 1790; Hare, Mission of the Comforter). See the treatises De Paracleto, by Scherff (Lips. 1714), Knapp (Halle, 1790), Volborth (Gotting. 1786), Hugenholz (Leyden, 1834). SEE HOLY SPIRIT.

## Paracletice[[@Headword:Paracletice]]

             (παρακλητική) is a book of anthems or hymns used among the Greek Christians, and derives its name from its office, as it chiefly tends to comfort the sinner, or because the hymns are partly invocatory, consisting of pious addresses to God and the saints. The hymns of the Paracletice are not appropriated to particular days, but contain something proper to be recited every day, in the mass; vespers, matins, and other offices. Allatius finds great fault with this book, and says there are many things in it disrespectful to the Virgin Mary, and many things ascribed to her against all reason and equity; that it affirms that John the Baptist, after his death, preached Christ in hell.; and that Christ himself, when he descended into hell, freed all mankind from the punishments of that place, and the power of the devil.

## Paradise[[@Headword:Paradise]]

             is but an Anglicized form of the Greek word παράδεισος, which is identical with the Sanscrit paradesa, Persian pardes, and appears also in the Hebrew pardes, פִּרְדֵּס, and the Arabic firdarus. In all these languages it has essentially the same meaning, a park. It does not occur in the Old Testament, in the English version, but is used in the Sept. to translate the Hebrew gân, גָּן, a garden (Gen 2:8 sq.), and thence found its way into the New Testament, where it is applied figuratively to the celestial dwelling of the righteous, in allusion to the Garden of Eden (2Co 12:4; Rev 2:7). It has thus come into familiar use to denote both that garden and the heaven of the just. SEE EDEN.

I. Literal Application of the Name (Scriptural and profane). — Of this word (παράδεισος) the earliest instance that we have is in the Cyropaedia and other writings of Xenophon, nearly 400 years before  Christ; but his use of it has that appearance of ease and familiarity which leads us to suppose that it was current among his countrymen. A wide, open park, enclosed against injury, yet with its natural beauty unspoiled, with stately forest-trees, many of them bearing fruit, watered by clear streams, on whose banks roved large herds of antelopes or sheep — this was the scenery which connected itself in the mind of the Greek traveler with the word: παράδεισος, and for which his own language supplied no precise equivalent (comp. Anab. 1:2, § 7; 4, § 9; 2:4, § 14; Hellen. 4:1, § 15; Cyrop. 1:3, § 14; (Econom. 4, § 13). We find it also used by Plutarch, who lived in the 1James , 2 d century of our aera. It was by these authors evidently employed to signify an extensive plot of ground, enclosed with a strong fence or wall, abounding in trees, shrubs, plants, and garden culture, and in which choice animals were kept in different ways of restraint or freedom, according as they were ferocious or peaceable; thus answering very closely to the English word park, with the addition of gardens, a menagerie, and an aviary. The circumstance which has given this term its extensive and popular use is its having been taken by the Greek translators of the Pentateuch, in the 3d century B.C., and, following them, in the ancient Syriac version, and by Jerome in the Latin Vulgate, as the translation of the garden (גָּן, gan) which the benignant providence of the Creator prepared for the abode of innocent and happy man.

The translators also use it, not only in the twelve places of Genesis 2, 3, but in eight others, and two in which the feminine form (גִּנָּה) occurs; whereas, in other instances of those two words, they employ κῆπος, the usual Greek word for a garden or an enclosure of fruit-trees. But there are three places in which the Hebrew text itself has the very word, giving it the form פִּרְדֵּס, pardes. These are, “the keeper of the king's forest, that he may give me timber” (Neh 2:8); orchards (Ecc 2:5); “an orchard of pomegranates” (Son 4:13). Through the writings of Xenophon, and through the general admixture of Orientalisms in the later Greek after the conquests of Alexander, the word gained a recognized place, and the Sept. writers chose it for a new use, which gave it a higher worth and secured for it a more perennial life. The Garden of Eden became ὁ παράδεισος τῆς τρυφῆς (Gen 2:15; Gen 2:23; Joe 2:3). They used the same word whenever there was any allusion, however remote, to the fair region which had been the first blissful home of man. The valley of the Jordan, in their version, is the paradise of God (Gen 13:10). There is no tree in the paradise of God equal to that which in the prophet's  vision symbolizes the glory of Assyria (Eze 31:1-9). The imagery of this chapter furnishes a more vivid picture of the scenery of a παράδεισος than we find elsewhere. The prophet to whom “the word of the Lord came” by the river of Chebar may well have seen what he describes so clearly. Elsewhere, however, as in the translation of the three passages in which pardes occurs in the Hebrew it is used in a more general sense (comp. Isa 1:30; Num 24:6; Jer 29:5). In the apocryphal book of Susanna (a moral tale or little novel, possibly founded on some genuine tradition) the word paradise is constantly used for the garden. It occurs also in three passages of the Son of Sirach, the first of which is in the description of Wisdom: “I came forth as a canal dug from a river, and as a water-pipe into a paradise” (24:30). In the other two it is the objective term of comparisons: “Kindness is as a paradise in blessings, and mercifulness abideth forever — the fear of the Lord is as a paradise of blessing, and it adorns above all pomp” (40:17, 27). Josephus calls the gardens of Solomon, in the plural number, “paradises” (Ant. 8:7, 3). Berosus (B.C. cent. 4), quoted by Josephus (c. Apion, 1:20), says that the lofty garden-platforms erected at Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar were called the Suspended Paradise.

The word itself, though it appears in the above form in the Son 4:13; Ecc 2:5; Neh 2:8, may be classed, with hardly a doubt, as of Aryan rather than of Shemitic origin. It first appears in Greek as coming straight from Persia (Xenoph. ut sup.). Greek lexicographers classify it as a Persian word (Julius Pollux. Onomast. 9:3). Modern philologists accept the same conclusion with hardly a dissentient voice (Renan, Langues Semitiques, 2:1, p. 153). “The word is regarded by most learned men as Persian, of the same signification as the Hebrew gan. Certainly it was used by the Persians in this sense, corresponding to their darchen; but that it is an Armenian word is shown both from its constant use in that language and from its formation, it being compounded of two Armenian simple words, part and ses, meaning necessary grains or edible herbs. The Armenians apply this word, pardes, to denote a garden adjoining the dwelling, and replenished with the different sorts of grain, herbs, and flowers for use and ornament” (Schroederi Thesaur. Ling. Armen. Dissert. p. 56 Amsterd. 1711). With this E. F. C. Rosenmüller accords (Bibl. Alterthumsk. vol. i, pt. i, p. 174): “It corresponds to the Greek παράδεισος, a word appropriated to the pleasure-gardens and parks with wild animals around the palace of the Persian monarchs. The  origin of the word, however, is to be sought with neither the Greeks nor the Hebrews, but in the languages of Eastern Asia. We find it in Sanscrit paradesha, a region of surpassing beauty; and the Armenian pardes, a park or garden adjoining the house, planted with trees for use and ornament.” “A paradise, i.e. an orchard, an arboretum, particularly of pomegranates, a park, a fruit-garden; a name common to several Oriental languages, and especially current among the Persians, as we learn from Xenophon and Julius Pollux: Sanscrit, pardesha; Armenian, pardezo; Arabic, firdaus; Syriac, fardaiso; Chaldee of the Targums, pardesa” (First, Concord. V. T. p. 920, Leipsic, 1840). Gesenius (s.v.) traces it a step farther, and connects it with the Sanscrit paradanae, high, well-tilled land, as applied to an ornamental garden attached to a house. Other Sanscrit scholars, however, assert that the meaning of pardefa in classical Sanscrit is “foreign- country;” and although they admit that it may also mean “the best or most excellent country,” they look on this as an instance of casual coincidence rather than derivation. Other etymologies, more fanciful and far-fetched, have been suggested: (1) from παρά and δεύω, giving as a meaning the “well-watered ground” (Suidas, s.v.); (2) from παρά and δεῖσα, a barbarous word, supposed to signify a plant, or collection of plants (Joann. Damasc. in Suidas, l.c.); (3) from פרה דשא, to bring forth herbs; (4) פרה הרס, to bring forth myrrh (Ludwig, De raptu Pauli in Parad. in Menthei's Thesaur. Theolog. 1702).

On the assumption that the Song of Solomon and Ecclesiastes were written in the time of Solomon, the occurrence of the foreign word may be accounted for either (1) on the hypothesis of later forms having crept into the text in the process of transcription, or (2) on that of the word having found its way into the language of Israel at the time when its civilization took a new flight under the son of David, and the king borrowed from the customs of Central Asia that which made the royal park or garden part of the glory of the kingdom. In Neh 2:8, as might be expected, the word is used in a connection which points it out as distinctly Persian. The account given of the hanging gardens of Babylon, in like manner, indicates Media as the original seat both of the word and of the thing. Nebuchadnnezzar constructed them terrace upon terrace, that he might reproduce in the plains of Mesopotamia the scenery with which the Median princess he had married had been familiar in her native country; and this was the origin of the κρεμαστὸς παράδεισος (Berosus, in Josephus, c. Revelation , 1, 9).

II. The Terrestrial Paradise (chiefly condensed from Winer). —

1. Biblical Description. — The name was originally applied to “the garden of Eden” (Gen 2:8; Gen 4:16,; comp. 2:8), from the name of the region in which it lay; an Eastern country, the first dwelling-place of the human race. It was watered by a river which passed out from the garden, in four arms or branches (Hebr. רָאשַׁים, heads, i.e. streams, not springs), of which one, Pison, surrounded the land of Havilah, which was rich in gold, bellium, and the stone shoham — SEE ONYX; the second, Gihon, surrounded the land of Cush — SEE ETHIOPIA. The third, Hiddekel, flowed to the east of Assyria; and the fourth was the Euphrates; the last, being generally known, was not described (see Gen 2:10 sq.). Yet this account has been variously understood, Rosenmüller understanding by heads (רָאשַׁים, v. 10), head-streams; and Gesenius, the beginnings of distinct rivers.

These apparently exact topographical data have excited the zeal of historians and theologians, who have vied with each other in efforts to point out the precise geographical site of the garden. It is unnecessary. here to adduce all the views proposed. Most of them are collected in Morini Diss. de Paradiso Terrestri (in the Leyden edition of Bochart, Opp. 2:9 sq., and in Ugolino, Thesaur. vii); in the Allgenmeine Welthistor. 1:117 sq.; in Hottinger, Enneas Dissert. p. 64 sq.; in Eichhorn's Urgesch. by Gabler, II, 1:76 sq.; in Bellerman's Handb. 1:143 sq.; and in Schulthess, Das Paradies, das irdische u. Uberirdische, historische, mythische, u. nystische (Zur. 1816). Comp. also Rosenmüller, Alterth. 1, 1:172 sq.; Marck, Hist. Paradis. Illustrat. (Amsterd. 1705). It was most natural, in order to have a fixed starting-point, to begin with the sufficiently known position of the rivers Euphrates (פְּרָת) and Tigris (הַדֶּקֶּל). All hypotheses which do not do this are manifestly groundless, and we may omit their consideration (for example, that set forth by Latreille, in his Memoires sur divers sujets Deuteronomy 1 -hist. nat. des insect, de Geogr. ancienne; etc. [Paris, 1819]; that of Kannegiesser, Grundriss der Alterthumswissensch. [Halle, 1815]; and likewise that of Hasse, Preussens Anspruiche ans Bernsteinland [Konigsberg, 1709], who supposes Eden to have been on the coast of Prussia!). But a difficulty arises in attempting to find two other rivers, which, with the Tigris and Euphrates, could once have come from one source. This but few have endeavored with care to solve; as Calvin (Comment. in Genesim), Huetius (De situ paradisi, in Ugolino, Thesaur.  vii), Bochart (Opera, 2:29 sq., and in Ugolino, Thesaur. vii), Morinus, J. Vorst (in Ugolino as above).

All these have understood the tenth verse to mean that the river in question parted, as it passed from the garden, into four rivers, two flowing northward and two southward. According to this view, we are to understand by the Pishon and Gihon, the two chief mouths of the Shat el-Arab, the united Tigris and Euphrates; Huetius and Bochart specifying Pishon as the western and Gihon as the eastern, on etymological grounds; Calvin, Grotius, and Hottinger, on the contrary, make Pishon the Pasitigris, while they differ in identifying the others. The land of Cush was supposed by these interpreters to be the Chusistan of the Persians; or the name was found in the Cissii (Κίσσιοι), as Strabo calls the people of Susiana (15:728. See Grotius on Gen 2:10). Havilah would then be the adjacent parts of Arabia, where Strabo places the Chaulotaioi (16:767), and Eden must be sought in the neighborhood of Korna (310O' 28” N. lat., 470 29' 18” E. long. from Greenwich), where the Euphrates and Tigris unite. But much my be urged against this view: 1, The word Cush, which often occurs in the Old Testament in the sense of Ethiopia (as Nah 3:9; Psa 68:31. Comp. Gesen. Thesaur. s.v. כּוּשׁ), is here applied to an entirely different and remote land; 2, the two chief mouths of the Shat el-Arab seem to have been scarcely known to the ancients, and were not important enough at best to be named with the Tigris and Euphrates; 3, nor is this the most natural interpretation of the tenth verse, as it not only fails to explain the term heads (יָאשַׁים) properly, but makes the manner of expression in general very awkward. Still more could be said against the view of J. Hopkinson (Descriptio Paradisi [Leyd. 1598]; also in Ugolinmos Thesaur. 7). He places the site of Paradise around Babylon, and, by the four streams proceeding from one, understands the two channels of the Euphrates, Nahar Malca and Maarsares (comp. Mannert, V, 2:342 sq.); the former of which runs towards the east; being Pishon; while the latter turns westward, the Gihon. On this scheme Susiana must be considered as Havilah, and Arabia is the land of Cush. Thus this author affords a more natural interpretation of Gen 2:10 than those before quoted; but his view seems open to fatal objections:

(1.) It is very improbable that the tradition, of Paradise should connect in its topography two artificial canals with the Euphrates and Tigris, for even if they were supposed to be natural streams, yet they could not be prominent features of a country which abounds in canals and sluices.

(2.) The fact that the Nahar Malca, whose course, indeed, is not clearly laid down, empties into the Tigris, which forms for a great distance the boundary of Susiana, is not a sufficient explanation of the phrase “compasseth the whole land of Havilab.”

(3.) There is no ether reason for identifying Susiana with Havilah than because the Nahar Malca is assumed to be Pishon.

(4.) The expression “from thence” (מַשָּׁם, Gen 2:10) refers more naturally to the garden (הִגָּן) than to the land of Eden (עֵדֶן). Erasmus Rask also places Paradise at Babylon (in Illgen's Zeitschrift, VI, 2:94 sq.). He makes the Shat el-Arab the original river of Eden (Gen 2:10); the Pishon is the Karun, the Pasitigris of the ancients; and the Gihon he finds in the Karasu, the ancient Gyndes. The last two empty. into the Shat el-Arab south of Korna. Cush is in his view Chusistan; Havilah is the coast beyond the mouth of the Shat el-Arab. Paradise would then stand on the western side of the latter stream, between Korna and Basra, some distance from the sea. It is plain that too much is assumed in this scheme, and that it is opposed by what we have remarked above as to the meaning of Cush.

In order to escape the difficulties presented in this account, attempts have been made to force upon the text various strange interpretations. Thus Verbrugge (Orat. de sit. Paradis. p. 11) understands the river (נָהָר) to mean merely a great abundance of springs,; and hence one need only seek a well-watered district of Asia to find Eden at once (comp. Jahn's Archaeol. I, 1:28). This certainly gives wide room for selection! But it is surpassed in this respect by the view, often urged, that the position of the rivers has changed in the course of ages (see Clericus, Ad. Gen 2:8; Reland; Baumgarten, Comment. I, 1:40). Calvin opposes this view (see Com. on Gen 2:10). This idea has been elaborated by Raumer (in the Hertha, 1829, 13:340 sq.), who adopts the idea that at one time the Black and Caspian seas were one; and, gathering together the Irtish, the Petchora, the Dwina, and the Volga, forms a Ural island, which he calls Havilab, ,and shows that gold is really found in that region. But this view, and in particular the beauty and pleasant climate of this region, are mere assumption (comp. with this theory that of Ephraem Syrus on Genesis 2, in his Opera, 1:23). Clericus understood by Pishon the Chrysorrhoas, which rises near Damascus, and appears by its very name to flow through a gold region (comp. Kohlreif, Das wegen Erschaf. d. Mensch. denk, wurd. Damask. Lubeck, 1737). Lakemacher (Observ. Philol. v. 195 sq.) also places  Paradise in Syria, but makes the Jordan the Pishon. Harduin, again (De situ Paradis. Ter. [excursus to Pliny's Hist. Nat. vi] 1:359 sq.), finds it in Galilee, and takes the Jordan for the original river. But his explanation of Gen 2:10 is too wild and trivial for refutation. Thus Gihon is the Dead Sea, and Pishon the river Achena in Arabia (mentioned by Pliny, 6:32). But Clericus explains the details plausibly. For Havilah he refers to 1Sa 15:7, where it is mentioned as a place near Palestine. He makes Cush the same with Cassiotis in Syria. (Strabo mentions a mount Casius in Seleucia, 16:750.) Gihon is then the Orontes (see Strabo, 16:750 sq.; Ammian. Marcel. xiv, 8, p. 29), and Eden also lies in Syria.

According to Reland (Dissert. Miscell. 1:1 sq.) and Calmet, Pishon is the Phasis, which rises in Mount Caucasus, and stands connected with the anciently famous gold land Colchis (Pliny, 6:4; Strabo, 11 498); and Gihon is the Araxes (modern Aras), which also arises in Armenia and flows into the Caspian. Cush is the land of the Cossseans (who are placed by the ancient geographers in the neighborhood of Media and the Caspian. Strabo, 11:522; 16:744; Diod. Sic. 17:111; comp. Mannert, V, 2:493 sq.). Thus all the four rivers arise in one region — in the Armenian mountains — and Armenia is Eden. Verbrugge agrees with this view for the most part, but would make Gihon the river Gyndes (see Herod. 1:189), which formed part of the boundary between Armenia and Matiana. J. D. Michaelis, who, however, is doubtful in respect to some of the rivers, was inclined to find the Gihon in the Oxus of the ancients, which is still by the Arabs and Persians called Jehfn; and compares the name Cush with the city Chath, which stood on the site of the present Balch, on the Oxus; Havilah wih the Chwalisher or Chwalisser (comp. Muller in Busching's Magazin, 16:287 sq.), the people from whom the Caspian Sea is called by the Russians the Chwalinskoje. Consistently with this view, Pishon might be the Aras (Araxes), although Michaelis does not suggest it (comp. Schlotzer, in Michaelis's Liter. Briefwechsel, i. 212 sq.). Jahn agrees in general with Michaelis (Archaol. I, 1:27 sq.), but makes Pishon the Phasis. This scheme of identification, in some form, certainly has the greatest countenance in the sacred text.

Hammer (in the Wiener Jahrbuch d. Lit. 1820, 9:21 sq.; comp. Mahn in Bertholdt's Journ. 11:327 sq.) finds the Mosaic Paradise in the elevated plain of Bactria. Pishon, in his view, is the river Sihon, or Jaxartes, which arises near the city Cha, and flows around the land Ilah, where lay the gold- mine of Turkistan, and where jewels and bdellium were also found. Havilah  is then Chowaresm; Gihon the Oxus, the river nearest the Jaxartes, which arises in the land of Hindû-Cush, or the Indian Caucasus. Link (Urwelt, 1:307, 1st ed.) understands Cush of the land around the Caucasus; Pishon of the Phasis; Gihon is the Kur (the Cyrus), and, as the sources of the streams are not far apart, he finds Paradise in the highland of Armenia and Grusinia, the original home of many kinds of fruit-trees and of grain.

All the hypotheses of this class, though differing so widely among themselves, have this in common, that they understand the Mosaic account to indicate a particular region of Asia; and comparing the names Havilah, Cush, etc., with names of similar sound which now occur in Syria, Armenia, and the vicinity of the Caspian Sea, combine the results with the position of the Tigris and Euphrates. In opposition, however, to this method of inquiry, it may be urged

(1) that Cush (Ethiopia) has a fixed geographical meaning, though of wide extent, and that hence every effort to give it an entirely new and special significance in this place, as is done by Clericus, Reland, Michaelis, and others, is exceedingly forced.

(2) That Havilah (1Sa 15:7) is certainly in Arabia, and cannot have bordered on the Chrysorrhoas.

(3) The fact that the Phasis of the ancients did not arise in Armenia, but in the Caucasus range, militates against Redmond's theory.

(4) To explain Havilah by a name which cannot be proved to be ancient at all (as Michaelis does) is pointless. (Beke's view [in Origines Bibl. 1:311 sq.] is worthless.)

2. Rationalistic Interpretations. — Turning from such doubtful inquiries, later German. interpreters have mostly agreed to consider Gen 2:10 sq. as a mythical description of the lost Paradise, to be compared with the Grecian accounts of the gardens of the Hesperides. They assume, as its possible foundation, an old tradition placing the original seat of the human race in Eastern Asia, which, however, like the Grecian myth referred to, grew by the free accretion of partial and fragmentary geographical notions, until the garden of Eden came to have a place as definite on the map of the world, in men's eyes, as the Gardens of the Hesperides, the Islands of the Blessed, or the Indian mountain Meru, from which four rivers pour forth to water the whole earth (comp. Bohlen, Indien, 2:210). Credner, however,  who adopts this view in the main, thinks that the account itself indicates a western position for Eden, and compares the “Islands of the Blessed,” which he identifies with the Canaries! — The authors of the Universal History receive the account in Genesis as giving Moses's geographical view, in the then imperfect state of knowledge (Allgemeine Welthistorie, 1:124); and it is plausibly urged that in early times the scientific method of statement, giving fragments of knowledge as such, apart. from all subjective notions, was unknown. Yet this view does not shut out the inquiry what particular lands and rivers were meant by the writer; and this question has been examined especially by Sickler, Buttmann, and Hartmann.

Sickler (in Augusti's Theol. Monatsschrift, 1, 1:1 sq., 75 sq.) supposes that the author of the account meant by the river (נָהָר) the Caspian Sea, viewing it as an enormous stream from the East. The first river named is Pishon, which surrounds the whole earth, from the east out to the Nile. The second is the Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Black seas, including also the Phasis. This, in the writer's view, surrounded the whole earth on the west, as far as the Nile. The third and fourth rivers, Tigris and Euphrates, are merely inland streams, dividing one region from another, but making the circuit of none. Eden is then in the vicinity of the Caspian, where there are very fruitful and pleasant tracts of country. According to Buttmann, however (Alteste Erdkunde des Morgenl. Berlin, 1803; also in his Mythologus, 1:63 sq.), this account was brought from Southern into Western Asia. The original writer conceives of the four chief streams of the world as if they proceeded from one region and were arms of a single river. In the central part of Southern Asia he was acquainted with the Indus and Ganges; while the Shat el-Arab, the united Tigris and Euphrates (called Euphrates when the story reaches Western Asia, because this river is there best known) towards the west, and the Irabatti in Ava and Pegu towards the east, were to him the limits of the known world. Pishon is compared with Besynga (βήσυγγα), called by Ptolemy (7:2) the most considerable stream of India east of the Ganges; Havilah with Ava, a very ancient Indian kingdom (known to the Greeks as χρυσῆ χρώα, land of gold), and with the name Eviltse, or Evilei, given in connection with the Chinese by an unknown author (Hudson, Expos. tot. Miundi, 3:2). Cush, like the Ethiopia of the Greeks, will then mean simply the extreme South. Gihon is the Ganges, and Hiddekel the Indus (called Hind, Hidd), the name Hiddekel being really the two names Hid, Chid, the Indus, and Dekel, the Tigris, which have been through carelessness or ignorance written together. Finally, the narrator by Assur, Assyria (v. 14), probably understood the  same region which later writers refer to the Medes or Persians. Hartmann (Aufkldrung fuber Asien, 1:249 sq.) attributes the whole geographical account in Genesis 2 to the Babylonian or Persian period, and places Paradise in Northern India, in the famous valley of Cashmere (see Herod. 3:17). As this valley is shut in by a chain of impassable mountains, covered with snow, from which on the north spring the tributaries of the Oxus, and on the south those of the Indus; and as the Behut (Hydaspes, modern Ihylum) flows through the valley, it is easy to suppose that a very old tradition might substitute one stream instead of one mountain chain as the source of several rivers. Now the Hebrew writer gave those names to these four streams of Paradise which seemed greatest to him; thus Gihon is the Oxus, Pishon the Phasis, Havilah is Colchis, Cush is Bactria, or Balk. Just such a fanciful conception as this tradition presents lies at the basis of the exposition of Josephus (Antiq. 1:1, 3), extending, however, only to the Pishon and the Gihon, which he makes to be the Ganges and the Nile respectively (comp. Epiphan. Opera, 2:60; Hottinger, Enneas Dissertat. p. 67 sq.). The fact that Havilah is mentioned as abounding in gold might be adduced to support this view of the Pishon. But although India was known as a gold country, yet Africa, and, in Western Asia, Arabia, were far more famous in this respect; and the reference of Havilah to a special district on this ground is mere waywardness. The reference of Gihon to the Nile by Josephus is adopted by most of the fathers (see esp. Theophil. Antol. 2:24; Philostorg. in Niceph. Hist. Eccles. 9:19), and in this view the Ethiopian Nile, with its branches, may be understood (see Gesen. Thesaur. 1:282). Even the Greeks connected the Nile with the Indus (Pishon comp. Arrian, Alex. 6:1, 3; Pausan. 2:5, 2). On the other hand (see Philostorg. l.c.) some have supposed Pishon to be the Indian river Hypasis.

Of the three hypotheses which we have last stated, that given by Hartmann is the most simple. Sickler's supposes a conception on the part of the ancient writer which is entirely too inconsistent with itself. That of Buttmann rests upon too many separate suppositions, improbable enough in themselves; and assumes, besides, the existence of southern Asiatic traditions among the Hebrews before the Captivity; a view that finds no support but in the hypothesis itself, which places Paradise in India. But Hartmann's view also is sufficiently met by the fact, which, however, has only recently become known, that the vale of Cashmere is, in climate and productions, very far from resembling a paradise (see Ritter, Erdklunde, 2:1083 sq.; 7:70 sq.). Thus, even if we should adopt this mythical view,  there would be just as much difficulty in determining the regions which the author of Genesis intended, as more literal interpreters have found in placing them, on the supposition that the description is truly geographical. There appears no proof in this view that the writer thought at all of South Asia (although Pishon may be the Oxus); at least, it is going too far to extend his views to India, and identify Pishon with the Indus or the Ganges. Ewald (Isr. Gesch. 1:331) thinks that the names were changed in the passage of the tradition to the Hebrews; that they substituted the better known names of the Euphrates and Tigris for those of the unknown Indus and Ganges. Tuch (Gen. p. 72 sq.) would look only at the easily intelligible part of the account, the fellow-streams Euphrates and Tigris and would look for Paradise among the heights of Armenia, which would accord well with Noah's history (see Genesis 8). But it is objected that it is uncritical to cut off half of the description given, and destroy the conception, in order to join certain historical features. It is no part of our purpose here to examine the results of historical investigation, apart from the Mosaic records, respecting the first seat of the human race.

All that is related in Genesis as having occurred from the creation of man, and his location in the garden of Eden, up to the time of his guilt and expulsion, has in like manner been viewed as a philosophical speculation, set forth in a historical form, on the origin of physical and moral evil, and the destruction of that golden age which the fancy of all nations has seen in remote antiquity (see especially Ammon, in the Neues theol. Jour. 3:1 sq.; Bibl. Theol. 2:300 sq.; Bauer, Hebr. Mythol. 1:85 sq.; Buttmann. in the Berl. Monatsschrift. [1804] 261 sq., and Mythol. 1:122 sq.; Vater, Comment. uib. Pentat. 1:14 sq.; Gesenius, in the Hall. Encykl. i, ‘358 sq.; Eichhoni, Urgeschich.; Hartmann, Heb. Pentat. p. 373 sq.; Colln, Bibl. Theol. 1:224 sq.). But more literal and historical interpreters of the passage have also appeared (as Hengstenberg, Christol. I, 1:26 sq.; Tiele and Baumgarten, Comment.). Others are but half literal in their exposition, and seek to distinguish the essential facts from the mere dress of ornament (e.g. Less, Cramer, Luderwald, Eifert, Werner in his Geschichtl. Auffas. der 3 ersten Cap. d. Gen. [Ttibing. 1829]). Von Gerstenberg defends the allegorical exposition, Rosenmüller and Gamborg the hieroglyphical view, that the account is but a translation into words of old hieroglyphic sketches (see Tuch, Gen. p. 56 sq.; and comp. Bellerman, Handb. 1:37 sq.; Beck, Comment. Rel. Chr. Hist. p. 393 sq.). It seems scarcely necessary to refer to the views of Hiillman, in his Theogonie, and of Ballenstedt, in Die neue  u.jetzige Welt, p. 222 sq., as they do not rest on the Mosaic history. The anonymous work, Ursprungl. Entwickelungsgang der relig. u. sittl. Bildung (Greifsw. 1829), is simply childish.

3. Parallel Traditions. — The idea of a terrestrial paradise, the abode of purity and happiness, has thus formed an element in the religious beliefs of all nations. The image of “Eden, the garden of God,” retained its hold upon the minds of the poets and prophets of Israel as a thing of beauty whose joys had departed (Eze 28:13; Joe 2:3), and before whose gate the cherubim still stood to guard it from the guilty. For interesting parallels from the philosophical speculations of other nations, see Bruns, in Gabler's Jour. f. auserl. theol. Lit. v. 50 sq.; Bauer, Mythol. 1:96 sq.; Pustkuchen, Urgesch. der Menschh. 1:186 sq.

(1.) Classical. — Descriptions of the early golden age with which man's existence on earth began, in general, are given by Hesiod, Works and Days, p. 95 sq.; Dicsearchus, in Porphyr. Abstinen. 4:2; Virgil, Georg. 1:128 sq.; Ovid, Met. 1:89; Lucretius, v. 923 sq.; Plato, Polit. p. 271. Comp. Lactant. Instit. v. 5; S. G. Friderici Diss. de Aurea cetat. quam p oetce finxerunt (Leips. 1736); Tiedemann, in the Berl. Monatsschr. (Dec. 1796), p. 505 sq.; Carus, Werke, 6:157 sq.

(2.) Oriental. — Arab legends tell of a garden in the East, on the summit of a mountain of jacinth, inaccessible to man; a garden of rich soil and equable temperature, well watered, and abounding with trees and flowers of rare colors and fragrance. So among the Hindûs, in the center of Jambudwipa, the middle of the seven continents of the Puranas, is the golden mountain Meru, which stands like the seed-cup of the lotus of the earth. On its summit is the vast city of Brahma, renowned in heaven, and encircled by the Ganges, which, issuing from the foot of Vishnui, washes the lunar orb, and, falling thither from theskies, is divided into four streams, that flow to the four corners of the earth. These rivers are the Bhadra, or Oby of Siberia; the Sita, or Hoang He, the great river of China; the Alakananda, a main branch of the Ganges; and the Chakshu, or Oxus. In this, abode of divinity is the Nandana, or grove of Indra; there too is the Jambu tree, from whose fruit are fed the waters of the Jambu river, which give life and immortality to all who drink thereof (Vishnu Purana, trans. Wilson, p. 166-171). The enchanted gardens of the Chinese are placed in the midst of the summits of Houanlun, a high chain of mountains farther north than the Himalaya, and farther east than Hindû-Cush. The fountain of  immortality which waters these gardens is divided into four streams the fountains of the supreme spirit, Tychin. Among the Medo-Persians the gods' mountain Alborj is the dwelling of Ormuzd, and the good spirits, and is called “the navel of the waters.” The Zend books mention a region, called Heden, and the place of Zoroaster's birth is called Hedenesh, or, according to another passage, Airjana Vidjo (Knobel, Genesis).

These last-named traditions even proceed to detail the steps by which this fair abode was forfeited. According to the Zendavesta, men were so blinded by a wicked demon that they viewed the whole creation and their own happiness, as the work of Ahriman. After thirty days they went hunting, with black clothing on; shot a white goat, and drank its milk, finding it pleasant. The evil spirits now brought them fruit, which they ate, and straightway lost all their excellence. After fifty years they first began sexual intercourse. (See Rhode, Heil. Sage des Zendvolks, p. 391 sq.; and comp. Ballenstedt, in Schroter u. Klein Oppositionsschr. v. 3 sq., who connects the account of the fall of man with the conflict between Ormuzd, the principle of good, and Ahriman, that of evil; and the victory of the latter, Gen 3:15.) But nearest of all, the fable of the Dalai Lama (see Vater, Archivf. KirchenGesch. 1:15 sq.) approaches the Mosaic narrative. A plant of sweet taste appeared on the earth: first one greedy man ate of it, then all followed his example, and immediately all spirituality and all happiness were gone. The length of life decreased, and with it human stature. At last the plant disappeared, and men were left to subsist, first on a kind of reddish butter, then on reed-grass, and finally on what their own hard labor could cause the earth to produce. Virtues had fled from earth; deeds of violence, murder, and adultery had taken their place. Compare further, Rosenmüller, Alterthum. I, 1:180; Tuch, Genes. p. 50 sq. On Grecian myths, see Volker, Mythol. d. Japhet. Geschlechts, oder d. Siindenfall des Menschen, nach Griech. Mythen (Giesen. 1824).

All these and similar traditions are but mere mocking echoes of the old Hebrew story, jarred and broken notes of the same strain; but, with all their exaggerations, “they intimate how in the background of man's visions lay a paradise of holy joy — a paradise secured from every kind of profanation, and: made inaccessible to the guilty; a paradise full of objects that were calculated to delight the senses and to elevate the mind; a paradise that granted to its tenant rich and rare immunities, and that fed with its perennial streams the tree of life and immortality” (Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, pt. 2, p. 133).

III. Figurative Application of “Paradise” to the Heavenly World (chiefly from Smith's Dict. of the Bible). — The term, having by a natural process become a metaphor for the abstract idea of exquisite delight, was transferred still higher to denote the happiness of the righteous in the future state. The origin of this application must be assigned to the Jews of the middle period between the Old and the New Testament. In the Chaldee Targums, “the garden of Eden” is put as the exposition of heavenly blessedness (Psa 90:17, and other places). The Talmudical writings, cited by the elder Buxtorf (Lex. Chald. et Talm. p. 1802) and John James Wetstein (N.T. Gr. 1:819), contain frequent references to Paradise as the immortal heaven, to which the spirits of the just are admitted immediately upon their liberation from the body. The book. Sohar speaks of an earthly and a heavenly Paradise, of which the latter excels the former “as much as darkness does light” (Schottgen, Hor. Hebr. 1:1096).

Hence we see that it was in the acceptation of the current Jewish phraseology that the expression was used by our Lord and the apostles: “To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise;” “He was caught up into Paradise;” “The tree of life, which is in the Paradise of my God” (Luk 23:43; 2Co 12:4; Rev 2:7).

It was natural that this higher meaning should at length become the exclusive one, and be associated with new thoughts. Paradise, with no other word to qualify it, was the bright region which man had lost, which was guarded by the flaming sword. Soon a new hope sprang up. Over and above- all questions as to where the primeval garden had been, there came the belief that it did not belong entirely to the past. There was a paradise still into which man might hope to enter. It is a matter of some interest to ascertain with what associations the word was connected in the minds of the Jews of Palestine and other countries at the time of our Lord's teaching, what sense therefore we may attach to it in the writings of the N.T.

In this as in other instances we may distinguish several modes of thought, each with marked characteristics, yet often, blended together in different proportions, and melting one into the other by hardly perceptible degrees. Each has its counterpart in the teaching of Christian theologians. The language of the N.T. stands apart from and above all. Traces of this way of looking at it had appeared previously in the teaching of the Son of Sirach. The four rivers of Eden are figures of the wide streams of Wisdom, and she  is as the brook which becomes a river and waters the paradise of God (Sir 24:25-30). This, however, was compatible with the recognition of Genesis 2, as speaking of a fact. But in later times the figurative or celestial reference became more and more distinct. It would be a hopeless task to attempt to recite the opinions of all the commentators upon this question: their name is legion. All that we can attempt is a chronological outline of the main course of thought on the subject.

1. To the idealistic school of Alexandria, of which Philo the Jew is the representative, paradise was nothing more than a symbol and an allegory. That writer (De Mundi Opif. §. 54) is the first who ventured upon an allegorical interpretation. To him the thought of the narrative as one of fact was unendurable. The primeval history spoke of no garden such as men plant and water. Spiritual perfection (ἀρετή) was the only paradise. The trees that grew in it were the thoughts of the spiritual man. The fruits which they bore were life and knowledge and immortality. The four rivers flowing from one source are the four virtues of the later Platonists, each derived from the same source of goodness (Philo, De Alleg. i). Philo conceived that by paradise is darkly shadowed forth the governing faculty of the soul; that the tree of life signifies religion, whereby the soul is immortalized; and by the faculty of knowing good and evil the middle sense, by which are discerned things contrary to nature. In another passage (De Plantat. § 9) he explains Eden, which signifies “pleasure,” as a symbol of the soul, that sees what is right, exults in virtue, and prefers one enjoyment, the worship of the only wise, to myriads of men's chief delights. Again (Legis Allegor. i, § 14) he says, “Now virtue is tropically called paradise, and the site of paradise is Eden, that is, pleasure.” The four rivers he explains (§ 19) of the several virtues of prudence, temperance, courage, and justice; while the main stream, of which they are branches is the generic virtue, goodness, which goeth forth from Eden, the wisdom of God. It is obvious that a system of interpretation such as this was not likely to become popular. It was confined to a single school, possibly to a single teacher. It has little or nothing corresponding to it in the N.T. The opinions of Philo, therefore, would not be so much worthy of consideration, were it not that (as we shall see) he has been followed by many of the Christian fathers.

2. The rabbinical schools of Palestine presented a phase of thought the very opposite of that of the Alexandrian writer. They had their descriptions, definite and detailed, a complete topography of the unseen world. Paradise,  the garden of Eden, existed still, and they discussed the question of its locality. The answers were not always consistent with each other. It was far off in the distant East, farther than the foot of man had trod. It was a region of the world of the dead, of Sheol, in the heart of the earth. Gehenna was on one side, with its flames and torments. Paradise on the other, the intermediate home of the blessed. (Comp. Wetstein, Grotius, and Schottgen, In Luke 23.) The patriarchs were there, Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, ready to receive their faithful descendants into their bosoms (Joseph. De Macc. c. 13). The highest place of honor at the feast of the blessed souls was Abraham's bosom (Luk 16:23), on which the new heir of immortality reclined as the favored and honored guest. Or, again, paradise was neither on the earth nor within it, but above it, in the third heaven, or in some higher orb. SEE HEAVEN. Or there were two paradises, the upper and the lower — one in heaven, for those who had attained the heights of holiness — one in earth, for those who had lived but decently (Schottgen, Hor. Heb. in Rev 2:7), and the heavenly paradise was sixty times as large as the whole lower earth (Eisenmenger, Entdecktes Judenth. 2:297). Each had seven palaces, and in each palace were its appropriate dwellers (ibid. p. 302). As the righteous dead entered paradise, angels stripped them of their grave clothes, arrayed them in new robes of glory, and placed on their heads diadems of gold and pearls (ibid. p. 310). There was no night there. Its pavement was of precious stones. Plants of healing power and wondrous fragrance grew on the banks of its streams (ibid. p. 313). From this lower paradise the souls of the dead rose on sabbaths and on feast-days to the higher (ibid. p. 318), where every day there was the presence of Jehovah: holding council with his saints (ibid. p. 320). (Comp. also Schottgen, Hor. Heb. in Luke 23.) Among the Hebrew traditions enumerated by Jerome (Trad. Hebr. in Gen.) is one that paradise was created before the world was formed, and is therefore beyond its limits. Moses bar-Cepha (De Parad.) assigns it a middle place between the earth and the firmament. Some affirm that paradise was on a mountain, which reached nearly to the moon; while others, struck by the manifest absurdity of such an opinion, held that it was situated in the third region of the air, and was higher than all the mountains of the earth by twenty cubits, so that the waters of the flood could not reach it. Others again have thought that paradise was twofold, one corporeal and the other incorporeal; others that it was formerly on earth, but had been taken away by the judgment of God (Hopkinson, Descr. Parad. in Ugolino, Thesaur. vol. 7).

3. Out of the discussions and theories of the rabbins there grew a broad popular belief, fixed in the hearts of men, accepted without discussion, blending with their best hopes. Their prayer for the dying or the dead was that his soul might rest in paradise, in the garden of Eden (Maimonides, Porta Mosis, quoted by Wetstein, In Luke 23; Taylor, Funeral Sermon on Sir G. Dalston). The belief of the Essenes, as reported by Josephus (War. 2:8, 11), may be accepted as a fair representation of the thoughts of those who, like them were not trained in the rabbinical schools, living in a simple and more childlike faith. To them accordingly paradise was a far-off land, a region where there was no scorching heat, no consuming cold, where the soft west wind from the ocean blew forevermore. The visions of the second book of Esdras, though not without an admixture of Christian thoughts and phrases, may be looked upon as representing this phase of feeling. There also we have the picture of a fair garden, streams of milk and honey, twelve trees laden with divers fruits, mighty mountains whereon grow lilies and roses (2:19) — a place into which the wicked shall not enter.

It is with this, popular belief, rather than with that of either school of Jewish thought, that the language of the N.T. connects itself. In this as in other instances it is made the starting-point for an education which leads men to rise from it to higher thoughts. The. old word is kept, and is raised to a new dignity or power. It is significant, indeed, that the word “paradise” nowhere occurs in the public teaching of our Lord, or in his intercourse with his own disciples. Connected as it had been with the thoughts of a sensuous happiness, it was not the fittest or the best word for those whom he was training to rise out of sensuous thoughts to the higher regions of the spiritual life. For them, accordingly, the kingdom of heaven, the kingdom of God, are the words most dwelt on. The blessedness of the pure in heart is that they shall see God. If language borrowed from their common speech is used at other times, if they hear of the marriage-supper and the new wine, it is not till they have been taught to understand parables and to separate the figure from the reality. With the thief dying on the cross the case was different. We can assume nothing in the robber-outlaw but the most rudimentary forms of popular belief. We may well believe that the word used here, and here only, in the whole course of the Gospel history, had a special fitness for him. His reverence, sympathy, repentance, hope, uttered themselves in the prayer, “Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom!” What were the thoughts of the sufferer as to that kingdom we do not know. Unless they were supernaturally raised above  the level which the disciples had reached by slow and painful steps, they must have been mingled with visions of an earthly glory, of pomp and victory and triumph. The answer to his prayer gave him what he needed most, the assurance of immediate rest and peace. The word paradise spoke to him, as to other Jews, of repose, shelter, joy — the greatest contrast possible to the thirst and agony and shame of the hours upon the cross. Rudimentary as his previous thoughts of it might be, this was the word fittest for the education of his spirit.

There is a like significance in the general absence of the word from the language of the Epistles. Here also it is found nowhere in the direct teaching. It occurs only in passages that are apocalyptic, and therefore almost of necessity symbolic. Paul speaks of one, apparently of himself, as having been “caught up into paradise,” as having there heard things that might not be uttered (2Co 12:3). In the message to the first of the Seven Churches of Asia. “the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God,” appears as the reward of him that overcometh, the symbol of an eternal blessedness (comp. Dean Trench, Comm. on the Epistles to the Seven Churches, ad loc.). The thing, though not the word, appears in the closing visions of Revelation 22.

4. The eager curiosity which prompts men to press on into the things behind the veil has led them to construct hypotheses more or less definite as to the intermediate state, and these have affected the thoughts which Christian writers have connected with the word paradise. Patristic and later interpreters follow, as has been noticed, in the footsteps of the Jewish schools. To Origen, and others of a like spiritual insight, paradise is but a synonym for a region of life and immortality one and the same with the third heaven (Jerome, Ep. ad Joh. Hieros. in Wordsworth on 2 Corinthians 12). So far as it is a place, it is as a school in which the souls of men are trained and learn to judge rightly of the things they have done and seen on earth (Origen, De Princ. 2:12). Origen, according to Luther (Comm. in Gen.), imagined paradise to be heaven, the trees angels, and the rivers wisdom. Papias, Irenaeus, Pantaenus, and Clemens Alexandrinus have all favored the mystical interpretation (Huet. Origeniana, 2, 167). Ambrosius followed the example of Origen, and placed the terrestrial paradise in the third heaven, in consequence of the expression of Paul (2Co 12:2; 2Co 12:4); but elsewhere he distinguishes between the terrestrial paradise and that to which the apostle was caught up (De Parad. c. 3). In another passage (Ep. ad Sabirnum) all this is explained as allegory. The sermon of  Basil, De Paradiso, gives an eloquent representation of the common belief of Christians who were neither mystical nor speculative. Minds at once logical and sensuous ask questions as to the locality, and the answers are wildly conjectural.

It is not in Hades, and is therefore different from Abraham's bosom (Tertull. De Idol. c. 13). It is above and beyond the world, separated from it by a wall of fire (id. Apol. c. 47). It is the “refrigerium” for all faithful souls, where they have the vision of saints and angels: and of Christ himself (Just. Mart. Respons. ad Orthodox. — 75 and 85), or for those only who are entitled, as martyrs, fresh from the baptism of blood, to a special reward above their fellows (Tertull. De Anim. c. 55). It is in the fourth heaven (Clem. Alex. Fragm. § 51). — It is in some unknown region of the earth, where the seas and skies meet, higher than any earthly mountain (Joann. Damasc. De Orthod. Fid. 2:11), and had thus escaped the waters of the flood (P. Lombard. Sentent. 2:17, E.). It has been identified with the φυλακή of 1Pe 3:19, and the spirits in it are those of the antediluvian races who repented before the great destruction overtook them (Bishop Horsley, Sermons, 20). (Comp. an elaborate note in Thilo, Codex Apocryph. N.T. p. 754.) The word enters largely, as might be expected, into the apocryphal literature of the early Church. Where the true Gospels are most reticent, the mythical are most exuberant. The Gospel of Nicodemus, in narrating Christ's victory over Hades (the “harrowing of hell” of our early English mysteries), tells how, till then, Enoch and Elijah had been its sole inhabitants — how the penitent robber was there with his cross on the night of the crucifixion — how the souls of the patriarchs were led thither by Christ, and were received by the archangel Michael, as he kept watch with the flaming swords at the gate. In the apocryphal Acta Philippi (Tischendorf, Act. Apocr. p. 89), the apostle is sentenced to remain for forty days outside the circle of paradise, because he had given way to anger and cursed the people of Hierapolis for their unbelief. Among the opinions enumerated by Morinus (Diss. de Parad. Terrest. in Ugolino, Thesaur. vol. vii) is one that, before the fall, the whole earth was a paradise, and was really situated in Eden, in the midst of all kinds of delights. Ephraem Syrus (Comm. in Gen.) expresses himself doubtfully upon this point. Whether the trees of paradise, being spiritual, drank of spiritual water, he does not undertake to decide; but he seems to be of opinion that the four rivers have lost their original virtue in consequence of the curse pronounced upon the earth for Adam's transgression.

5. The later history of the word presents some facts of interest. Accepting, in this as in other instances the mythical elements of Eastern Christianity, the creed of Islam presented to its followers the hope of a sensuous paradise, and the Persian word was transplanted through it into the languages spoken by them. In the West it passes through some strange transformations, and descends to baser uses. The thought that men on entering the Church of Christ returned to the blessedness which Adam had forfeited was symbolized in the church architecture of the 4th century. The narthex, or atrium, in which were assembled those who, not being fideles in full communion, were not admitted into the interior of the building, was known as the “Paradise” of the church (Alt, Cultus, p. 591). Athanasius, it has been said, speaks scornfully of Arianism as creeping into this paradise, implying that it addressed itself to the ignorant and untaught. In the West we trace a change of form, and one singular change of application. Paradiso becomes in some Italian dialects Paraviso, and this passes into the French parvis, denoting the western porch of a church, or the open space in front of it (Ducange, s.v. Parvisus; Diez. Etymolog. Worterb. p. 703). In the church this space was occupied, as we have seen, by the lower classes of the people. The word was transferred from the place of worship to the place of amusement, and, though the position was entirely different, was applied to the highest and cheapest gallery of a French theater (Alt, Cultus, l.c.). By some, however, this use of the word is connected only with the extreme height of the gallery, just as “Chemin de Paradis” is a proverbial phrase for any specially arduous undertaking (Bescherelles, Dictionnaire Francais).

IV. Literature. — In addition to the many works cited above, see the bibliography of the subject in Danz, Worterbuch, s.v. Paradies; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. col. 1038; Alger, Future Life, Index; the copious article in Herzog's Real-Encyklopadie, 20:332-377; and Malcom, Theological Index, s.v. Eden. Comp. also Gould, Myths of the Ancient World, p. 242 sq.; Brinton, Myths of the New World, p. 868 sq. The following are among the pertinent monographs: Engelmann, De Paradiso terrest. (Jena, 1669); Eppelin, De Parad. igne delet. (Alt. Nori. 1735); Heinson, De Paradiso (Helmst. 1698); Huet, De situ Parad. (Amst. 1698); Neumann, Das Paradies (Wittenb. 1741); and especially Schulthess, Das' Paradies, d. irdische u. uberird., hist., myth. u. mystische (Zur. 1816; Leips. 1821). SEE EDEN; SEE HEAVEN.

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

             a term applied, in ecclesiastical language, to the garden of a convent; the name is also sometimes applied to an open court or area in front of a church, and occasionally to the cloisters, and even to the whole space included within the circuit of a convent, but usually to the burial-place. Probably the word is a. corruption of Parvise, which is still in use in France for the open space around cathedrals and churches.

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

             There have been at least four notable attempts in very recent times to discover this long-sought locality; two of them by American, and two by German authors. Their theories have been put forth with the greatest assurance, and in most cases supported by a vast array of learning; but they all seem to. have failed to satisfy the judgment of the literary world, or to add anything substantial towards a reasonable solution of the question.

1. The view of Friederich Delitzsch, the eminent Assyriologist, son of the well-known commentator, has. already been given under the art. EDJEN. Brilliant as are, the researches of his work, its conclusions have been rejected by the most careful and competent critics. See Haldev ,in the Revue Critique, 1881, page 457 sq.; Noldecke, in the Zeitschr. d. deutsch.  mogenland. Gesellschhaft, 1882, page 174; Lenormant, in Les. Origine de l'Histoire, volume 2. We cite (from The Nation, N.Y., March 15, 1883) some of the geographical objections:

"Why, if the stream of Eden be the middle Euphrates, is it left unnamed in the narrative, though it is certain that the Hebrews were perfectly familiar both with the middle and the upper course of that river?... If the lower Tigris be meant by the Hiddekel, why is this river described as flowing in front of Assyria, which lay above the central Mesopotamian lowland asserted to be Eden? How should a writer, familiar with the whole course of the Tigris, deem its lower part a branch of the Euphrates?... Why is Havilah, if the Arabian border-land so well known to the Hebrews be meant, so fully described by its products? Who tells us that the gold, the bdellium, and the shoham of Babylonia were also characteristic of the adjoining Havilah?"

2. A modern traveller, Reverend J.P. Newman, D.D., had previously indicated a somewhat similar position to the above (A Thousand Miles on Horseback, N.Y. 1875, page 69), namely, at the confluence of the Euphrates and the Tigris; and he was confident that ancient tablets would yet be exhumed fully establishing this location. But the inscriptions recovered by Smith, Rassam, and others in that vicinity do not confirm the theory, and it has thus been brushed aside with the multitude of other conjectures that preceded it.

3. A more startling conclusion is announced by Reverend William F. Warren, D.D., LL.D., president of the Boston University, "that the cradle of the human race, the Eden of primitive tradition, was situated at the North pole, in a country submerged at the time of the deluge," (Paradise Found, Boston, 1885, 8vo). This is the outcome of his researches in early traditions, noticed under our art. SEE COSMOLOGY.

The author brings to the support of this view an amazing amount of reading and investigation, which we have not space to criticise in detail. To such as are prepared to accept the mythologies of antiquity as having a historical basis, and to place the Biblical account on a level of authority with them, and at the same time to extend the origin of the human race to a date contemporary with the thermal sera of geology, this book, which is written in a fascinating style, and illustrated with a copious reference to the literature of the subject, will prove at least an ingenious and plausible, if not a  conclusive, argument; but for those who maintain the literal accuracy of the history in Genesis, and the substantial agreement of the topographical conditions there given with the present conditions of the earth's surface, it cannot appear other than a most preposterous and chimerical hypothesis. The great objection which we see in it is the setting aside as an unintelligible narrative the only professed and historic description which we possess of the Garden of Eden, and then resorting to the vague and conflicting testimony of-paganism, combined with the scanty and problematical indications of cosmological science, for an identification that is at last claimed as decisive and final. If the Biblical passage (Gen 2:10-14), with its explicit items, fails to point out the true spot, we may as well give up the attempt as hopeless. To us that account seems sufficiently clear and consistent; and we believe that explorations in the region thus designated will vindicate the accuracy of the Scripture language beyond any reasonable doubt. It is a question of exegesis and geography, not of mythological comparison.

4. The last formal production in this line is an attempt to show that Paradise was situated about sixty-five miles south-east of Damascus, in a shallow alluvial basin, amid the wild basaltic crags of the desolate volcanic region known as the Hauraz (Die Auflosung der Paradies-frage, by Moritz Engel, Leipsic, 1885, 8vo). An elaborate effort is made to identify the names and circumstances; but the agreement is most fanciful and indistinct. Eden is the present Ruhbe, an Arabic term for a rich patch of soil; the four rivers are the wadies which pour down the surrounding slopes in the rainy season; while the most violent processes of rationalism are resorted to for the purpose of disposing ,of the associated names and features of the narrative: e.g. the cherubim are volcanoes of the Hauran; Cain is only a more specific title for Adam; Cain's sons and Lamech's wives are mountain-peaks adjacent, etc. It would seem as if the ne plus ultra of absurdity has now been reached in the vagaries on this subject, and it is time to return to sober examination of the given data, if any success is to be achieved in the-exposition.

## Paradisi, Niccolo[[@Headword:Paradisi, Niccolo]]

             an old Venetian painter, by whom there is a picture of the Crucifixion, which, with the symbols of the four evangelists, is in the monastery of the Agostiniani, in the territory of Verruchio. It is inscribed “Nicholaus Paradixi miles de Venetiis pinxit, 1404.”

## Paradiso, Jacobus De[[@Headword:Paradiso, Jacobus De]]

             a German monastic, member of the Carthusians, flourished at Erfurt near the middle of the 15th century. He died in 1465. Paradiso wrote Tractatus de causis multalrunm passionum, preacipue iracundice, et remediis earundem (Pez, Bib. Ascet. 7:389).

## Paraeus, David, D.D.[[@Headword:Paraeus, David, D.D.]]

             a celebrated German theologian of the Reformation period, was born Dec. 20, 1548, at Francolstein, in Silesia. He was the son of Johann Wangler, but changed his patronymic, in accordance with the custom of his days (παρεῖος being the literal rendering of Wangler; from παρειά, German Wange, cheek). He was educated at Hermsberg and Heidelberg. One of his teachers, Christopher Schilling, becoming himself a convert to Protestantism, influenced young Wangler to forsake Lutheranism, and he became a most ardent disciple of the theologian of Geneva. Parseus entered on his ministry in 1571, at a village called Schlettenbach, which he soon exchanged for Hemsbach, in the diocese of Worms. It was a stormy time, owing to the contests between the papists and Protestants, Lutherans and Calvinists, and in 1577 Parmeus lost his place in consequence of being a sacramentarian, or Calvinist. He went first to Frankenthal, and three years after to Witzingen; but in 1584 prince Casimir made him a professor at Heidelberg. In 1586 he commenced authorship by the publication of his Method of the Ubiquitarian Controversy. In 1589 he published the German  Bible, with notes. He rose to the highest professorship in theology, and his fame drew students to the university from the remotest parts of Hungary and Poland. He held several disputations against the writers of the “Augsburg Confession.” One of the most memorable he held in 1596, when he defended Calvin against the imputation that the Geneva Reformer favored Judaism in his “Commentaries upon several parts of Scripture.” At the time of the centennial jubilee of the Reformation in 1617, which was celebrated at Heidelberg, Parseus published some pieces upon the subject, which drew upon him the resentment of the Jesuits of Mentz: they wrote a sharp censure of his works, and he published a suitable answer to it. The following year, 1618, at the instance of the states-general, he was pressed to go to the Synod of Dort, but excused himself on account of age and infirmities.

After this time he enjoyed but little tranquillity. The apprehensions he had of the ruin which his patron the elector palatine would bring upon himself by accepting the crown of Bohemia caused him to change his residence. He terrified himself with a thousand bad omens; he feared the success of the Imperialists; and, considering the books he had written against the pope and Bellarmine, he looked upon it as the most dreadful calamity that could happen to him to fall into the hands of the monks; for which reason he gladly complied with those who advised him to provide in time for his own safety, and accordingly he retired to the town of Anweil, in the duchy of Zweibrucken, near Landau (October, 1621). He left that place shortly after and went to Neustadt, but did not even stay long there, but returned to Heidelberg, in order to spend his last days at his beloved home, and so to be buried near the professors of the university. He died June, 1586. The expository works of Parseus are his most numerous, and were long greatly esteemed on the Continent. They have been published collectively at Geneva and at Frankfort. Among them are commentaries on Genesis, Hosea, Matthew, several of Paul's Epistles, the Apocalypse, and Adversaria on other parts of the Bible. Although the Biblical writings of Parseus are superseded, it is impossible to deny to them considerable merit, both in the exegetical exposition of the sacred text and his practical deductions. The greatest drawback to this merit arises from the long theological (chiefly polemical) discussions with which the commentary is overburdened. His commentary on Romans is well known to English theologians for the anti-monarchical principles which it embodies, and which gave so much offense to king James I and the University of Oxford. All of Paraeus's works were published by his son at Frankfort-on-the-Main in. 1647 (3 vols. fol.). See Middleton, Evangel.  Biogr. 2:401 sq.; and the Memoir in vol. 1 of the works, also published separately since.

## Parafrenarii[[@Headword:Parafrenarii]]

             the coachmen of the higher clergy in the ancient Christian Church. They had also the care of their stables and horses. They were sometimes reckoned among the number of the clergy, but of an inferior order.

## Paraguay[[@Headword:Paraguay]]

             a republic of South America, which, as represented on most maps, is confined to the peninsula between the rivers Paraguay and Parana, as far north as about the parallel of 21° 30', but which actually, by recent treaties with neighboring states, has so considerably enlarged that it now embraces an extensive region called the Chaco, west of the Paraguay, and as far south as the river Vermejo, and west as the meridian of 61° 20', and a tract lying between the Parana and the Uraguay. The whole area, according to official statistics, is in round numbers 348,000 square miles, of which 131,000 square miles are comprised between the rivers Paraguay and Parana, 196,000 square miles are west of the Paraguay, and upwards of 21,000 square miles are between the Parana and Uraguay. The peninsula between the rivers is still the important part of Paraguay. A mountain-chain called Sierra Anambahy, which traverses it from north to south, and bifurcates to the east and west towards the southern extremity, under the name of Sierra Maracaju, divides the tributaries of the Parana from those of the Paraguay, none of which are very considerable, although they are liable to frequent and destructive overflows. As regards its physical character, the northern portion of the country is mountainous, especially towards the east. The southern portion is one of the most fertile districts of South America, consisting of hills and gentle slopes richly wooded, of wide savannas, which afford excellent pasture-ground, and of rich alluvial plains, some of which, indeed, are marshy, or covered with shallow pools of water (only one lake, that of Ypao, deserving special notice), but a large proportion of the land is of extraordinary fertility and highly cultivated. The banks of the rivers Parana and Paraguay are occasionally belted with forest; but, in general, the low lands are destitute of trees. The climate, for a tropical country, is temperate, the thermometer occasionally rising to 100° in summer, but in winter being usually about 45°. The natural productions are very varied, although they do not include the precious metals or other  minerals common in South America. Much excellent timber is found in the forests. Several trees yield valuable juices, as the India-rubber and its cognate trees; and an especially useful shrub is the Mate, or Paraguay tea- tree, which forms one of the chief articles of commerce, being in general use throughout La Plata, Chili, Peru, and other parts of South America. The tree grows wild in the north-eastern districts, and the gathering of its leaves gives employment in the season to a large number of the native population. Wax and honey are collected in abundance, as is also cochineal, and the medicinal plants are very numerous. The chief cultivated crops are maize, rice, coffee, cocoa, indigo, mandioc, tobacco, sugar-cane, and cotton.

One half of the land is national property, consisting partly of the lands formerly held by the Jesuit missions, or by other religious corporations, partly of lands never assigned to individuals, partly of lands confiscated in the course of the revolutionary ordeal through which the country has been passing. The, national estates have, for the most part, been let out in small tenements, at moderate rents, the condition of the tenure being that they shall be properly cultivated. Agriculture, though it has in recent years made considerable progress; nevertheless is still far from the standard of European progress. Only about 30,000 square miles of the whole territory are in cultivation. There are few manufactures — sugar, rum, cotton and woollen cloths, and leather being the only industrial productions. Indeed, the commerce of the country is chiefly in the hands of the government, which holds a monopoly of the export of the Paraguay tea, and in great part of the timber trade. The population consists of whites of Spanish descent, native Indians, negroes, and a mixture of these several races, who call themselves “Paraguayos,” but are usually called “Pardos.” The Indians are most numerous. They are mostly of the friendly tribe Guaranis, whose language is also the language of the country. By a census which was taken in 1857, the population was reported at 1,33,1, but the inaccuracy of this census is now generally conceded, and the population of Paraguay, considerably reduced in recent times by war with Brazil and internal strife (see below), is now generally estimated to be about 1,000,000.

History. — The history of Paraguay is highly interesting. The country was discovered by Sebastian Cabot in 1526; but the first colony was settled in 1535 by Pedro de Mendoza, who founded the city of Assuncion, and established Paraguay as a province of the vice-royalty of Peru. The warlike native Guaranis, a people who possessed a certain degree of civilization,  and professed a dualistic religion, for a long time, however, successfully resisted the Spanish arms, and refused to receive either the religion or the social usages of the invaders. In the latter half of the 16th century (since 1586) the Jesuit missionaries were sent to the aid of the first preachers of Christianity in Paraguay (who had labored since 1537); but for a long time the Jesuits also were almost entirely unsuccessful, the effect of their preaching being in a great degree marred by the profligate and cruel conduct of the Spanish adventurers who formed the staple of the early colonial population. The Jesuits, however, did not hopelessly abandon their task, as had the Franciscans, who had preceded them. With their indomitable will and keen judgment of human nature, the Jesuits were probably the only Christians who could succeed. Finding that the obstacles were almost insurmountable, they concentrated their strength on the province of Guayra, and there succeeded in winning the confidence of the natives, whom they united in settlements (Reductiones), and taught there not only religion, but agriculture, arts, and industries. But even these settlements failed for a long time to bring about the much-desired change. There were constant quarrels and much fighting, and as late as 1610 several settlements had to be abandoned. The Jesuits finally determined to secure the reins of government in the entire country, to bring about such a change as they had hoped for, but had found it impossible to secure, so long as they did not themselves possess the civil control. In the 17th century the home government consented to place in their hands the entire administration, civil as well as religious, of two provinces, which, not possessing any of the precious metals, were of little value as a source of revenue; and, in order to guard the natives against the evil influences of the bad example of European Christians, gave to the Jesuits the right to exclude all other Europeans from these colonies. From this time forward the progress of civilization as well as of Christianity was rapid. The legislation, the administration, and the social organization of the settlement were shaped according to the model of a primitive Christian community, or rather of many communities under one administration; and the accounts which have been preserved of its condition appear to present a realization of the ideal of a Christian Utopia.

A careful inquiry into the history of the territory so ruled by the Jesuits reveals, however, that the natives had been made by them altogether helpless. True, the Jesuits were kind to their subjects, and gave them a quasindependence in what they called a Christian republican government, but they did everything in such a guardian-like manner that the natives lost the little qualification they once possessed for  independent enterprise. Besides, the great power and accumulating wealth of the Jesuits provoked envy, and finally resulted in much opposition to the Jesuits; and when in 1750 they opposed the disposition of some of their territory to Portugal, and armed the natives for defense of the land against the Spanish government, the total expulsion of the Jesuits from Paraguay resulted in 1768. The province was again made subject to the Spanish viceroys. For a time the fruits of the older civilization maintained themselves; but as the ancient organization fell to the ground, much of the work of so many years was undone; the communities lapsed into disorganization, and by degrees much of the old barbarism returned, and that in a more aggravated form. In. 1776, Paraguay was transferred to the newly formed vice-royalty of Rio de la Plata; and in 1810 it joined with the other states in declaring its independence of the mother kingdom of Spain, which, owing to its isolated position, it was the earliest of them all to establish completely. In 1814 Dr. Francia, originally a lawyer, and the secretary of the first revolutionary junta, was proclaimed dictator for three years; and in 1817 his term of the office was made perpetual. He continued to hold it till his death in 1840; and although many of his measures tended to improve the condition of the country and to develop its internal resources, yet his rule was arbitrary and despotic in the highest degree; and his attempt to isolate the territory from commercial intercourse with the rest of the world was attended with a complete stagnation of commerce and the enterprise to which it leads. On his death the government was vested in consuls, and in 1844 a new constitution was proclaimed, and Don Carlos Antonio Lopez elected in that year. He held the government until his death in 1870. The condition of the country was little changed under his administration. Though he was a man of extraordinary character, he was so largely controlled by the restless and roving spirit of the white population of Paraguay that he was forced into a war with Brazil and the La Plata estates, which brought the country to the very verge of destruction. It barely escaped utter ruin. A provisional government conducted the affairs of Paraguay, independent of Brazil, after the re-establishment of peace in 1870, until the people had time to elect Riverola as their president. In December, 1871, Salvador Jovellanos became president. Under his administration the country was slowly recovering from the dreadful desvastations in which the war had resulted, when a rebellion broke out (1874), which has only been suppressed very recently. The arbitrary measures which the unsettled condition of the country forced the government to adopt have resulted in driving many whites into the  Argentine territory and the Brazilian provinces. In the spring of 1876 the most heartrending condition prevailed. Little was produced by the farmers, and the principal staple of food, maize, sold at famine prices.

The republic is divided into twenty-five departments. The central department, in which the capital, Assuncion, is situated, contained in 1857 398,698, or nearly one third of the whole inhabitants, and the capital itself 48,000. The inhabitants of the towns consist chiefly of whites, or of half- breeds (mestizos), who closely resemble whites; the language commonly spoken, besides that of the native Indian, the Guaranis, is the Spanish. The established religion is the Roman Catholic, the ecclesiastical head of which is the bishop of Assuncion. Education is pretty well diffused, much more than is usually the case in countries so long ruled by the Jesuits. See Muratori, Christianesimo felice nelle missione nel Paraguai (Ven. 1713); Ibafiez, Regno da. Soced. d. J. etc. (Lisbon, 1770); Charlevoix, Gesch. v. Paraguay u. den Missionen der Jesuiten (Nuremb. 1764); Dugraty, La republique de Parag. (Brussels, 1864); Masterman, Seven Years in Paraguay (Lond. 1869); and especially Washburn, History of Paraguay (Bost. 1871). See also Harper's Monthly, vol. 18 and 40.

## Parah[[@Headword:Parah]]

             (Heb. Parah', פָּרָה[with the article], heifer; Sept. Φαρά v. r. Α᾿φάρ), a city of the tribe of Benjamin, named in the north-eastern group between Avim and Ophrah (Jos 18:23). Buckingham (Travels, p. 312) heard of a village named Farah, which Robinson, however, could not find; but the name exists farther to the south-east attached to the Wady el-Farah, one of the southern branches of the great Wady Suweinit, and to a site of ruins at the junction of the same with the main valley (Ritter, Pal. u. Syrien, 3:529). This identification is supported by Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 339) and Schwarz (Palestine, p. 126). The drawback mentioned by Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2:112), namely, that the Arabic word: (“mouse”) differs in signification from the Hebrew (“the cow”) is not of much force, since it is the habit of modern names to cling to similarity of sound with the ancient names, rather than of signification (Beit-ur, el-Aal, etc.). A view of the valley is given by Barclay (City of the Great King, p. 558), who proposes it for AENON SEE AENON (q.v.); but he incorrectly interprets the name (“valley of delight”).

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

             SEE TALMUD.

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

             The probable site is Khurbet Farah, laid down on the Ordnance Map at five and a half miles north-east of Jerusalem, and described in the accompanying Memoirs (3:209) as “heaps of stones only."

## Parallelism[[@Headword:Parallelism]]

             SEE POETRY, HEBREW.

## Paralytic[[@Headword:Paralytic]]

             (παραλυτικός, παραλελυμένος), a class of sick persons named in the Gospels in connection with daemoniacs and epileptics (see Mat 4:24; comp. Act 8:7), as being deprived of the power of motion, and borne for cure on couches to the Savior (Mat 9:2; Mar 2:3; Luk 5:18; comp. Act 9:23). Elsewhere we find paralysis mentioned as a consequence of apoplexy (1Ma 9:55). In our version the word παραλυτικός is rendered “sick of the palsy,” and so other versions. Modern physicians understand by paralysis or palsy the loss of power over the voluntary muscles; sometimes accompanied with the loss of sensibility in certain parts of the body, in which the muscles affected are relaxed and slack. This last symptom seems to distinguish paralysis from catalepsy and the various kinds of tetanus, in all of which the muscles are rigid and contracted. During palsy the circulation, the animal heat, and the usual secretions continue. The attack is often very sudden, following an apoplectic stroke; but sometimes comes on slowly and imperceptibly; and in either case the cure is exceedingly difficult (see Sprengel, Instit. Pathol. Spec. 4:441; comp. the Berliner Medicin. Encyclop. 21:16 sq.). But the ancient physicianis understood paralysis in a much wider sense, and, according to Richter's careful investigations (see his Dissert. quat. Med. Gotting. 1775), applied the term to every disease which destroyed the power of voluntary action, without regard to the condition of the muscles; thus including under it both tetanus and catalepsy. He adduces in confirmation of this view, besides other passages of ancient physicians, the treatise of Coelius Aurelianus (Morb. Chron. 2:1), who distinguishes two kinds of paralysis — the one marked by spasms, the other by flaccidity of the muscles. This would serve to explain the case (Mat 8:6) of a paralytic who was in great suffering (see Ackermann, in Weise's Material. fur Gottesgelahrth. 1, 2:57 sq.). But pain is rarely experienced in the disease now called palsy; and when it does occur it is not severe, being merely a pricking or itching sensation. On the other hand the paralysis a conductione, or convulsive palsy of Coelius Aurelianus (or, as the moderns  term it, the contractura articulorum, spasm of the joints), is an exceedingly painful disease. It is certain that the words used to denote diseases in the Gospels are to be understood as used, not with scientific definiteness, but like other words in the language of common life, as including various symptoms more or less allied to each other. It is not therefore necessary, in any case, to understand the case spoken of by Matthew as one of tetanus or lockjaw (as Choulunt. Spec. Pathol. u. Therap. p. 711 sq., 2d ed.), a disease more common in not than in temperate climates, and in Africa than in the East; and often followed quickly by death. Some, again, interpret the case of the woman who was bowed together (Luk 13:11) of the tetanus emprosthotonos, that form of the disease which bends forward stiffly the neck and the whole body. But an arthritic contraction of the body may also be meant (comp. Wedel, Exercitat. Med. Philol. p. 4 sq.).

On the other hand, the case of Alcimus, spoken of in 1Ma 9:55, was probably one of sudden tetanus, which would account for the severe pain mentioned, a symptom not found in apoplexy, as well as for the sudden death. The tetanus (which receives its common name of lockjaw from its effect on the organs of speech) attacks and disables the body suddenly; is connected with severe pain in the muscles affected, and sometimes results fatally within thirty or fifty hours. Yet it is possible, with Ackermann, to refer such cases to apoplexy, understanding by the “torment” (βάσανος) the suffering which bystanders, from the visible symptoms, suppose the patient to suffer. The victim of this disease is motionless; his breathing is slow and interrupted, accompanied by a rattling sound; foam often appears in the mouth; the face is swollen and red; the eyes protrude, and are fixed, and the extremities cold (see Conradi, Handb. d. spec. Pathol. 2:531). It is well known that apoplexy often kills in a few minutes. See further, on the varying views which medical men take of the palsy of the New Testament, Bartholini Paralytici N.T. Medico et Philol. Commentarii, illustr. (Hafn. 1653; 3d ed. Leips. 1685); Wedel, Exercit. Med. Philol. dec. 5,p. 6 sq; dec. 8, p. 17 sq.; Ader, Enarrat. de Eegrotis in Evany. (Tolos. 1723), p. 10 sq.; Baier, Animadv. physico-med. ad loca. N.T. Spec. 2:30 sq.; Medic.-hermen. Untersuch. 109 sq. (extracted from Ackermann).

The passages which speak of a withered hand (1Ki 13:4; Mat 12:10; Mar 3:1) remain to be noticed. This (Gr. χεὶρ ξηρά) in the last two passages can be understood either of atrophy of the limbs (see Ackermann, in Weise's Material. 3:131 sq.; comp. Conradi, op.  cit. 2:212) or of palsy (Wedel, Exercit. dec. 8, p. 24 sq.; comp. Ader, Enarrat. p. 69 sq.; Schulthess, in Henke's Museum, 3:24 sq.). The case of Jeroboam (1Ki 13:4), whose hand was suddenly so affected that he could not draw it back to him, is either one of palsy, or perhaps of tetanus, as Ackermann thinks (l.c.). SEE PALSY.

## Paramahansas[[@Headword:Paramahansas]]

             a species of Sanyasi, or Hindu ascetics, and, indeed, the most eminent of the four gradations, being solely occupied with the investigation of Brahm, and equally indifferent to pleasure, insensible to cold or heat, and incapable of satiety or want. In accordance with this definition, individuals are sometimes found who pretend to have reached this degree of perfection, and in token of it they go naked, never speak, and never indicate any natural want. They are fed by attendants, as if unable to feed themselves. They are usually classed among the Saiva ascetics, but Prof. H. H. Wilson doubts the accuracy of the classification.

## Paramandyas[[@Headword:Paramandyas]]

             a portion of the dress of Caloyers, or Greek monks. It consists of a piece of black cloth sewed to the lining of their caps, and hanging down upon their shoulders.

## Paramats[[@Headword:Paramats]]

             a Buddhist sect which arose in the beginning of the present century at Ava. They respect only the Abhidharmma, and reject the other sacred books. Kosan, the founder of the sect, with about fifty of his followers, were put to death by order of the king.

## Paramo, Luiz De[[@Headword:Paramo, Luiz De]]

             a Spanish theologian, was born about 1545 in Borox, near Toledo. He was archdeacon and canon of the cathedral of Leon, and afterwards inquisitor of the faith in Sicily and in Spain. He consecrated his pen to history and to the defense of the Inquisition, and, wrote, among other works, De ornigine et progressu officii Sanctoe Inquisitionis ejusque dignitate et utilitate (Madrid, 1598, fol.; reprinted in 1614 at Antwerp). This book is the rarest and the most curious upon the tribunal of the Holy Office. Extracts have been translated from it in the sequel of the Manuel des Inquisiteurs (Paris, 1762, 12mo). See Antonio, Biblioth. Hispana nova, vol. ii.

## Paramonarios[[@Headword:Paramonarios]]

             was the name of an inferior officer belonging to the ancient Christian Church. The paramonarii are referred to in the Council of Chalcedon. Translators and critics differ as to the meaning of the word. Some of the more ancient writers consider it as equivalent to the Mansionarus or Ostiarus (q.v.). More modern critics, again, explain it by villicus, or steward of the lands. Walcott says the paramonarios was “in the East a bailiff of Church lands; in the West, a resident verger and porter.”

## Paramour[[@Headword:Paramour]]

             is in one passage of the A.V. (Eze 23:20) properly the rendering of פַּלֶּגֶשׁ, pille'gesh (whence the Greek παλλακίς), a concubine (q.v.), as elsewhere rendered, being in every other instance used only of a female.

## Paran[[@Headword:Paran]]

             (Heb. Paran', פָּארָן, according to Gesenius and Furst, excavated, i.e. a place of caves, from an Arab. root; according to others, from פָּאִר, to be beautiful; Sept. and Josephus, Φαράν; Vulg. Pharan), a name given in the Bible to a desert and to a mountain. The present article embodies the Biblical and the modern information on this subject.

1. THE WILDERNESS OF PARAN (מַדְבִּר פָּארָן; Sept. ἡ ἔρημος τοῦ Φαράν). The situation and boundaries of this desert are set forth with considerable exactness by a number of incidental notices in Scripture. It had Palestine on the north, the valley of Arabah on the east, and the desert of Sinai on the south. Its western boundary is not mentioned in the Bible, but it appears to have extended to Egypt and the Mediterranean.

The first notice of Paran is in connection with the expedition of the eastern kings against Sodom. After defeating the giant tribes east of the Jordan, they swept over Mount Seir (Edom) “unto the terebinth of Paran (עִד אֵיל פָּארָן; Sept. ἕως τῆς τερεβίνθου τῆς Φαράν Vulg. usque ad Campestria Pharan, A.V. “El Paran”), which is in the wilderness” (Gen 14:6). Doubtless some well-known sacred tree is here referred to. It stood on the western border of Seir, and consequently in the Arabah, SEE SEIR; and it was “in the wilderness” — that is, the desert of Paran, apparently considerably south of Kadesh. From the terebinth of Paran they  turned back, “and came to En-mishpat, which is Kadesh.” — When Abraham sent away Hagar and Ishmael from his tent at Beersheba, they went out into “the wilderness of Paran;” and Ishmael dwelt there, allying himself doubtless with the nomad tribes who made that place their home (Gen 21:14; Gen 21:21).

But it is from its connection with the wanderings of the Israelites that Paran derives its chief and abiding interest: “And the children of Israel took their journeys out of the wilderness of Sinai; and the cloud rested in the wilderness of Paran” (Num 10:12). From this it might be thought that Paran lay close to Mount Sinai, where the Israelites had long been encamped; but the full narrative which is afterwards given shows that from the encampment at Sinai they made a four-days march to Hazeroth (Num 10:33; Num 11:3; Num 11:34-35); and then the next march brought them into “the wilderness of Paran” (Num 12:16). From Paran the spies were sent to survey Canaan (Num 13:3); and after completing their mission they returned to the camp “unto the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesh” (Num 13:26). There is an apparent difficulty here. At first sight it would appear as if Kadesh in Paran was only a single march from Hazeroth; while Hazeroth has been identified with Ain Hudherah, which is 140 miles distant from Kadesh. The difficulty is solved by a reference to the detailed itinerary in Numbers 33 :Paran is not mentioned there, because it was the name of a wide region, and the sacred writer records only the names of the camp-stations. Hazeroth is mentioned, however, and so is Kadesh; and between them there are twenty stations (17-38). Most probably all these stations were in Paran, for it is said that when they “took their journeys out of the wilderness of Sinai, the cloud rested in the wilderness of Paran” (10:12); and Moses also states, “When we departed from Horeb, we went through all that great and terrible wilderness which ye saw by way of the mountain of the Amorites; and we came to Kadesh- barnea” (Deu 1:19). The wilderness of Paran in fact extended from Hazeroth, and the desert of Sinai (or Horeb) on the south, to the foot of the mountains of Palestine on the north; and its eastern border ran along the valley of the Arabah, from the gulf of Akabah to the southern shore of the Dead Sea. Through this wide region the Israelites marched, not in a straight line, but, like the modern Arab tribes, from pasture to pasture; and. it was when entering upon that long and toilsome march that Moses said to his father-in-law, “Leave us not, I pray thee; forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou mayest be ‘to us instead  of eyes” (Num 10:31). Jethro was intimately acquainted with the whole wilderness. As a nomad pastoral chief he knew the best pastures and all the wells and fountains; and hence Moses was most anxious to secure his services as guide.

The reference made to Paran in 1 Samuel 25 shows that it bordered upon the southern declivities of the mountains of Judah. Probably its boundary was not very accurately defined; and whatever part of that region lay between the limits of settled habitation was called “the wilderness, or pasture-land, of Paran.” It thus included a large section of the Negeb. SEE SOUTH COUNTRY. — The reference to Paran in Deu 1:1 is not so clear. The object of the sacred writer is to describe the place where Moses gave his long address to the Israelites. It was “on this (the east) side of Jordan, in the wilderness” (or Midbar of Moab; comp. Deu 1:5), in the plain (the Arabah, ערבה) over against the Red Sea (or “opposite to Suf, מול סוŠ), between Paran and Tophel, etc. (“between Paran, and between Tophel and Laban,” etc.). The sense appears to be that the Arabah in which Moses stood was opposite to the northern gulf of the Red Sea, and had on the one side Paran, and on the other Tophel, etc. It must not be inferred that Paran extended up to Jericho; all that seems to be meant is that it formed the western boundary of the greater part of the Arabah. — It would seem from the incidental statement in 1Ki 11:18 that Paran lay between Midian and Egypt. The region there called Midian was situated on the south of Edom, SEE MIDIAN, apparently at the head of the AElanitic gulf; and the road taken by the fugitive Hadad was most probably that now traversed by the Egyptian Haj route, which passes through the whole desert of Tih.

It is strange that both Eusebius and Jerome (followed by Steph. Byz.; Reland, p. 556; Raumer, and others) speak of Paran as a city, which they locate three days' journey east (πρὸς ἀνατολάς, but they must evidently mean west) of Aila (Onomast. s.v. Faran). They refer, doubtless, to the old town of Faran, in the valley of Feiran, at the foot of Mount Serbal, in the desert of Sinai. In this valley there are still ruins of a town, and indeed of more than one, with towers, aqueducts, and sepulchral excavations; and here Ruppell found the remains of a church, which he assigns to the 5th century (Reise in Nubien. p. 263). This was the Pharan or Faran which had a Christian population, and was the seat of a bishopric so early as A.D. 400 (Orieons Christ. col. 735; Reland, Palaest. p. 219, 220, 228). The city is  described, under the name of Feiran, by the Arabian historian Edrisi, about A.D. 1150, and by Makriri about A.D. 1400. The description of the latter is copied by Burckhardt (Syria, p. 616). He mentions it as having been a city of the Amalekites; and the history of the Hebrew pilgrimage renders it extremely probable that the Amalekites were actually stationed in-this valley. from which they came forth to attack the Israelites, when encamped near it at Rephidim (Exo 17:8). Feiran was thus an important place in early ages (Robinson, 1:126, 592); but it lies nearly thirty miles beyond the southern boundary of Paran. Nevertheless it seems to be a trace of the ancient name transferred to an adjoining locality. Some writers even regard it as the source of the designation of the region. Josephus mentions a valley of Paran; but it was situated somewhere in the wilderness of Judaea (War, 4:9, 4).

Paran is not strictly speaking “a wilderness.” The sacred writers call it midbar; that is, a pasture-land, as distinguished from an agricultural country. Its principal inhabitants were nomads, though it had a few towns and some corn-fields (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 1:190 sq.). The leading features of its physical geography are as follows: The central section, from Beersheba to Jebel et-Tib, is an undulating plateau, from 600 to 800 feet in height, traversed by bare rounded ridges, and shallow, dry valleys, running on the one side into the Arabab, and on the other to the Mediterranean. The soil is scanty, white, and thickly strewn with nodules of flint. In early spring it is partially covered with grass, shrubs, and weeds; but during the heat and drought of summer all vegetation disappears. and the whole surface assumes that aspect of dreary desolation which led the Israelites to call it “a great and terrible wilderness” (Deu 1:19); and which suggested in recent times the somewhat exaggerated language of Mr. Williams — “A frightfully terrific wilderness, whose horrors language must fail to describe” (Holy City, 1, App. 1, p. 464). Fountains are rare, and even wells and tanks are far apart. The plateau rises considerably towards the north-east; and, as deep glens descend from it to the Arabah, this section presents the appearance of a series of parallel ridges extending east and west. Their southern sides are mostly bluffs of naked white rock, which seem from a distance like colossal terrace-walls. These are the mountains of the Amorites mentioned in Deu 1:19-20, to which the Israelites approached through the wilderness, and which formed the southern border of Canaan. Besides these there is a line of bare white hills running along the whole western border of the Arabah, and forming  the support of the table-land of Paran. Towards the valley they descend in steep shelving slopes and rugged precipices, averaging about a thousand feet in height; and everywhere deeply furrowed by wild ravines. The passes from the Arabah to Paran are difficult,, and a comparatively small band of resolute men might defend them against an army. The southern declivities of the mountain of the Amorites would also present serious obstacles to the advance of a large host.

These natural features enable us to understand more fully some points in the history of the wilderness journey, and to illustrate many incidental expressions in the sacred narrative. They show why the Israelites feared to enter Canaan from Kadesh until they had ascertained by the report of the spies that those formidable mountain-passes were open (Deu 1:22). They show how the Amorites, “which dwelt in that mountain,” were able to drive them back when they attempted to ascend (Deu 1:44; comp. Num 14:40-45). They show how expressive and how natural is the language so often used by Moses at Kadesh. When he sent the spies, “he said unto them, Get you up this way southward, and go up into the mountain;” “so they went up... they ascended by the south.” “Caleb said, Let us go up at once. But the men that went up with him said, We be not able to go up against the people” (Num 13:17; Num 13:21-22; Num 13:30-31). Again, in describing the defeat of the people — “They rose up early... and gat them up into the top of the mountain, saying, We will go up into the place which the Lord hath promised... Moses said, Go not up. . . But they presumed to go up. . . and the Amalekites came down,” etc. (14:40, 42, 44, 45).

The name Paran thus corresponds in general outline with the desert Et-Tih. The Sinaitic desert, including the wedge of metamorphic rocks, granite, syenite, and porphyry, set, as it were, in a superficial margin of old red sandstone, forms nearly a scalene triangle, with its apex southward, and having its base or upper edge not a straight, but concave crescent line — the ridge, in short, of the Et-Tih range of mountains, extending about 120 miles from east to west, with a slight dip, the curve of the aforesaid crescent southward. Speaking generally, the wilderness of Sinai (Num 10:12; Num 12:16), in which the march-stations of Taberah and Hazeroth are probably included towards its north-east limit, may be said to lie south of the Et-Tih range, the wilderness of Paran north of it, and the one to end where the other begins. That of Paran is a stretch of chalky formation, the chalk being covered with coarse gravel, mixed with black  flint and drifting. sand. The caravan route from Cairo to Akaba crosses the Et-Tih desert in a line from west to east, a little south. In this wide tract, which extends northward to join the “wilderness of Beersheba” (Gen 21:21; comp. Gen 21:14), and eastward probably to the wilderness of Zin, SEE KADESH, on the Edomitish border, Ishmael dwelt, and there probably his posterity originally multiplied. Ascending northward from it on a meridian to the east of Beersheba, we should reach Maon and Carmel, or that southern portion of the territory of Judah, west of the- Dead Sea, known as “the South,” where the waste changes gradually into an uninhabited pasture-land, at least in spring and autumn, and in which, under the name of “Paran,” Nabal fed his flocks (1Sa 25:1). Between the wilderness of Paran and that of Zin no strict demarcation exists in the narrative, nor do the natural features of the region, so far as yet ascertained, yield a well-defined boundary. The name of Paran seems, as in the story of Ishmael, to have predominated towards the western extremity of the northern desert frontier of Et-Tih, and in Num 34:4 the wilderness of Zin, not Paran, is spoken of as the southern border of the land or of the tribe of Judah (Jos 15:3).

If by the Paran region we understand “that great and terrible wilderness” so emphatically described as the haunt of noxious creatures and the terror of the wayfarer (Deu 1:19; Deu 8:15), then we might see how the adjacent tracts, which still must be called “wilderness,” might, either as having less repulsive features, or because they lay near to some settled country, have a special nomenclature of their own. For the latter reason the wilderness of Zin, eastward towards Edom and Mount Seir, and of Shur, westward towards Egypt, might be thus distinguished; for the former reason that of Zin and Sinai. It would not be inconsistent with the rules of scriptural nomenclature if we suppose these accessory wilds to be sometimes included under the general name of wilderness of Paran;” and to this extent we may perhaps modify the previous general statement that south of the Et-Tih range is the wilderness of Sinai, and north of it that of Paran. Still, construed strictly, the wildernesses of Paran and Zin would seem to lie as already approximately laid down. If, however, as previously hinted, they may in another view be regarded as overlapping, we can more easily understand how Chedorlaomer, when he “smote” the peoples south of the Dead Sea, returned round its south-western curve to the El-Paran, or “terebinth tree of Paran,” viewed as indicating a locality in connection with the wilderness of Paran, and yet close, apparently, to that Dead Sea border (Gen 14:6).  It is worthy of special note that the wanderings of the Israelites through Paran became to it as a new baptism. Its name is now, and has been for ages; Bedu et-Tih, “The wilderness of wandering” (Abulfeda, Tab. Syr. ed. Kohler, p. 4; Jaubert's Edrisi, 1:360). In addition to the authorities already referred to, notices of Paran will be found in the writings of Burckhardt (Travels in Syria, p. 444); Seetzen (Zach's Monatl. Corresp. ch. xvii); Ruppell (Reisen, p. 241); Bartlett (Forty Days in the Desert, p. 149 sq.); Ritter (Pal. und Syr. 1:147 sq., 1079 sq.); Olin (Travels in Egypt, etc. 2:59 sq.); Miss Martineau (Eastern Life, p. 418 sq.); and especially in Palmer's Desert of the Exodus, (1872). SEE SINAI.

2. MOUNT PARAN (הִר פָּארָן) is mentioned only in two passages, both sublime odes celebrating the Divine Majesty. The same glorious event, whatever it may have been, is plainly alluded to in both. Moses says, “The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran,” etc. (Deu 33:2); and Habakkuk writes: “God came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran” (Hab 3:3). The object of both writers is to call attention to those places where the most striking manifestations of divine power and majesty were made to Israel. Next to Sinai, Kadesh stands out as the theater of the Lord's most remarkable workings. It lies in the valley of the Arabah, with Seir on the one side and the highlands of Paran on the other. The summits of both these ranges were, doubtless, now illumined, now clouded, like the brow of Sinai, by the divine glory (comp. Num 16:19-35; Num 16:42; Num 20:1). Teman was another name for Edom, or Seir; and hence the local allusions of Moses and Habakkuk are identical. It may therefore be safely concluded that Mount Paran is that ridge, or series of ridges, already described, lying on the north-east part of the wilderness of Tih. There is nothing in Scripture which would lead us to connect it more closely with Sinai than with Seir, or to identify it with Jebel Serbal, which overlooks Wady Feiran, as is done by Stanley and some others.

## Paranymph[[@Headword:Paranymph]]

             (παρανύμφιος), a term used in ancient Greece to denote one of the friends or relations of a bridegroom who attended him on the occasion of his marriage. Among the Jews there were two paranymphs, one a relative of the bridegroom and the other of the bride; the first was called his companion, and the other her conductor. Their business was to attend upon the parties at the marriage ceremony. SEE WEDDING.

## Parapet[[@Headword:Parapet]]

             (Ital. para-petto, from parare, to protect, and petto, the breast) is an architectural term applied to a low breastwork intended for the protection of gutters and roofs. In England they are commonly battlemented or panelled, but in France they are usually pierced. Parapets are of very ancient date. The Israelites were commanded to build a “battlement” round their flat roofs.

## Paraphrase[[@Headword:Paraphrase]]

             SEE COMMENTARY; SEE TARGUM.

## Parasara[[@Headword:Parasara]]

             is the name of several celebrated personages of ancient India whose history is recorded or referred to in the Mahabharata (q.v.), the Puranas (q.v.), and other Hindû writings.

## Parasceve[[@Headword:Parasceve]]

             (παρασκευή. preparation), the day before the Savior's passion. It is called by the Council of Laodicea the fifth day of the great solemn week, when such as were baptized, having learned their creed, were to repeat it before the bishop or presbyters in the church. This was the only day for several ages that ever the creed was publicly repeated in the Greek churches. — It was also called Holy Thursday, or Maundy Thursday (q.v.), and is observed with great pomp in the Romish Church. SEE PREPARATION.

## Parash[[@Headword:Parash]]

             SEE HORSE.

## Parashioth[[@Headword:Parashioth]]

             (or Parshiyoth, פִּרְשַׁיּוֹת). It was the custom of the Jews to have the whole Law, or Five Books of Moses, read over in the synagogues in the course of  every year. Hence, for the sake of convenience, the Law was divided into fifty-four sections, or Parashioth, as nearly equal in length as possible. These were appointed to be read in succession, one every week, until the whole was gone over. They were made fifty-four in number because the longest years contained fifty-four weeks, and it was thought desirable that no Sabbath in all such a case should be left without its particular portion; but as common years were shorter, certain shorter sections were joined together so as to make one out of two, in order to bring the reading regularly to a close at the end of the year. The course of reading the Parashioth in the synagogues commenced on the first Sabbath after the feast of Tabernacles; or, rather, on the Sabbath before that, for on the same day that they finished the last course of reading they began the new course, in order, as the rabbins allege, that the devil might have no ground for accusing them to God of being weary of reading the Law. SEE HAPHTARAH.

## Parasiti[[@Headword:Parasiti]]

             (παράσιτοι, fellow-waiters), assistants to certain priests among the ancient Greeks. The gods to whose service parasites were attached were Apollo, Heracles, the Anaces, and Athena of Pallene. They were generally elected from the most ancient and illustrious families, but what were the precise duties assigned to them it is difficult to discover. They were twelve in number, and received as the remuneration for their services a third part of the sacrifices offered to their respective gods. Parasites were also appointed as assistants to the highest magistrates in Greece. Thus there were both civil and priestly parasites. The term is now generally used to denotes flatterers or sycophants of any kind. Paratorium, a name sometimes given to the Oblationarium (q.v.) of the Ordo Romanus, because when the offerings were received preparation was made out of them for the Eucharist.

## Parasurama[[@Headword:Parasurama]]

             is the sixth avatar, or incarnation of Vishnu, in which he appears as Rama, the son of Jamadagui, armed with aparasu, or axe. Arjuna, king of the Haihayas, had obtained, as a reward for his pious deeds, a thousand arms and sovereignty over all the earth. The gods, alarmed at his power, applied to Vishnu, who decided to be born as a son of Jamadagui, in order that he might slay him. Jamadagui was a pious sage, who had married Renuka, a princess, and had obtained by her five sons, the last of whom was Rama, or Vishnu incarnate. On a certain occasion Arjuna came to the hermitage of Jamadagui, and was there hospitably received by the saint, who could treat him and his followers sumptuously, as he possessed a fabulous cow of plenty, that not only supplied him with the milk and butter required for his sacrificial offerings, but with everything else he wished for. Pleased with the precious qualities of this cow, and disregarding the kind treatment he had received, Arjuna carried off with him the cow and her calf. When Rama, who was absent at this time, returned to the hermitage, he took up his axe (or his bow) and slew Arjuna and his army. The sons of Arjuna, to avenge their father's death, attacked the hermitage and succeeded in killing Jamadagui. Thereupon Rama made a vow to extirpate the whole Kshattriya, or military race, and, not satisfied with destroying the sons of Arjuna, he killed every Kshattriya whom he met afterwards. It is said that "he cleared thrice seven times the earth" (i.e., slew as many generations) "and filled with their blood the five large lakes of Samautapauchaka, from which he offered libations to the race of Bhrigu." He then performed a solemn sacrifice, and distributed the land and great riches among the ministering priests. There can be little doubt that the legend is in essence historical, recording a great struggle in primeval times between Brahmans and Kshattriyas, of which we have the parallel in the history of Vasishtha and Viswamitra (q.v.).

## Paratrapezon[[@Headword:Paratrapezon]]

             (παρατράπεζον) is the name given in the Greek Church to a side-table for the additional chalices. SEE CHALICE.

## Paray-le-Monial[[@Headword:Paray-le-Monial]]

             a little village in the eastern part of France, has become noted in recent times as the seat of a sacred shrine dedicated to a virgin who is reputed to  have led a most exemplary life, and was canonized in 1864. All manner of miracles are reputed to have been wrought at the shrine of Paray-le- Monial, and so general became the enthusiasm over these wonderful (!) reports that pilgrimages were regularly organized not only in France, where the checkered fate of the last war would naturally turn the lower classes to superstitious veneration and faith in the miraculous intervention of departed saints, but also in Belgium, and in Protestant England and America. In 1873 pilgrims from all points of the compass flocked to Parav- le-Monial. Of course the English and American pilgrims attracted special attention, for it was supposed that in neither of these countries could any superstitious veneration be fostered and quickened. The general supposition of Protestants, and all who disbelieve ecclesiastical miracles (q.v.), is that the Ultramontanes are seeking to unite the lower classes of all countries under the papal banner, and, by awakening in them a sympathy for the Romish cause, to undermine the opposition which has developed against Jesuitism and Ultramontanism at the different European centers of influence. Inasmuch as the Jesuits and Ultramontanes generally have encouraged the people in these pilgrimages, the supposition seems reasonable.

In the article MARIE A LA COQUE we have already given the personal history of this remarkable Romish saint. It remains to be added here that the Romanists of Paray-le-Monial claim to possess her bones, and that over them stands the altar erected to her memory. A correspondent of the New York Tribune, who was an eyewitness, in September, 1873, of the arrival and reception of a great body of English pilgrims — a motley throng of men and women — priests and laymen, old and young, rich and poor — thus describes the saint's remains and their costly shrine:

“She lies stretched upon an altar in the splendid chapel which her devotees have endowed. When the bones already referred to were gathered up from the grave in which they had lain for two hundred years, they were committed to the charge of a cunning artificer, who reverently connected them as far as they would go with gold wire. Head, feet, and hands were formed out of wax and attached to the bones, and the body was wrapped up in wadding, with an outward covering of cloth of gold, and laid upon a magnificent marble altar enclosed in a rich case of bronze-dore, and studded with precious stones. The eyes of the wax figure, which are made of enamel, are half open. With its right hand it presses upon its breast a burning heart of pure gold, and in its left hand it holds a branch of silver  lilies. The chapel itself is almost oppressive from the richness of its decoration. The walls are hidden behind the pictures and the banners which the faithful have deposited there. The vault is of azure, studded with stars of gold. The pavement of the church is of marble, while that of the sanctuary is set with stones in imitation of carpet-patterns. Before the wax figure burn constantly, day and night, sixteen golden lamps set with precious stones. One of the lamps burns for the preservation of the faith in Belgium, another for the conversion of England, a third represents the Order of the Sacred Heart, and the rest are severally devoted to similar ‘intentions.' After this week the number of lamps will be increased by one, which the English pilgrims have brought with them, and for the endowment of which a sum of money has been invested. As things go, it takes a capital sum of forty pounds to endow a lamp with oil in perpetuity.”

SEE PILGRIMAGE.

## Parbar[[@Headword:Parbar]]

             (Heb. hap-Parbar', הִפִּרְבָּר, with the article; Sept. διαδεχομένους; ‘Vulg. cellulae), a word occurring in Hebrew and A.V. only in 1Ch 26:18, but there found twice: “At [the] Parbar westward four [Levites] at the causeway, two at [the] Parbar.” From this passage, and also from the context, it would seem that Parbar was some place on the west side of the Temple enclosure, the same side with the causeway and the gate Shallecheth. The latter was cause to the causeway — probably on it, being that which in later times gave place to the bridge: and we know from its remains that the bridge was at the extreme south of the western wall. Parbar therefore must have been north of Shallecheth, apparently where the Bab Silsilis now is. As to the meaning of the name, the rabbins generally agree (see the Targum of the passage; also Buxtorf, Lex Talm. s.v. פרב; and the references in Lightfoot, Prospect of Temple, ch. v) in translating it “the outside place;” while modern authorities take it as equivalent to the parvarim in 2Ki 23:11 (A.V. “suburbs”), a word almost identical with parbar, and used by the early Jewish interpreters as the equivalent of migrashim, tie precincts (A.V. “suburbs”) of the Levitical cities. Accepting this interpretation, there is no difficulty in identifying the Parbar with the suburb (τὸ προάστειον) mentioned by Josephus in describing Herod's Temple (Ant. 15:11, 5), as lying in the deep valley which separated the west wall of the Temple from the city opposite it; in other words, the southern end of the Tyropeeon, which intervenes between  the Wailing-place and the (so-called) Zion. The two gates in the original wall were in Herod's Temple increased to four. It does not follow (as some have assumed) that Parbar was identical with the “suburbs” of 2Ki 23:11, though the words denoting each may have the same signification. For it seems most consonant with probability to suppose that the “horses of the Sun” would be kept on the eastern side of the Temple mount, in full view of the rising rays of the god as they shot over the Mount of Olives, and not in a deep valley on its western side. Parbar is probably an ancient Jebusitish name, which perpetuated itself after the Israelitish conquest of the city. Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1123 a) and Furst (Handwb. 2:235 b) connect parbar and parvarim with a similar Persian word, farwar, meaning a summer-house or building open on all sides to the sun and air. SEE TEMPLE.

## Parcae[[@Headword:Parcae]]

             (from the root pars, “a part”), the name given by the Romans to the powerful female divinities who presided over the birth and the life of mankind; they are called the goddesses of Fate, from the fact that they assigned to every one his “part” or lot. The Greek name, Moirae, has the same meaning (from μέρος, a share). They were three in number, Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos, daughters of Nox and Erebus, according to Hesiod, or of Jupiter and Themis, according to the same poet in another poem. Some make them daughters of the sea. Clotho, the youngest of the sisters, presided over the moment in which we are born, and held a distaff in her hand; Lachesis spun out all the events and actions of our life; and Atropos, the eldest of the three, cut the thread of human life with a pair of scissors. Their different functions are well expressed in this ancient verse:

“Clotho colum retinet,

Lachesis net,

et Atropos occat.”

The name of the Parcae, according to Varro, is derived a partu or parturiendo, because they presided over the birth of men, and, by corruption, the word parca is formed from parta or partus; but, according to Servius, they are called so by antiphrasis, quod nemini parcant. The power of the Parcae was great and extensive. Some suppose that they were subject to none of the gods but Jupiter; while others suppose that even Jupiter himself was obedient to their commands; and indeed we see the father of the gods, in Homer's Iliad, unwilling to see Patroclus perish, yet obliged, by the superior power of the Fates, to abandon him to his destiny. According to the more received opinion, they were the arbiters of the life  and death of mankind, and whatever good or evil befalls us in the world immediately proceeds from the Fates or Parcae. Some make them ministers of the king of hell, and represent them as sitting at the foot of his throne; others represent them as placed on radiant thrones, amid the celestial spheres, clothed in robes spangled with stars, and wearing crowns on their heads. According to Pausanias, the names of the Parcae were different from those already mentioned. The most ancient of all, as the geographer observes, was Venus Urania, who presided over the birth of men; the second was Fortune; Ilythia was the third. To these some add a fourth, Proserpina, who often disputes with Atropos the right of cutting the thread of human life. The worship of the Parcae was well established in some cities of Greece, and though mankind were well convinced that they were inexorable; and that it was impossible to mitigate them, yet they were eager to show a proper respect to their divinity by raising them temples and statues. They received the same worship as the Furies, and their votaries yearly sacrificed to them black sheep, during which solemnity the priests were obliged to wear garlands of flowers. The Parcae were generally represented as three old women with chaplets made of wool, and interwoven with the flowers of the narcissus. They were covered with a white robe, and fillets of the same color, bound with chaplets. One of them held a distaff, another the spindle, and the third was armed with scissors, with which she cut the thread which her sisters had spun. Their dress is differently represented by some authors. Clotho appears in a variegated robe, and on her head is a crown of seven stars. She holds a distaff in her hand reaching from heaven to earth. The robe which Lachesis wore was variegated with a great number of stars, and near her were placed a variety of spindles. Atropos was clothed in black; she held scissors in her hand, with clews of thread of different sizes, according to the length or shortness of the lives whose destinies they seemed to contain. Hyginus attributed to them the invention of these Greek letters, α, β, η, τ, υ, and others called them the secretaries of heaven, and the keeping of the archives of eternity. The Parcae had places consecrated to then throughout all Greece, at Corinth, Sparta, Thebes, Olympia, etc. See Hesiod, Theog. et scut. Her.; Pausan. 1. 1, c. 40: 1. 3, c. 11; 1. 5, c. 15; Homer, II. 24:49; Callimach. in Dian.; AElian, Animn. 10; Pindar, Olymp. 10; Nem. 7; Eurip. in Iphiq.; Plutarch, De faltcie in orbe Lunce; Hygin. inz proe fab. 277; Orph Hymnn. 58; Apolloil. 1, etc.; Claudian, De rapt. Pros.; Horace, Od. 6, etc.; Ovid, Met. v.' 533; Lucan, 3; Virgil, AEn. 1:22, etc.; Senec. in Herc. Fur.; Stat Theb. 6

## Parched Corn[[@Headword:Parched Corn]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of קָלַי[once קָלַיא, 1Sa 17:17], kali', an edible substance (Lev 23:14; Rth 2:14; 1Sa 17:17; 1Sa 25:18; 2Sa 17:28, twice, the last “parched pulse”), and of ἄλφιτα in Jdt 10:5. The correctness of this translation has not, however, been assented to by all commentators. Thus, as Celsius (Hierobot. 2:231) says, “Syrus interpres, Onkelos, et. Jonathan Ebrnea voce utuntur, Lev 23:14; 1Sa 17:17;' 25:18; 2Sa 17:18.” Arias Montanus and others, he adds, render kali by the word tostum, considering it to be derived from קָלָה, kalah', which in Hebrew signifies “to toast” or ‘ parch.” So in the Arabic kali signifies anything cooked in a frying-pan, and is applied to the common Indian dish which by Europeans is called currie or curry; kali and kalla signify one that fries, or a cook. From the same root is supposed to be derived the word kali or al- kali, now so familiarly known as alkali, which is obtained from the ashes of burned vegetables. But as, in the various passages of Scripture where it occurs, kali is without any adjunct, different opinions have been entertained respecting the substance which is to be understood as having been toasted or parched. By some it is supposed to have been grain in general; by others, only wheat. Some Hebrew writers maintain that flour or meal. and others that parched meal, is intended, as in the passage of Rth 2:14, where the Sept. translates kali by ἄλφιτα, and the Vulg. by polenta. A difficulty, however, arises in the case of 2Sa 17:28, where the word occurs twice in the same verse. We are told that Shobi and others, on David's arrival at Mahanaim, in the farther limit of the tribe of Gad, “brought beds, and basins, and earthen vessels, and wheat, and barley, and flour, and parched corn (kali), and beans, and lentils, and parched pulse. (kali), and honey, and butter, and sheep, and cheese of kine, for David and for the people that were with him to eat.” This is a striking representation of what may be seen every day in the East: when a traveler arrives at a village, the common light beds of the country are brought him, as well as earthen pots, with food of different kinds. The meaning of the above passage is explained by the statement of Hebrew writers that there are two kinds of kali — one made of parched corn, the other of parched pulse; which are described by R. Salomon, on Aboda Zarah, fol. 38:2.

There is no doubt that in the East a little meal, either parched or not, mixed with a little water, often constitutes the dinner of the natives, especially of those engaged in laborious occupations, as boatmen while dragging their vessels  up rivers, and unable to make any long delay. Another principal preparation, much and constantly in use in Western Asia, is burgul, that is, corn first boiled, then bruised in the mill to take the husk off, and afterwards dried or parched in the sun. — In this state it is preserved for use, and employed for the same purposes as rice. The meal of parched corn is also much used, particularly by travelers, who mix it with honey, butter, and spices, and so eat it; or else mix it with water only, and drink it as a draught, the refrigerating and satisfying qualities of which they justly extol (Kitto, Pictorial Bible, 2:537). Parched grain is also, no doubt, very common. Thus in the bazars of India not only may rice be obtained in a parched state, but also the seeds of the Nymphea, and of the Nelumbsium epeciosum, or bean of Pythagoras, and most abundantly the pulse called gram by the English, on which their cattle are chiefly fed. This is the Cicer arietinum of botanists, or chick-pea, which is common even in Egypt and the south of Europe, and may be obtained everywhere in India in a parched state, under the name of chebenne. Belon (Observat. 2:53) informs us that large quantities of it are parched and dried, and stored in magazines at Cairo and Damascus. It is much used during journeys, and particularly by the great pilgrim caravan to Mecca (comp. Hasselquist, p. 191). Considering all these points, it does not appear to us by any means certain that the kali is correctly translated “parched corn” in all the passages of Scripture. Thus, in Lev 23:14 : “Ye shall eat neither bread, nor parched corn (kali), nor green, ears, until...” So in Rth 2:14 : “And he (Boaz) reached her parched corn (kali), and she did eat.” 1Sa 17:17 : “Take now for thy brethren an ephah of parched corn.” And again, 25:18, where five measures of parched corn are mentioned. Bochartt remarks (Hieroz. II, 1:7) that Jerome renders kali by frixum cicer, i.e. the parched cicer or chick-pea; and, to show that it was the practice among the ancients to parch the cicer, he quotes Plautus (Bacch. 4:5, 7), Horace (De Arte Poetica, 1. 249), and others; and shows from the writings of the rabbins that kali was also applied to some kind of pulse. The name kali seems, moreover, to have been widely spread through Asiatic countries. Thus in Shakspeare's Hindee Dictionary, kalce, from a Sanscrit root, is translated pulse — leguminous seeds in general. It is applied in the Himalayas to the common field-pea. It is cultivated in the Himalayas, also in the plains of Northwest India, and is found wild in the Khadie of the Jumna near Delhi; the corra muttur of the natives, called kullae in the hills (Illust. of Himalayan Botany, ip. 200).

Hence we are disposed to consider the pea, or the chick-pea, as more correct than parched corn in some of the  above passages of Scripture. See also Gesenius. Thesaur. p. 1215; Celsius, Hierobot. 2:231 sq., where other methods of interpretation are collected. Some have even supposed kali to be a kind of coffee-bean! The predominant opinion of interpreters. however, sustains the rendering of the A.V., since wheat or barley, roasted in the ears and then rubbed out, is still common among the. Bedouinn (see Legh, in Macmichael's Journey, p.235), and in Palestine (Robinson, Bibl. Res. 2:394). Thus Thomson remarks, “A quantity of the best ears, not too ripe, are plucked with the stalks attached. These are tied into small parcels, a blazing fire is kindled with dry grass and thorn-bushes, and the corn-heads are held in it until the chaff is mostly burned off. The grain is thus sufficiently roasted to be eaten, and it is a favorite article all over the country” (Land and Book, 2:510). Tristram likewise observes, “We once witnessed a party of reapers making their evening meal of parched corn. A few sheaves of wheat were brought down, and tossed on the fire of brushwood. As soon as the straw was consumed, the charred heads were dexterously swept from the embers on a cloak spread on the ground. The women then beat the ears and tossed them into the air until they were thoroughly winnowed, when the wheat was eaten at once while it was hot. The dish was by no means unpalatable” (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 492). SEE EARS (OF CORN).

## Parched Ground[[@Headword:Parched Ground]]

             is the rendering of the Hebrew sharab', שָׁרָב, in Isa 35:7. This word properly means “heat of the sun,” as the A.V. renders it in Isa 49:10. Hence it is used to designate a phenomenon which is frequent in Arabia and Egypt, and may be occasionally seen in the southern parts of Europe; called by the Arabs Serab, and by the French Le Mirage, by which name it is also commonly known in English. Descriptions of this illusion are often given by travelers. It consists in the appearance of a lake or sea in the midst of a plain where none in reality exists. It is produced by the reflection of the rays of light from strata of air heated by the sand or the sun; and it frequently exhibits, along with the undulating appearance of water, the shadows of objects within or around the plain, both in a natural and in an inverted position. The deception is most complete, and to the weary traveler who is attracted by it, it is in the highest degree mortifying, since, instead of refreshing water, he finds himself in the midst of nothing but glowing sand. It is often used proverbially. or for the sake of comparison, by the Arabs, as in the Koran (Sur. 24:39): “But as for those who believe  not, their works are like the serab of the plain: the thirsty imagines it to be water, but when he reaches it he finds it is nothing.” The same figure occurs in Isa 35:7 : “The sharab shall become a lake,” i.e. the illusive appearance of a lake in the desert shall become a real lake of refreshing waters. See Gesenius and Henderson on Isaiah, and comp. the descriptions and explanations in Kitto's Physical History of Palestine, p. 147, 150, 151. SEE MIRAGE.

## Parchi, Estori Ben-Moses[[@Headword:Parchi, Estori Ben-Moses]]

             a noted Hebrew scholar, was a native of Provence, and belonged to those exiles who were driven from France in the year 1306, under Philip IV, the Fair, one of the most rapacious, perhaps the most cruel sovereign who ever sat on the throne of France. At the time of the expulsion Parchi must have been a young man yet, for in the introduction to his work he gives us a description of the miseries which he had to undergo in the following words: “They drove me out from the college; naked I had to leave my father's house, as a young man, and was obliged to wander from country to country, from people to people, whose languages were foreign to me.” Parchi found a resting-place in Palestine, where he wrote his וָפֶרִח בִּפְתּוֹר , which treats on the topography of Palestine, and is especially valuable for the geography of the Holy Scriptures, the Talmud, and the Middle Ages, for numismatics and chronology. It was first published at Venice, 1549, and has been edited with a very valuable introduction by H. Edelmann (Berlin, 1846 and 1852). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:259; Zunz, in Asher's Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela (London, 1841), 2:393-448; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:268; Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1851, 1852, p. 526; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. ut. s. Sekten, 3:62; Zunz, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur, p. 462, 535, 536. (B. P.)

## Parchment[[@Headword:Parchment]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. at 2Ti 4:13 of the Greek μεμβράνα, a skin, from which the English membrane is derived. The apostle Paul in this passage directs Timothy to bring with him to Rome, whither he charges him to repair speedily, certain things, “but especially the parchments;” what these parchments were to which so much importance seems to be attached can only at this time be matter of conjecture.

Parchment is prepared from the skins of animals, generally sheep, in an untanned state. It “is one of the oldest inventions of writing materials, and  was known at least as early as 500 years B.C. Herodotus speaks of books written upon skins in his time. Pliny, without good grounds, places the invention as late as 196 B.C., stating that it was made at Pergamos (hence the name Pergamea, corrupted into English parchment) in the reign of Eumenius II, in consequence of Ptolemy of Egypt having prohibited the exportation of papyrus. Possibly the Pergamian invention was an improvement in the preparation of skins, which had certainly been used centuries before. The manufacture rose to great importance in Rome about a century B.C., and parchment soon became the chief material for writing on; and its use spread all over Europe, and retained its pre-eminence until the invention of paper from rags, which from its great durability proved a fortunate circumstance for literature” (Chambers). Parchment is now rarely used except for literary diplomas and such documents as are destined for special permanence. SEE WRITING.

## Parchon, Salomon Ben-Abraham[[@Headword:Parchon, Salomon Ben-Abraham]]

             one of the earliest Jewish grammarians and lexicographers, who flourished about 1130 at Calatajud, in Aragon. He afterwards emigrated to the peninsula of Salerno, where he most probably died about 1180. Being anxious to furnish his co-religionists in Southern Italy with the results of the grammatical and exegetical labors of his brethren in Spain, Parchon compiled, in the year 1160, a Hebrew lexicon, entitled: מחברת הערו. Though it is substantially a translation of Ibn-Ganach's celebrated lexicon, SEE IBN-GANACH, yet Parchon also introduces in it the labors of Chajug, Jehudah Ha-Levi, Ibn-Ezra, etc., and explains many words by the aid of passages from the Targums, the Mishna, Tosefta, and the Talmud. The work is divided into two parts; the first containing a grammar of the Hebrew language, and the second a lexicon. It has been published by Stern (Presburg, 1844), with a valuable introduction by Rappaport, in which this erudite scholar gives a succinct history of the study of the Hebrew language, and of the different periods in which the great grammarians lived. Parchon also wrote a commentary on the Prophets and Hagiographa, which has not as yet come to light (comp. Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch [Leipsic, 1859], p. 108; Fuirst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 3:66).

## Parcloses (or Percloses)[[@Headword:Parcloses (or Percloses)]]

             is an architectural term applied to enclosures, railings, or screens, such as may be used to protect a tomb, to separate a chapel from the main body of the church (especially those at the east end of the aisle); also to form the front of a gallery, or for other similar purposes. It is either of open work or close. A distinct chapel is often formed in this manner, e.g. a chantry chapel. SEE CHAPEL.

## Pardee, Richard Gay[[@Headword:Pardee, Richard Gay]]

             one of the most noted Sunday-school workers of our day, and one of the most remarkable of American lay-workers in the interests of the Christian Church, was born at Sharon, Conn., Oct. 12, 1811, and was the oldest of a family of twelve children. His boyhood was spent on his father's farm, upon Sharon Mountain, and Richard attended the common district school. This was the only schooling he ever had. At the age of seventeen he went to Seneca Falls, N. Y., to live with an uncle, and was engaged for a time as a clerk in the post-office, but afterwards learned the dry-goods business. He was at this time strongly inclined to a life of gayety; but about 1831 he was converted, and ever after he most faithfully served the Church and his God. He became at once active in Sunday-school work, and being of a quick, perceptive turn,of mind he fathomed the imperfections of Sunday- school training as it prevailed at that time, and applied himself to bring about improvements. While living in Palmyra, N. Y., where he had engaged in business, he became intimate with Mr. L. B. Tousley, the well-known children's missionary of that region, and the two friends made frequent missionary tours together through the western part of the state, addressing large meetings of children, teachers, and friends of Sunday-schools. Pardee was at that time a Presbyterian elder, and superintendent of the Sunday- school of the church to which he belonged, and also corresponding secretary of the “Wayne County Sunday-school Union.” From 1851 to 1853 he resided at Geneva, N. Y., and then removed to New York City to enter the service of the “New York Sunday-school Union.” As the agent of that organization, his business was to promote in every legitimate way a healthy activity in the cause of Sunday-schools, but especially to secure the establishment of mission-schools.

The agent was well suited to the task assigned him, and the work accomplished became at once a spur and a model for Christian workers in this line of effort in other cities. The mission-schools of the New York Sunday-school Union became a notable  feature in the religious movement of the great metropolis, and had a wide influence in leading to similar operations elsewhere. He resigned his position in the Union in the fall of 1863 to take a position as agent in a life insurance company, but he so conditioned his employers that he had perfect liberty to go and come when he pleased, and he became thenceforth of even greater service to the general Sundayschool interests of this country than he had previously been. He now spent more than three fourths of his time in voluntary, unpaid labor in the Sunday-school cause, going to conventions, institutes, and Sundayschool meetings of every kind to which he was invited, visiting in this way every state in the union except California, everywhere welcome, and everywhere carrying with him an influence rich in blessing. He was also sent for by the students of several of our largest theological seminaries, and delivered in each a course of familiar lectures on the practical details of Sundayschool organization and labor. Among the institutions in which he thus labored were the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Princeton, the Union Seminary in New York, and the Episcopal Seminary in Philadelphia These blessed labors were suddenly cut short by death, Feb. 11, 1869. A more gentle, genial, loving spirit was never met. Without being remarkably original, he was yet eminently progressive in his ideas, always keeping himself on the top of the advancing wave; and the new ideas which he gathered and scattered in such rich profusion wherever he went were in turn sent broadcast all over the country through the columns of the Sunday-school Times, to which he regularly contributed from the establishment of that paper until his hand ceased to hold a pen. Mr. C. C. North, the noted Methodist lay-worker, in a eulogy which he pays the much lamented Pardee, writes (N. Y. Christian Advocate, Feb. 18,1869): “It has not been within my province to write of philosophic powers, of scientific researches, of brilliant poetic conceptions, nor of splendid oratory; but of traits, virtues, and usefulness, so singular and so rare, that while the generation past produced but one Raikes, the present has given birth to but one Pardee.” His two volumes, the Sunday-school Worker and the Sabbath- school index, are widely known and prized. See Dr. John S. Hart in Sunday-school Times, April 3, 1869.

## Pardes[[@Headword:Pardes]]

             (פרדס, i.e. Paradise) is the acrostic comprising the four exegetical rules, סוד, דרוש, רמז, פשט, by which the rabbins explained the Scriptures.  Immediately after the close of the canon the study of the Old Testament became an object of scientific treatment among the Jews. A number of God-fearing teachers arose, who, by their instruction, encouragement, and solemn admonitions, rooted and built up the people in their scriptural faith. As the Bible formed the central point around which their legends, sermons, lectures. discussions, investigations, etc., clustered, a homiletico-exegetical literature was in the course of time developed, called Midrash (q.v.), מדרש (from דרש, “to study, expound” — a term which the A.V. renders by “Story,” 2Ch 13:22; 2Ch 24:27), which became as mysterious in its gigantic dimensions as it is in its origin. Starting from the principle that Scripture contains all sciences, as well as the requirements of man for time and eternity, an answer to every question, and that every repetition, figure, parallelism, synonym, word, letter, nay, the very shape and ornaments of the letter or titles, must have some recondite meaning, “just as every fibre of a fly's wing or an ant's foot had its peculiar significance,” the text was explained in a fourfold manner: viz. 1. פְּשִׁט; 2. רֶמֶז; 3. דְּרוּשׁ; 4. סוֹד. The one called פְּשִׁט, simple, primary, literal, aimed at the simple understanding of words and things, in accordance with the primary exegetical law of the Talmud, that no verse of the Scripture ever practically traveled beyond its literal meaning, אין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו (Jebanmoth, 24a), though it might be explained, homiletically and otherwise, in innumerable new ways. The second, רֶמֶז, means “hint,” i.e. the discovery of the indications contained in certain seemingly superfluous letters and signs in Scripture.

These were taken to refer to laws not distinctly mentioned, but either existing traditionally or newly- promulgated. This method, when more generally applied, begot a kind of memoria technica, a stenography akin to the “Notarikon” of the Romans. Points and notes were added to the margins of scriptural MSS., and the foundation of the Massorah, or diplomatic preservation of the text, was thus laid. The third, דְּרוּשׁ, was homiletic application of prophetical and historical dicta to the actual condition of things. It was a peculiar kind of sermon, with all the aids of dialectics and poetry, of parable, gnome, proverb, legend, and, the rest, exactly as we find it in the New Testament. The fourth, סוֹד, secret, mystery, was a science into which but few were. initiated. It was theosophy, metaphysics, angelology, a host of wild and glowing visions of things beyond earth. Faint echoes of this science survive in NeoPlatonism, in Gnosticism, in the Cabala, in Hermes Trismegistus. It was also called “the Creation” and” the Chariot,” in allusion to Ezekiel's  vision. Yet here again the power of the vague and mysterious was so strong that the word Pardes or Paradise gradually indicated this last branch, “the secret science only.” Comp. Keil, Introd. to the Old Testament (Edinb. 1870), 2:381 sq.; Havernick, Introd. (ibid. 1852), p. 362; Ginsburg, Coheleth (Lond. 1861.), p. 30; Deutsch, Lit. Remains (New York, 1874), p. 14; Wahner, Antiq, Ebrceorum Gott. 1743), 1:353 sq.; Steinschneider, Jewish Lit. (Lond. 1857), p. 142; Hirschfeld, Halachische Exegese (Berlin, 1840), p. 114 sq.; Schtirer, Lehrbuch der neutestam. Zeitgeschichte, p. 448; Dopke, Hermeneutik der neutestamentlischen Schriftsteller, p. 135 sq.; Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vortrage (Berlin, 1832), p. 59; Schwab, Traite des Berakoth ou premiere partie du Talmud (Paris 1871), p. 9 sq. (B.P.)

## Pardies, Ignace Gaston[[@Headword:Pardies, Ignace Gaston]]

             a French Jesuit, much noted for his attainments in philosophy, mathematics, and belles-lettres, was born, of distinguished parentage, at Paris in 1636. After due training at the schools in Paris, he conceived the purpose of entering the Society of Jesus, and joined the order in 1652. For several years he was employed as instructor in polite literature. His leisure he employed in speculative studies, and soon came to be noted for his mastery of the Cartesian philosophy. Pardies claimed not only to have mastered Des Cartes's views, but to have improved upon that system. He died in 1673, before he had really developed his own philosophical theories into a system, and there is not enough extant in his writings to judge of him as an original mind. Pardies had the reputation in his own day of a writer much cultivated, and with a neat and concise expression and pure diction. He had a dispute with Sir Isaac Newton regarding his New Theory of Light and Colors in 1672. His works are not of interest to us. A list of them is given in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:190, 191. See also Bayle, Hist. Dict. s., v.; Niceron, Memoires, vol. 1and 9; Chaufepie, Nouv. Dict. histor. s.v. (J. H.W.)

## Pardo[[@Headword:Pardo]]

             a Jewish family, several members of which have become distinguished as rabbins and writers.

1. ABRAHAM, a younger brother of Isaac, also a learned and pious man, who died at Jerusalem.

2. DAVID (1), third son of Joseph (1), went with his father to Amsterdam, and officiated there, while his father was yet alive, as rabbi of the synagogue Beth Israel, which was built in 1618. Through the efforts of David Pardo, in 1639, the three synagogues were united to form from that time forward one single and inseparable community of Spanish and Portuguese Jews. In the same year a rabbinical school, “Talmud Thora,” was established, which attained to eminence, and where Saul Levi Morteira, Menasse ben-Israel, Isaac Aboab, and David Pardo lectured. Pardo published the Spanish translation of the חובות הלבבות, by Zaddik ben-Joseph Formon, the Compendio dos Dinimr (Amst. 1610), which was also printed in Hebrew letters, in a new edition. He died in 1652, leaving behind two sons, Joseph and Josijahn.

3. DAVID (2), perhaps a descendant of Isaac Parde (a son of Isaac, according to Furst, who seems to confound this David with David Pardo, No. 1), lived at Spalatro in the last century, and distinguished himself as a writer. He wrote, משכיל לדוד, a super-commentary on Rashi's commentary on the Pentateuch (Venice, 1760): — שושנים לדוד, a commentary on the Mishna. (ibid. 1752)': — חסדי דוד, a commentary on the six orders of the Tosefta (Livorno, 1790):— מכתם לדוד, acollection. of decisions (Amst. 1756): — למנצח לדוד.

4. ISAAC, son of Joseph (1), was known for his piety, in which he surpassed his father. At Salonica, his native place, he was president of the Jewish college ישיבה ראש, and acquired reputation as a good preacher. Towards the end of his life he went to Scopia, in order to be near his sons, where he died shortly after his arrival.

5. JACOB (1), son of David (2), was rabbi at Ragusa, and wrote, קהלת יעקב, a commentary on the earlier prophets, viz. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings (Venice, 1784): — מרפא לשין, prayers and religious poems(ibid. 1800): — תהלה בארש, prayers occasioned by the earthquake at Ragusa (ibid. 1780).

6. JACOB (2) CHAJIM (ben-David Samuel ben-Jak. ben-Dav.) was born at Ragusa in 1818. He was educated at the university in Padua, and was noted for his remarkable attainments. When eighteen years of age he wrote. באור על מיכה, a commentary on Micah; reprinted in S. D.  Luzzatto's אבני זכרון, as well as Pardo's “cilque discorsi.” He died in 1839, when about to enter upon his official duties, as rabbi at Verona. Pardo's death was regarded as a great loss to the Jewish community. D. Chan. Viterbo and Jos. Almanzi gave vent to their feelings in two poems, which were published (Prague, 1839). Though Pardo died so young he was yet distinguished for his oratorical talent, and the Jews looked upon him as one of their ablest men in the pulpit. After his decease five of his discourses were published.

7. JOSEPH (1) of Salonica, where his parents had settled after the expulsion from Spain. When the Portuguese Jews, who had found a new home at Amsterdam, had increased to a community, they called Joseph Pardo to be the spiritual leader of the synagogue Beth Jacob, so called after Jacob Tirado, its founder. By his efforts, and with the help of Jacob Coronel, of Hamburg, in the year 1615 the foundation was laid of the afterwards famous orphan asylum, the Hermandad de los Huerfanas, of Amsterdam. Joseph Pardo died Feb. 10, 1619.

8. JOSEPH (2), son of David (1), succeeded his father in the rabbiship, and afterwards went to London, where he wrote his שלהן טהור, “The Pure Table,” an abridgment of the Jewish rites, of which many editions have appeared. He died before 1680. His son David (3), who likewise officiated as rabbi at London, published the שלחן טהור at Amsterdam, dedicating it to the vestry of the London congregation.

9. JOSIJAHN, a pupil and son-in-law of Saul Levi Morteira, also officiated as chacham or rabbi until, in 1674, he went in the same capacity to Curanoa, and afterwards to Jamaica. His son David (4) was rabbi at Surinam, where he died about 1717.

See Kayserling, Die Pardos, in Frankels Monatsschrift, 1859, p. 386 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 257 (Germ. transl. by Hamberger); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:272; 10:7, 9, 14; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, p. 370; Kayserling, Sephardim, p. 169, 201, 203, 296; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:325; 3:281, 296; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:66 sq.; Finn, Sephardim, p. 462. (B. P.)

## Pardon[[@Headword:Pardon]]

             (prop. some form of כָּפִר, to cover, i.e. forgive) is in theology the act of forgiving an offender, or removing the guilt of sin, that the punishment due  to it may not be inflicted. On the nature of pardon, it may be observed that the Scripture represents it by various phrases: a lifting up or taking away of sin (Psa 32:1), a covering of it (Psa 85:2), a non-imputation of it (Psa 32:2), a blotting of it out (Psa 51:1), a non- remembrance of it (Heb 8:12; Isa 43:25). In character,

1, It is an act of free grace (Psa 51:1; Isa 43:25);

2, a point of justice, God having received satisfaction by the blood of Christ (1Jn 1:9);

3, a complete act, a forgiveness of all the sins of his people (1Jn 1:7; Psa 103:2-3);

4, an act that will never be repealed (Mic 7:19). The author or cause of pardon is not any creature, angel, or man; but God. Ministers preach and declare that there is remission of sins in Christ; but to pretend to absolve men is the height of blasphemy (1Th 2:4; Rev 13:5-6). SEE ABSOLUTION; SEE INDULGENCES; and the article below, PARDONS. There is nothing that man has done or can do by which pardon can be procured: wealth cannot buy pardon (Pro 11:4), human works or righteousness cannot merit it (Rom 11:6), nor can water baptism wash away sin. It is the prerogative of God alone to forgive (Mar 2:7), the first cause of which is his own sovereign grace and mercy (Eph 1:7). The meritorious cause is the blood of Christ (Heb 9:14; 1Jn 1:7). It is to be sought by prayer. SEE FORGIVENESS.

Pardon of sin and justification are considered by some as the same thing, and it must be confessed that there is a close connection; in many parts they agree, and without doubt every sinner who shall be found pardoned at the great day will likewise be justified; yet they have been distinguished thus:

1. An innocent person, when falsely accused and acquitted, is justified, but not pardoned; and a criminal may be pardoned, though he cannot be justified or declared innocent. Pardon is of men that are sinners, and who remain such, though pardoned sinners; but justification is a pronouncing persons righteous, as if they had never sinned.

2. Pardon frees from punishment, but does not entitle to everlasting life; but justification does (Romans 5). If we were only pardoned, we  should, indeed, escape the pains of hell, but could have no claim to the joys of heaven; for these are more than the most perfect works of man could merit; therefore they must be what the Scripture declares — “the gift of God.” After all, however, though these two may be distinguished, yet they cannot be separated; and, in reality, one is not prior to the other; for he that is pardoned by the death of Christ is at the same time justified by his life — (Rom 5:10; Act 13:38-39). See Charnock, Works, 2:101; Gill, Body of Divinity, s.v.; Owen, On Psalms 130; Hervey, Works, 2:352; Dwight, Theology; Fuller, Works; Griffin, On Atonement, Appendix; Knapp, Theology, p. 385; New Englander, Jan. 1875, art. 3. SEE JUSTIFICATION.

## Pardon Bell[[@Headword:Pardon Bell]]

             is the same as the Ave (q.v.), which was tolled three times before and thrice after service; it was suppressed in the English Church by bishop Shaxton. It derived its name from the indulgences attached to the recitation of the angelus.

## Pardoner[[@Headword:Pardoner]]

             SEE QUAESTOR.

## Pardons[[@Headword:Pardons]]

             or the releasement from the temporal punishment of sin, the popes of Rome claim to have the power to grant. It is held by Romanists that the pope, in whom this power is lodged, can dispense it to the bishops and inferior clergy for the benefit of penitents throughout the Church. In the theory of pardons, the point is assumed that holy men may accomplish more than is strictly required of them by the divine law; that there is a meritorious value in this overplus; that such value is transferable, and that it is deposited in the spiritual treasury of the Church, subject to the disposal of the pope, to be, on certain conditions, applied to the benefit- of those whose deficiencies stand in need of such a compensation. A distinction is then drawn between the temporal and the eternal punishment of sin; the former of which not only embraces penances, and all satisfactions for sin in the present life, but also the pains of purgatory in the next. These are supposed to be within the control and jurisdiction of the Church, and in the case of any individual may be ameliorated or terminated by the imputation of so much of the over-abundant merits of the saints, etc., as may be  necessary to balance the deficiencies of the sufferer. The privilege of selling pardons we have treated in the art. INDULGENCES SEE INDULGENCES . We content ourselves, therefore, in this place by stating what the Romish doctrine of pardons is; and yet this is no small undertaking, for Romanists have had so many crotchets about it that one can scarce tell where to find them. We shall endeavor to explain it in these following propositions in the language of Beveridge:

“First, they assert, as Bellarmine saith, that ‘many holy men have suffered more for God and righteousness' sake than the guilt of the temporal punishment which they were obnoxious to for faults committed by them could exact.'

“Secondly, hence they say, as Johannes de Turrecremata, ‘That one can satisfy for another, or one can acceptably perform satisfactory punishment for another,' viz. because they suffer more than is due to their own sins; and seeing all sufferings are satisfactory, what they undergo more than is due to their own is satisfactory for other men's sins.

“Thirdly, ‘Seeing they who thus undergo satisfactory punishments for others do not appoint the fruit of this their satisfaction to any particular persons, it therefore,' as Roffenis saith, ‘becomes profitable to the whole Church in common, so that it is now called the common treasury of the Church, to wit, that from thence may be fetched whatsoever any others lack of due satisfaction.'

“Fourthly, ‘This common treasure,' saith Bellarmine, ‘is the foundation of pardons.' So that, as he saith the Church hath power to apply this treasure of satisfaction, and by this to grant our pardons.'

“By this, therefore, we may have some sight into this great mystery, and perceive what they mean by pardons. For as Laymnanus the Jesuit saith, ‘A pardon or indulgence is the remission of a temporal punishment due to God without the sacrament, by the application of the satisfaction of Christ and the saints.' Or, as Gregorius de Valentia saith, ‘An ecclesiastical pardon or indulgence is a relaxation of a temporal punishment by God's judgment due to actual sins, after the remission of the fault, made without the sacrament (of penance), by the application of the superabundant satisfaction of Christ and the saints by him who bath lawful authority to do it.' But let us hear  what a pope himself saith concerning these pardons. Leo X, in his decretal, ann. 1518, saith, ‘The pope of Rome may, for reasonable causes, grant to the same saints of Christ who, charity uniting them, are members of Christ, whether they be in this life or in purgatory, pardons out of the superabuudancy of the merits of Christ and the saints: and that he used, for the living as well as for the dead, by his apostolic power of granting pardons, to dispense or distribute the treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints, to confer the indulgence itself, after the manner of an absolution, or transfer it after the manner of a suffrage.' So that, as Durandus saith, ‘The Church can communicate from this treasure to any one, or several, for their sins, in part or in whole, according as it pleases the Church to communicate more or less from the treasure.' And hence it is that we find it said in the book of indulgences or pardons, that popes Sylvester and Gregory, who consecrated the Lateran Church gave so many pardons that none could number them but God; Boniface being witness, who said, “If men knew the pardons of the Lateran Church, they would not need to go by sea to the Holy Sepulchre.” In the chapel of the saints are twenty-eight stairs that stood before the house of Pilate in Jerusalem. Whosoever shall ascend those stairs with devotion hath for every sin nine years of pardons; but he that ascends them kneeling, he shall free one soul out of purgatory. So that it seems the pope can not only give me a pardon for sins past, but to come; yea, and not only give me a pardon for my own sins, but power to pardon other men's sins, else I could not redeem a soul from purgatory.

“We have been the larger in the opening of this great Romish mystery, because we need do no more than open it; for, being thus opened, it shows itself to be a ridiculous and impious doctrine, utterly repugnant to the Scriptures. For this doctrine, thus explained, is grounded upon works of supererogation; for it is from the treasury of these good works that the Romish Church fetches all her pardons. Now, this is but a bad foundation, contrary to Scripture, reason, and the fathers; as we have seen in the fourteenth article. And if the foundation be rotten, the superstructure cannot be sound. Again, this doctrine supposes one man may and doth satisfy for another; whereas the Scriptures hold forth ‘Christ [as] our propitiation' (1Jn 2:2), ‘Who trode the wine-press of his Father's wrath alone' (Isa 63:3). Lastly, this doctrine supposes that a pope, a priest, a finite creature, can pardon sins; whereas the Scripture holds forth this as the prerogative only of the true God. For ‘who is a God like unto thee,' saith the prophet Micah, ‘that pardoneth iniquities?' (Mic 7:18). And therefore, when the Scribes and Pharisees said, ‘Who can forgive sins but God alone?' (Luk 5:21), what they said, though wickedly said by them, not acknowledging Christ to ue God, and so not to have that power, yet it was truly said in itself: for, had not Christ been God, he would have had no more power to forgive sins than the pope.

“And whatsoever the doctors of the Romish Church now hold, we are sure the fathers of old constantly affirmed that it was God only could forgive sin. So Chrysostom saith, ‘For none can pardon sins but only God.' Euthymius, ‘None can truly pardon sins, but he alone who beholds the thoughts of men.' Gregory, ‘Thou who alone sparest, who alone forgivest sins. For who can forgive sins but God alone?' Ambrose, ‘For this cannot be common to any man with Christ to forgive sins. This is his gift only who took away the sins of the world.' Certainly the fathers never thought of the pope's pardons, when they let such and the like sentences slip from them. Nay, and Athanasius was so confident that it was God only could pardon sin that he brings this as an argument against the Arians, to prove that Christ was God, because he could pardon sin. ‘But how,' saith he, ‘if the Word was a creature, could he loose the sentence of God, and pardon sin?' it being written by the prophets that this belongs to God; for ‘who is a God like to thee, pardoning sins, and passing by transgressions?' For God said, ‘Thou art earth, and unto earth shalt thou return.' So that men are mortal: and how then was it possible that sin should be pardoned or loosed by creatures? Yet Christ loosed and pardoned them. Certainly had the pope's pardons been heard of in that age, this would have been but a weak argument. For Arins might easily have answered, ‘It doth not follow that, because Christ could pardon sin, he was therefore God; for the pope is not God, and yet he can pardon sin.' But thus we see the fathers confidently averring it is God only can pardon sins, and therefore that the pope cannot pardon them by ally means whatsoever,, unless he be God, which as yet they do not assert. And so the Romish doctrine concerning pardons is a fond thing, repugnant to the Scriptures. And so is also their doctrine.” SEE KEYS.

## Pardus[[@Headword:Pardus]]

             GEORGIUS (OR GREGORIUS), a noted Eastern prelate, who is supposed to have flourished after the 11th century, although the time is not exactly known. The only clew that we have to the period in which he lived is a passage in an unpublished work of his, De Constructione Orationis, in  which he describes Georgius Pisila, Nicolaus Callicles, and Theodorus Prodromus as more recent writers of iambic verse.” Nicolaus and Theodorus belong to the reign of Alexius I Comnenus (A.D. 1081-1118), and therefore Pardus must belong to a still later period; but his vague use of the term “more recent,” as applied to writers of such different periods as the 7th and 11th or 12th centuries, precludes us from determining how near to the reign of Alexius he is to be placed. He was archbishop of Corinth, and hence he has sometimes been called Corinthus; but Allatius, in his Diatriba de Georgiis, pointed out that Pardus was his name and Corinthus that of his see, on his occupation of which he appears to have disused his name and designated himself by his bishopric. His only published work is Περὶ διαλέκτων, De Dialectis. It was first published with the Erotemata of Demetrius Chalcondylas and of Moschopulus, in a small folio volume, without note of time, place, or printer's name, but supposed to have been printed at Milan, 1493 (Panzer, Annal. Sypogr. 2:96). The full title of this edition is Περὶ διαλέκτων τῶν παρὰ Κορίνθου παρεκβληθεισῶν, De Dialectis a Corintho decerptis. It was afterwards frequently reprinted as an appendix to the earlier Greek dictionaries, or in the collections of grammatical treatises (e.g. in the Thesaurus Cornucopice of Aldus [Ven. 1496, fol.]; with the works of Constantine Lascaris [ibid. 1512, 4to]; in the dictionaries of Aldus and Asulanus [ibid. 1524, fol.], and of De Sessa and Ravanis [ibid. 1525, fol.]), sometimes with a Latin version. Sometimes (as in the Greek lexicons of Stephanus and Scapula) the version only was given. All these earlier editions were made from two or three MSS., and were very defective. But in the last century Gisbertus Koenius, Greek professor at Franeker, by the collation of fresh MSS., published the work in a more complete form, with a preface and notes, under the title of Γρηγορίου μητροπολίτου Κορίνθου περὶ διαλέκτων, Gregorius Corinthi Metropolitc de Dialectis (Leyden, 1766, 8vo).

The volume included two other treatises or abstracts on the Dialectis by the anonymous writers known as Grammaticus Leidensis and Grammaticus Meermannianus. An edition by G. H. Schaffer, containing the treatises published by Koenius, and one or two additional, among which was the tract of Manuel Moschopulus, De Vocum Passionibus, was subsequently published (Leips. 1811, 8vo), with copious notes and observations by Koenius, Bastius, Boissonade, and Schaffer, and a Commentatio Palaographica by Bastius. Several works of Pardus are extant in MS.; they are on grammar; the most important are apparently that Περὶ συντάξεως λόγου ἤτοι περἱ τοῦ μὴ σολοικίζειν  καὶ περὶ βαρβαρισμοῦ κ. τ. λ, De Constructione Ornationis, vel de Solacismo et Barbarismo, etc.; that Περὶ τρόπων ποιητικῶν, De Tropis Poeticis; and especially that entitled Ε᾿ξηγήσεις εἰς τοὺς κανόνας τῶν δεσποτικῶν ἑορτῶν, κ. τ. λ., Expositiones in Canones s. Hymnos Dominicos Festorumque totius Anni, et in Triodia Magnce Hebdomadis ac Festorum Deiparce, a grammatical exposition of the hymns of Cosmas and Damascenus, used in the Greek Church — a work which has been, by the oversight of Possevino, Sixtus of Sena, and others, represented as a collection of Homiliae et Sermones. See Allatius, De Georgiis, p. 416, ed. Paris, et apud Fabric. Bibl. Graec. 12:122 sq.; Koenius, Prof. in Gregor. Corinth.; Fabric. Bibl. Graec. 6:195 sq., 820, 341; 9:742.

## Pare[[@Headword:Pare]]

             SEE PAREUS.

## Pare The Nails[[@Headword:Pare The Nails]]

             (עָשָׂה הִצַּפָּרְנַים, lit. make the nails; Sept. περιονυχίζειν; Vulg. circumcidere ungues). This expression occurs in Deu 21:12, in reference to female captives taken in war: “Thou shalt bring her home to thine house, and she shall shave her head and pare her nails.” The margin has “or suffer to grow,” which is, as Roberts observes, I doubt not, the true meaning. This woman was a prisoner of war, and was about to become the wife of the man who had taken her captive. Having thus been taken from her native land, having had to leave her earliest and dearest connections, and now to become the wife of a foreigner and an enemy, she would naturally be overwhelmed with grief. To acquire a better view of her state, let any woman consider herself in similar circumstances. She accompanies her husband or father to the battle; the enemy becomes victorious, and she is carried off by the hand of a ruthless stranger. Poignant, indeed, would be the sorrow of her mind. The poor captive was to ‘shave her head' in token of her distress, which is a custom in the East to this day. A son on the death of his father, or a woman on the decease of her husband, has the head shaved in token of sorrow. To shave the head is also a punishment inflicted on females for certain crimes. The fair captive, then, as a sign of her misery, was to shave her head, because her father or brother was among the slain, or in consequence of having become a prisoner of war. It showed her sorrow, and was a token' of her submission. But this poor woman was to suffer her nails to grow as an additional emblem of her distress. That it does not mean she was to pare her nails, as the text has it, is established by the custom of the East, of allowing them to grow when in sorrow. The marginal reading, therefore, would have been  much better for the text. When people are performing penance, or are in captivity or disgrace or prison, or are devotees, they suffer their nails to grow; and some may be seen, as were those of the monarch of Babylon in his sorrow, ‘like birds' claws,' literally folding round the ends of the fingers, or shooting through the backs of their hands” (Oriental Illustrations, ad loc.). SEE NAIL (of the Finger).

## Pareau, John Henry[[@Headword:Pareau, John Henry]]

             a noted Dutch Orientalist, was born, of French parentage, in the second half of the last century, probably about 1770. He was for some time preacher at Deventer, later at Utrecht. At the last-named place he became professor of Oriental literature at the university. He died in 1830. He is the author of various useful and reputable works relating to Biblical criticism and interpretation. His Institutio Interpretis Veteris Testamenti (Tr. ad Rh. 1822, 8vo), a valuable compendium of sacred hermeneutics, has been deemed worthy of a place in the “Edinburgh Biblical Cabinet.” In 1814 he published a prize essay in Latin on the mythic interpretation of the Scriptures, in which he aimed a successful blow at the principles of interpretation adopted by modern German neologists. He also wrote on Hebrew antiquities, explained and illustrated the Lamentations of Jeremiah, the 13th chapter of 1 Corinthians, and in a dissertation on the book of Job defended the position that Job was acquainted with the doctrine of a future state, etc. (J. H. W.)

## Pareau, Louis Gerlach[[@Headword:Pareau, Louis Gerlach]]

             a noted Dutch theologian, son of John Henry, was born at Deventer, August 10, 1800. He studied at Utrecht, and at the age of twenty took the degree of doctor of theology on presenting Commentatio Critica ad 1 Corinthians 13. On the same day (September 23, 1820) he was also made doctor of philosophy "honoris causa." After ministering for some time at Nederlangbroek and Voorburg, he was made professor of moral theology at Groningen in 1831. He opened his lectures with an address, De Animo  non Minus Theologorum quam Ingenio Academica Institutione Informando. Pareau was twice rector of the university (in 1843 and 1858), and died October 27, 1866. He is the author of, Initia Institutionis Christiance Moralis (Groningen, 1842): — Dogmatica et Apologetica Christiana (1845): — in connection with Hofstede de Groot, Hermeneutica Codicis Sacri (1846): — Encyclopaedia Theologi Christiani (1851), also in connection with Hofstede de Groot. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pareia[[@Headword:Pareia]]

             a surname of Athene (Minerva), under which she was worshipped in Laconia.

## Parent[[@Headword:Parent]]

             (γονεύς.). As early as the giving of the decalogue parents were to be honored by their children as a religious duty (Exo 20:12; Lev 19:3; Deu 5:16); but as the law was promulgated more fully, their relation to their children was more accurately defined and more firmly established in society. The respect due to parents- was inviolable. A child who cursed (Exo 21:17; Lev 20:9;  comp. Deu 27:16; Pro 20:20; Mat 11:4) or struck his parents (Exo 21:15) was punishable with death. Even obstinate disobedience on the part of sons, who, in spite of all parental reproofs and influence, continued to be flagrantly wicked, was, upon judicial investigation, punished with stoning (Deu 21:18; Philo, Opera, 1:371; Joseph. Ant. 4:8, 24; Apion, 2:27). Parricide is not mentioned in the Mosaic law (so that of Solon [Cicero, Pro R. Amer. c. 25] and of Romulus [Plutarch, Vit. Rom. c. 22]. On the Egyptian law for this crime, see Diod. Sic. 1:77). The support of old or infirm parents was a matter of course, but in the Talmud is expressly enjoined on children (see Lightfoot, p. 908; comp. Potter, Greek Antiq. 2:618 sq.). The father, as head of the family, had very great authority over his children. But the Jewish law, unlike the Egyptian (yet there the power was limited” see Diod. Sic. 1:77), and that of the ancient Gauls (Caesar, Bell. Gall. 6:19), did not allow parents the power of life and death over their children; although it has been inferred from Judah's sentence of Tamar (Gen 38:24; comp. Liv. 2:41) that the father of the family, during the patriarchal period, exercised also the functions of a criminal judge. (On the extent of parental authority among the Romans, Zimmern's. Geschichte d. Romans Privatrechts, I, 2:665 sq., may be consulted.) Under the law, however, he not only controlled the household economy, but married his sons (Genesis 24; Exo 21:9 sq.; Jdg 14:2 sq.) and daughters (Gen 29:16 sq.; Gen 34:12) at his own pleasure; could sell the latter into slavery (Exo 21:7; comp. Plutarch, Vit. Sol. ch. 13), and could even annul any vows which they had made without his knowledge (see Num 30:6, and comp. Gans, Erbrecht, 1:135). But by the time of Christ the traditional expositions of the law had lessened the parent's authority (Mat 15:5. See Vow. Comp. Michaelis, Mos. Rit. 2:103 sq.). Much value was ascribed to the blessing of a parent, and the curse of none was accounted a great misfortune (Gen 27:4; Gen 27:12; Gen 49:2 sq.; Sir 3:11. See Grotius, ad loc. Comp. Homer, Od. 2:134; Il. 9:454; Plutarch, Tizmol. vi; Plato, Leg. 2:931 sq.). SEE CHILD; SEE FAMILY; SEE OLD.

By the old Roman law parents had power of life and death over their children, and in certain cases could sell them into slavery without redemption. The Christian emperors, however, soon modified and finally abolished this arbitrary power. In many heathen nations it still continues. Among civilized communities the duties of parents to children have in all ages, as a general rule, been recognized as relating to their health, their  maintenance, their education, and morals. SEE EDUCATION; SEE PAEDAGOGICS.

## Parent, Francois-Nicolas[[@Headword:Parent, Francois-Nicolas]]

             a French priest, was born at Melun in 1752. Being curate of Boississe-la- Bertrand, near Melun, when the Revolution broke out, he embraced its principles with ardor; and having renounced the ecclesiastical career by a letter addressed to the National Convention (Nov. 4, 1793), and inserted in the Moniteur of that day, he married shortly after, and became compiler of the Journal des Campagnes. He worked also on the Courier Francais, which then appeared, but found small resources in these occupations. He dragged out a miserable existence until the Consulate, when he obtained a moderate employment in; the police, section of customs. Having lost this place upon the Restoration, he entered a printing-house as corrector, and died in poverty, Jan. 20, 1822, at Paris. We have of his works, Recueil d'hymnes philosophiques, civiques et moraux (Paris, 1793, 8vo). He left several manuscript works, entitled, L'Ennemi du sang: — Raisonnons tous: — Mon Epitaphe et mes Confessions. See Mahul, Ann. necrol.; Feller, Dict. Hist.

## Parentino, Bernardo[[@Headword:Parentino, Bernardo]]

             called also Fra Lorenzo, an Italian painter, was born at Parenzo, in Istria, in 1437. He was a pupil of Andrea Mantegna. Lanzi says that he approached so near to Mantegna that his works might easily be mistaken for those of that master. In the cloister of Santa Giustina at Padua are ten Acts from the Life of St. Benedetto, with several little histories in chiaro-oscuro, which are highly commended by Lanzi. Parentino became a monk of the Order of the Angustines at Vicenza, where he died in 1531.

## Pareus [[@Headword:Pareus ]]

             SEE PAREUS.

## Parez [[@Headword:Parez ]]

             SEE RIMMON-PAREZ.

## Paria[[@Headword:Paria]]

             is the name given to the lowest class of the population of India to that class which, not belonging to any of the castes of the Brahminical system, is shunned even by the lowest Hindû professing the Brahminical religion, as touching a Paria would render him impure. The Paria seem to belong to a negro race, as appears from their short woolly hair, flat nose, and thick lips; they are, besides, of short stature, and their propensities are of the coarsest kind. Despised by the Hindûs, and ill-used by the conquerors of India, they have, in some parts of India, gradually sunk so low that, to judge from the description which is given of their mode of living by different writers. it is scarcely possible to imagine a more degraded position than that which is occupied by these miserable beings. SEE CASTE.

## Paris Manuscript[[@Headword:Paris Manuscript]]

             The only uncial MS. of the New Testament thus known consists of two fragments in the National (formerly Royal. later Imperial) Library at Paris (appended to No. 314) usually designated as W of the Gospels (formerly CODEX REGIUS), and containing Luk 9:34-37; Luk 10:12-23. They belong to the 8th century. They have been published by Tischendorf, Monum. Sacra Inedita (1846), who regards them as originally forming part of the same MS. to which the Naples fragment (Wb) belonged. See Tregelles, in Horne's Introd. 4:204; Scrivener, Introd. to N.T. p. 117. SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

## Paris Protestant Missionary Society[[@Headword:Paris Protestant Missionary Society]]

             This society was formed in 1822, under the title of “Societe des Missions Evangeliques de Paris.” A meeting was held for the purpose at the house of S. V. S. Wilder, Esq., an American merchant, then residing in Paris, which was attended by the presidents of the Reformed and Lutheran Consistories; by other pastors, with lay members of the two churches; by various foreign Protestants then in Paris, among whom were Rev. Daniel Wilson, Rev. S. S. Wilson, and Rev. Jonas King, and by Messrs. Cook and Croggon, Wesleyan missionaries then in France. One object of the society was declared to be to enlighten the public mind, through the press, as to the character and importance of the different missions of Protestant Christians among the heathen; and another to establish an institution for young persons recommended by the different missionary societies, to whom it might be necessary to study some of the Oriental languages. Rev. Jonas King, being nthen in Paris, and having received an invitation from Rev. Mr. Fisk, after the death of his associate, Rev. Mr. Parsons, to join him in the mission to the Holy Land, the new society assumed, for a given period, his support. The. committee issued an address, setting forth the object of the society, and soliciting contributions. They also established the monthly Concert of Prayer.

Subsequently this society directed all its efforts to Southern Africa, where their missions have been very energetically and successfully prosecuted to the present time. They have thirteen stations, among several different tribes, with fifty missionaries, and a large number of native assistants, and 8254 communicants. SEE SOUTH AFRICA.

## Paris Sanhedrim[[@Headword:Paris Sanhedrim]]

             SEE PARISIAN SANHEDRIM.

## Paris, Councils Of[[@Headword:Paris, Councils Of]]

             (Concilium Luteciense, or Parisiense). Several such ecclesiastical synods were held at that city. Some of them are more noteworthy than others. We make room here only for those of special import.

1. The first was held in 360, according to the most common opinion, under Julian the Apostate, who was proclaimed emperor at Paris, in May, 360. St. Hilary had lately arrived in Gaul from Constantinople, and at his entreaty the heretical formulary of Ariminum (A.D. 359) was rejected., Among the fragments which remain to us of St. Hilary, we have a synodicnal letter from the bishops of this council to those of the East, in which they return thanks to God for having delivered them from the Arian heresy, and for having enabled them to learn the real sentiments from the Orientals. They then give an open profession and clear exposition of the doctrine of consubstantiality; they retract all that they had, through ignorance, done at Ariminum and promise to perform whatever the Orientals required of them, to the extent of deposing and excommunicating all in Gaul who should resist. Further, the bishops declared that those who had consented to suppress the word οὐσία, or substance, both at Ariminum and at Nice in Thrace, had been chiefly induced to do so by the false statement made by the Arian party, that the confession of faith which they were called upon to sign had had the sanction of the Oriental bishops, who, as they said, had been the first to introduce the use of this word in all the controversy with the Arians, “And we,” they added, “received it, and  have always preserved the use of it inviolably; we have used this word ὁμοούσιος to express the true and actual generation of the only Son of God. When we say that he is of one and the same substance, it is only to exclude the idea of creation, adoption, etc. We recognize no likeness worthy of him but that of true God to true God... We revoke all that we have done ill through ignorance and simplicity, and we excommunicate Auxentius, Ursaces, and Valens, Gajus Megasiuts and Justin.” About this time several other councils were held in Gaul, by means of St. Hilary, upon the same subject. See Labbe, Conc. 2:821; Baroniusjp. 302, § 229; and Ragi, note 27.

2. Another important council was held at Paris in 557, under king Childebert; the archbishops of Bourges, Rouen, and Bordeaux were present. Ten canons were published. Among these are most important:

1. Against those who detain Church property.

4. Against marriages within the degrees prohibited; forbids to marry a brother's widow or wife's sister.

8. Enacts that the election of the bishop shall be left free to the people and clergy; that no one shall be intruded into a see by the prince, or contrary to the will of the metropolitan and the provincial bishops.

These canons are subscribed by fifteen bishops, among whom were S. Pretextatus of Rouen, Leo of Bordeaux, Germanus of Paris, and Euphronius of Tours. See Labbe, Conc. v. 814.

3. The next Parisian council of importance occurred in 573. Thirty-two bishops (six of whom were metropolitans) attended. It was called to terminate a difference between Chilperic and Sigebert, the two brothers of the king Gontram. Promotus, who had been uncanonically consecrated bishop of Chateaudun by Ogidius of Rheims, was deposed, but was not removed, apparently, until the death of Sigebert, See Labbe, Conc. v. 918.

4. In the spring of 577 a council of the Church was convened at Paris by Chilperic; forty-five bishops were present, who deposed Pretextatus, bishop of Rouen, upon a false accusation of having favored the revolt of Merovee, the king's son, and plotted his death. (Although Pretextatnus was innocent of the charge of conspiracy against the king in favor of Merovee [or Merovig], who was his grandsons he had been guilty of marrying the latter to Brunehilde, the widow of his uncle, which as also  alleged against him. Sigebert appears to have used intimidation to induce, the bishops to condemn Pretextatus. The place of his banishment was probably Jersey.) St. Gregory of Tours refused his consent to the act. Pretextatus was banished and Melanius put into his place. See Labbe, Conc. v. 925.

5. In 615 a council was convened under king Clotaire II. This was the most numerously attended of the Gallic councils up to that period. Seventy-nine bishops from all the newly united provinces of Gaul were present. Fifteen canons have been preserved, but others probably were published. Among the most noteworthy enactments are:

1. Declares elections of bishops made without consent of the metropolitan and the bishops of the province, and of the clergy and people of the city, or made by violence, cabal, or bribery, to be null and void.

2. Forbids bishops to appoint their own successors; forbids to appoint another to the see during the lifetime of the actual bishop, except the latter be incapable of managing his Church.

4. Declares that no secular judge may try or condemn any priest, deacon, or other ecclesiastic, without first giving warning to the bishop.

14. Forbids marriage with a brother's widow; and other incestuous marriages.

15. Forbids a Jew to exercise any public office over Christians, and in case of his obtaining such an office, contrary to canon, insists upon his being baptized with all his family.

Most of the other canons refer to the property of the Church and of ecclesiastics. King Clotaire published an edict for the execution of these canons, with some modification however, since he commanded that the bishop elected according to canon 1 should not be consecrated without the leave of the prince. See Labbe, Conc. v. 1649.

6. In November, 825, a council convened, and the bishops who attended addressed a synodal letter to the emperors Louis and Lothaire, in which they declare their approval of the letter of Hadrian to the emperor Constantine and his mother Irene. so far as relates to his rebuke for their  audacity and rashness in removing and breaking the images, but his command to adore them (eas adorare) they refuse to approve, styling all such adoration superstitious and sinful; they also declare that in their opinion the testimonies which he had collected from the holy fathers in support of his view, and had inserted in his letter, were very little to the purpose. They further declare that, without approving the acts of the Council of Constantinople in 754, they condemn the second Council of Nicaea, and hold that it was no light error on the part of those who composed it to assert not only that images should be venerated and adored (coli et adorari), and called by the title of holy, but that even some degree of holiness was to be attained through their means (verum etiam sanctimoniiam ab eis se adipisci professi sunt). They declared their adhesion to the Caroline books. See Goldast, In Dec. Imp. de Imag.; Labbe, Conc. 7:1542.

7. Another important synod was held at Paris June 6, 859, under Louis le Debonnaire. It was composed of the four provinces of Rheims, Sens, Tours, and Rouen; twenty-five bishops attended, besides the four metropolitans of the above-mentioned provinces. The council was held in the church of St. Stephen the elder. The acts of the council are divided into three Books of Canons.

Book I relates to ecclesiastical discipline.

Canon

7 Forbids to baptize except at the canonical times, without necessity.

8. Directs that persons baptized in illness, beyond the proper canonical times for baptism, shall not be admitted to holy orders, according to the twelfth canon of Neoceasarea.

16. Declares that all property amassed by bishops and priests after their ordination shall be considered as belonging to their churches, and that their heirs shall have no part of it.

18. Declares that the pastors of the Church ought to possess the property of the Church without being possessed by it, and that in the possession of it they ought to despise it. It condemns also those worldly people who are ever complaining that the Church is too rich.

26. Orders that one or two provincial councils shall be held annually.

27. Is intended as a check upon the chorepiscopi; forbids them to confirm and to perform any other function peculiar to the episcopate.

44. Forbids women to take the veil until thirty days after their husbands death, at which time they were by the emperor's edict free to marry again.

45. Forbids women to touch the sacred vessels, or to give the vestments to the priests; also forbids them to give the holy Eucharist to the people: an abuse which it seems had crept in in some places.

47. Forbids to say mass in private houses, or in gardens and chapels, except when on travel, and in extreme cases when people are very far from a church.

48. Forbids priests to say mass alone.

50. Insists upon the proper observation of Sunday, and directs that a humble supplication should be addressed to the prince, entreating him to stop all pleadings and markets on that day, and to forbid all work.

Book II relates to the duties of princes and lay persons.

Canon 10. Condemns the error of those persons who think that, having been baptized, they must eventually be saved, whatever sins they may commit.

Book III contains a collection of twenty-seven of the foregoing canons, which the bishops forwarded to the emperors Louis and Lothaire, specially requesting the execution of some of the number.

See Labbe, Conc. 7:1590.

8. In the autumn of the year 849 a council convened at Paris, which was composed of twenty-two bishops from the provinces of Tours, Sens, Rheims, and liouen. These prelates addressed a letter to Nomenoi, the duke of Bretagne, concerning his proceedings in the Council of Rennes in the preceding year, on which occasion he had taken for his own use the property of the Church, which, they stated, was the patrimony of the poor. He had driven the lawful occupiers from their sees, and had put mercenaries and thieves in their places; and he had favored the revolt of Lambert, count of Nantes, against king Charles. See Labbe, Conc. 8:58.

9. The next important ecclesiastical synod at Paris was held Oct. 16,1050, in the presence of king Henry I. Many bishops attended. A letter from Beranger was read, which gave great offense to the council, and he was condemned, together with his accomplices-also a book by John Scotus upon the Eucharist, whence the errors which they had condemned were taken. The council declared that if Beranger and his followers would not retract, the whole army of France, with the clergy at their head in their ecclesiastical vestments, would march to find them, wherever they might be, and would besiege them, until they should submit to the Catholic faith, or should be taken in order to be put to death. SEE VERCEIL, COUNCIL OF (1050). See Labbe, Conc. 9:1059.

10. Some time after Easter, 1147, a synod was convened at Paris by pope Eugenius III. Many cardinals and learned men attended it. The errors of Gilbert de Poiree, bishop of Poitiers, upon the subject of the Trinity, were examined; two doctors, Adam of Petit Pont, and Hugo of Champfleuri, attacking him vigorously. He was accused chiefly on the four following grounds:

1. Quod videlicet assereret Divinam Essentiam non esse Deum.” (That the Divine Essence was not God.)

2. “Quod proprietates personarum non essent ipse personae.” (That the properties of the Divine Persons were not the Persons themselves.)

3. “Quod theologicae persone in nulla preedicarentur propositione.” (That the Divine Persons are not an attribute, in any sense.)

4. “Quod Divina Natura non esset incarnata.” (That the Divine Nature was not incarnate.)

St. Bernard, who was present, disputed with Gilbert; but the pope, in default of certain evidence, deferred the decision of the question to a council to be held inn the year following. See Labbe, Conc. 10:1105, 1121.

11. A synod was held in 1186. It was an assembly of all the French archbishops, bishops, and chief seigneurs, whom the king, Philip Augustus, desired to exhort his subjects to make the voyage to Jerusalem in defense of the Catholic faith. See Labbe, Conc. 10:1747.

12. In another council, held three years afterwards by the same king, the payment of the Saladine tenth was ordered, i.e. the tenth of everyone's  revenue and goods for the succor of the Holy Land. See Labbe, Conc. 10:1763.

13. The next important Parisian council was held in 1201 by Octavian, the pope's legate, assisted by several bishops. Evraud of Nevers, the governor of the district, said to have been one of the Vaudois, was convicted of heresy; and having been carried to Nevers, was there burned. See Labbe, Conc. 11:24.

14. A council was held in 1210, in which the errors of Amauri, lately dead, were condemned, and fourteen of his followers sentenced to be burned. Also Aristotle's Metaphysics, which had been brought to Paris and translated into Latin, shared the same fate; and a decree was published forbidding. the book to be transcribed, read, or kept, under pain of excommunication. — Labbe, Conc. 11:49.

15. In 1213 Robert de Courdon, cardinal and legate, whom the pope had sent into France to preach the Crusade, convened a synod at Paris. Several canons of discipline were published, which are divided into four parts.

Part I refers to the secular clergy, and contains twenty canons.

1. Enjoins modesty of deportment; that the hair be kept cut short; forbids talking in church.

9. Forbids to employ a priest to say mass who is unknown, except he have letters from his own bishop.

13. Forbids the division of benefices and prebends.

14. Forbids the temporary or permanent appointment of rural deans in consideration of money received.

19. Forbids to possess more than one benefice with the cure of souls. Part II relates to the regulars, and contains twenty-seven canons.

1. Forbids to take money from any one entering upon the monastic state. Forbids monks to possess property.

2. Forbids to receive any one into the religious life under eighteen years of age.

3. Enjoins bishops to cause the suspicious little doors found in abbeys or priories to be blocked up.

4 and 5. Exhort to charity and hospitality towards the poor.

9. Forbids monks to wear white leather gloves, fine shoes and stockings, etc., like those used by the laity; to use any other cloth save white or black; and to dine out of the refectory.

Part III relates to nuns, etc., also to abbots, abbesses, etc., and contains twenty-one canons.

3. Forbids nuns to leave their convent in order to visit their relations, except for a very short time; and directs that then they shall have an attendant with them.

4. Forbids them to dance in the cloisters, or anywhere else; and declares that it is better to dig or plow on Sunday than to dance.

8. Directs that abbesses who fail in their duty shall be suspended; and, if they do not amend, shall be deposed.

9. Directs that abbots, priors, and other superiors who offend in the same manner shall be punished.

11. Directs that they who lead an irregular life shall be deposed.

17. Forbids abbots and priors to threaten or maltreat any who may propose a measure to the chapter for the reformation of the house or of its head.

Part IV relates to the duty of bishops and archbishops.

1. Directs them to keep their hair cut round, so as never to project beyond the mitre; and gives other directions for their proper conversation.

2. Forbids them to hear matins in bed, and to occupy themselves with worldly business and conversation while the holy office is being said.

4. Forbids them to hunt, etc., to wear precious furs, and to play with dice.

5. Directs that they shall cause some good book to be read at the beginning and end of their repasts.

6. Enjoins hospitality and charity.

15. Forbids them to permit duels, or hold courts of justice in cemeteries or holy places.

16. Enjoins the abolition of the Festival of Fools, celebrated every 1st of January.

17. Directs that a synod be held every year. Orders also confirmation, and the correction of disorders in the dioceses.

18. Directs that they shall not permit women to dance in cemeteries or in holy places, nor work to be done on Sundays.

See Labbe, Conc. 11:57.

16. Jan. 28, 1226, another Parisian synod was convened by a papal legate to consider the affairs of England and of the Albigenses. In consequence of the decision, Louis VIII ceased from his pretensions against England, and turned his arms against the Albigenses. The .legate, in the pope's name, excommunicated Raymond, count of Toulouse, with his accomplices, and confirmed to the king and his heirs forever the right to the lands of the said count, as being a condemned heretic. Amauri, count de Montfort, and Guy, his uncle, ceded to the king whatever rights they possessed over the lands in question. On March 20, same year, the king, Louis VIII, convoked another council upon.the. subject of the Albigenses. Raynald, 1:554 (note). See Labbe, Conc. 11:300.

17. A synod was convened in Paris in 1255, by Henry, archbishop of Sens, and five other archbishops, on occasion of the murder of a chanter of the cathedral church of Chartres. In this council the head of the order of preaching friars complained of certain things said and preached by some seculars, doctors in theology, to the prejudice of his order. William de S. Amour and Laurent, both doctors-regent in theology at Paris, being examined upon the subject by the prelates, denied the justice of the charge. Subsequently S. Amour wrote a book, entitled The Perils of the Last Days, in which he attacked the preaching friars without mercy. At last the dispute between the latter and the University of Paris became so warm that St. Louis was obliged to send to Rome to appease it. The pope, however, sided entirely with the friars. See Labbi, Conc. xi, .738.

18. A council was held March 21, 1260, by order of St. Louis, to implore the aid of heaven against the conquests of the Tartars. It was ordered that processions should be made, blasphemy punished, luxury in dress and at table repressed, tournaments prohibited for two years, and all sports whatever put a stop to, except practice with the bow and cross-bow. In the following year, in another council, all these acts were renewed. See Labbe, Conc. 11:793.

19. A synod was held in December, 1281, composed of four archbishops and twenty bishops. Much complaint was made of the conduct of the mendicant order, who persisted in preaching and hearing confession in spite of the bishops, upon pretext of having the pope's privilege for doing so. A bull by Martin IV, bearing date Jan. 10, 1280, was, however, produced, which confirmed the claim of the Franciscan friars; but, nevertheless, with this clause, that those persons who chose to confess to the friars should be bound to confess also once a year, at the least, to their own priest, according to the order of the Council of Lateran; and that the friars should sedulously exhort them to do so. See Doboulay, 3:465.

20. In 1302, April 10, a council convened at Paris to consider how to heal the difference between the king, Philip the Fair, and the pope, Bonifacius VIII. The former in the preceding year had thrown into prison Bernard de Saisset, bishop of Pamiers; upon which the pope wrote to Philip complaining of the act, accompanying the letter with the bull Ausculta Fili, in which he plainly bids him not deceive himself by thinking that he had no superior, and that he was independent of the head of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Philip assembled his barons with the prelates at Notre Dame, and laid before them his ground of complaint against the pope and his bull, which he caused to be read. Thereupon the barons addressed a letter to the cardinals, in which, in very strong language, they complained of the pope's conduct in pretending to consider the king as his subject, and that he held his temporal authority of him. The prelates were more backward in delivering their opinion, and endeavored to excuse the pope, and to maintain peace. This, however, was not suffered, and they were clearly informed that if any one of them presumed to hold a contrary opinion to that of Philip and his lords, he would be looked upon as the enemy of the sovereign and kingdom. They then addressed to the pope a letter conceived in a much milder strain than that of the barons, in which they implored him to be cautious, and to preserve the ancient union between the Church and State; and, moreover, to revoke the mandamus by which he had cited them  to appear at Rome. The answer of the cardinals to the barons was to the effect that the pope had not absolutely declared that the king ought to acknowledge that he held the temporality of him, a statement which the pope himself in his answer to the bishops by no means corroborated. This was not strictly speaking an ecclesiastical council, but a national assembly; two others of the same kind were held in the following year, upon the subject of the differences between the king and the pope. In September, in that year, the latter drew up a bull excommunicating Philip, but on the eve of the very day on which he had intended to publish it he was seized by William de Nogaret, the French general, and though released from confinement almost immediately, he never recovered the mortification and sorrow which this blow inflicted on him, and on Oct. 11, 1303, he died at Rome. See Labbe, Conc. 11:1474.

21. In 1310 Philip de Marigni, archbishop of Sens, convened a synod at Paris to deliberate upon the case of the Templars; after mature consideration, it was decided that some should be merely discharged from their engagement to the order, that others should be sent freely away, after having accomplished the course of penance prescribed; that others should be strictly shut up in prison, many being confined for life; and, lastly, that some, as, for instance, the relapsed, should be given over to the secular arm, after having been degraded by the bishop if in holy orders. All this was accordingly done, and fifty Templars were burned in the fields near the abbey of St. Antony, not one of whom confessed the crimes imputed to them, but on the contrary to the last they maintained the injustice of their sentence. See Labbe Conc. 11:1335.

22. A council was held March 3, 1323; William de Melum, archbishop of Sens, presided. A statute of four articles or canons was published, which was almost word for word identical with that drawn up in the Council of Sens, A.D. 1320, under the same prelate.

Canon

1. Directs that the people shall fast on the eve of the holy sacrament.

2. Directs that an interdict shall be laid upon any place in which a clerk is detained by a secular judge.

4. Of the life, conversation, and dress of clerks. See Labbe, Conc. 11:1711.

23. On March 6, 1346, a council was held, presided, over by the same archbishop, assisted by five bishops. Thirteen canons were published.

1. Complains of the treatment of the clergy by the secular judges, and sets forth that the former were continually imprisoned, put to the torture, and even to death.

10. Directs that beneficed clerks shall employ a part of their revenue in keeping in order and repairing their church and parsonage.

13. Confirms the Bull of John XXII, given May 7,1327, by which the indulgence of the Angelus is given to those who repeat it three times at night.

See Labbe, Conc. 11:1908.

24. A national council was held at Paris in 1395, at which the Latin patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem were present, together with seven archbishops, forty-six bishops, and a large number of abbots, deans, and doctors in theology. The object of the council, convoked by Charles VI, was to consider the best method of putting an end to the schism caused by the rival popes Benedict XIII and Clement VII. The Eastern patriarch, Simon of Alexandria, was unanimously elected to preside. The conclusion arrived at (Feb. 2) by the majority, was that the best means of securing the peace of the Church would be for both claimants to resign their pretensions. The king's uncles, the dukes of Berri and Burgundy, were in consequence sent as ambassadors to Rome to Benedict. See Labbe, Conc. 11:2511, Appendix.

25. Another national council was held May 22, 1398; convoked by the same prince. There were present, besides the regular Alexandrian patriarch Simon, the Latin patriarch of Alexandria, eleven archbishops, sixty bishops, and an immense number of abbots, deputies of universities, and others of the clergy. Simon Cramand opened the council. In the second session, held in July, it was a reel that the best way of bringing Benedict to reason was to deprive him not only of the power of collating to benefices, but of the entire exercise of his authority. For this purpose the king published, July 27, his letters patent, entirely suspending the pope's authority in the kingdom: this edict was published at Avignon, where Benedict then was, in September. This suspension lasted until May 30, 1403, when the king  revoked it, and promised, in his own name and that of his realm, true obedience to Benedict XIII. See Spicil. 6:157.

26. A national council, composed of clergy from all parts of France, was held in 1406, to take measures for terminating the schism. The council resooled to demand the convocation of a general council, and to withdraw from the obedience of Benedict XIII. The withdrawal was carried into effect on August 7, and the pope was forbidden to take any money out of the country. In the following session, held at St. Martin's, certain theologians and canonists discussed the question, some speaking in favor of Benedict, and others against him; and in the last session, Dec. 20, the king's advocate declared his adhesion to the demand of the university for a general council, and an entire withdrawal from the obedience of Benedict; upon a division both these points were carried. After this, both Benedict XIII and Gregory XII severally promised to renounce the pontificate for the sake of peace, neither of them, however, really purposing to do so; and in 1408, Gregory having created four cardinals, in spite of the opposition of those then existing, the latter withdrew from his obedience; appealing to a general council and to his successor. In answer to this appeal, Benedict published a bull excommunicating all persons whatsoever, even kings and princes, who refused to resort to conference as the means of restoring peace to the Church, etc. This bull was condemned at Paris, and torn up as inimical to the king's majesty. Pedro of Luna was declared to be schismatical, obstinate, and heretical, and every person forbidden to style him any longer either Benedict, pope, or cardinal, or to obey him, etc.

27. A national council was held in 1408, convoked to deliberate upon the government of the Church, and the presentations to benefices: first, The declaration of the favorers and adherents of Pedro of Luna was read; then a great number of articles were drawn up, upon the manner in which the French Church should be governed during the neutrality. These articles come under five principal heads.

1. Concerning the absolution of sins and censures reserved ordinarily for the pope; for these the council permits that recourse be had to the penitentiary of the Holy See (the president of the penitential court at Rome, an office said to have been established by Benedict II in 634); or, if that cannot be, to the ordinary.

2. Concerning dispensations for irregularities, and for marriage. In these cases recourse was to be had to provincial councils.

3. Concerning the administration of justice, for which purpose it was ordered that the archbishops should hold a council yearly with their sumffragans; the monks to do the same.

4. As to appeals, the last court of appeal was declared to be a provincial council.

5. As to presentations to benefices, it was ruled that the election of prelates should be made freely and according to right rule; that the election of bishops should be confirmed by the metropolitan, and those of archbishops by the primate, or by the provincial council. In fact, the provincial council was made the substitute in all those matters which were usually carried to the pope.

It was further resolved that the revenue of all benefices enjoyed by the followers of Pedro of Luna should be seized and put into the king's hands. See Labbe, Conc. 11:2518.

28. A synod convened in 1429, from March 1 to April 23, by call of John de Nanton, archbishop of Sens, who was assisted by the bishops of Chartres, Paris, Meaux, and Troyes, his suffragans; also by the proctors of the bishops of Auxerre and Nevers, and a great number of abbots and other ecclesiastics. Forty regulations, relating to the duties and conduct of ecclesiastics, monks, and regular canons, the celebration of marriage, and the dispensation of banns, were drawn up. The following are the most remarkable;

1. Orders canons and other clerks connected with the churches to celebrate divine service in an edifying, manner, to chant the Psalms reverently, pausing between the verses, so that one side of the choir should not begin before the other had finished.

4. Exhorts the clergy to act as models of piety and correct behavior to the laity; not to be careless in doing their duties, and not to accept any benefice merely for the sake of the income to be derived from it.

8. Excludes from entering the church for three months bishops who raise to the priesthood persons of irregular life and ignorant of the epistles, gospels, and other parts of the holy office.

Other regulations refer to the conduct of curates, and direct them to exhort their parishioners to confession five times a year, viz. at Easter  Whitsuntide, the Assumption, All Saints, and Christmas, and also at the beginning of the New Year; others relate to the conduct of abbots, abbesses, priors of the orders of St. Benedict and St. Augustine, prescribing annual chapters, modesty of apparel and gesture, etc.; and forbids money to be exacted from any one entering upon a monastic life.

Regulation 25. Forbids barbers, and other persons in trade, and merchants to exercise their calling on Sundays and festivals.

32 and 33. Forbid the celebration of marriages out of the parish church, and too great laxity in dispensations of banns.

See Labbe, Conc. 12:392.

29. An important synod, sometimes called the Council of Sens, was held in 1528, from Feb. 3 to Oct. 9, in the church of the Great Augustines. Cardinal Antoine du Prat, archbishop of Sens and chancellor of France, presided. He was assisted by seven bishops, viz. the bishops of Chartres, Auxerre, Meaux, Paris, Orleans, Novers, and Troyes. The objects of the council were chiefly to condemn the errors of Luther, and to reform the discipline of the Church. Sixteen decrees were published relating to the faith, and forty upon discipline. Among the first the following are the principal:

1. Declares that the Church Catholic is one, and cannot err.

2. That it is visible.

3. That the Church is represented by an oecumenical council, which has universal authority in determining questions of faith, etc.

4. That to the Church it belongs to determine the authenticity of the canonical books, and to settle the sense of Holy Scripture.

5. That the apostolical traditions are certain and necessary, and to be firmly believed.

6. That the constitutions and customs of the Church are to be submitted to with respect, and her rule of conduct to be obeyed.

7. That seasons of fasting and abstinence are to be observed under pain of anathema.

8. That the celibacy of the clergy being ordered by the Latin Church, having been always practiced and enjoined by the second Council of Carthage, as a law ordained in the apostolical times; they who teach the contrary are to be treated as heretics.

9. That monastic vows are not at variance with Christian liberty, and are to be kept.

10. That they who take from the number of sacraments, and who deny their efficacy to confer grace, are to be treated as heretics. This decree treats of each sacrament in detail.

11. That the necessity of the sacrifice of the mass is supported by several passages of Holy Scripture, especially by Luke 22. That this holocaust, this victim for sin, this continual sacrifice, is the “pure offering” of which the prophet Malachi speaks.

12. After refuting the opinions of Luther upon the subjects of purgatory and of prayer for the dead, this decree goes on to state that, after baptism, the guilt of sin being remitted, there still remains the temporal penalty to be paid, so that sinners may yet be compelled to expiate their faults in the under world, and that it is a salutary custom to offer the holy sacrifice for the dead.

13. Concerning the worship of saints, they declare it to be firmly established in the Church that the saints hear our prayers, that they are alive to our sorrows, and feel Joy in seeing us happy; and that Holy Scripture proves this.

14. Declares that it is not idolatry to venerate imaged; that the intention is to honor them whom they represent, and remind us of and make us imitate their holy actions.

15. That man's free-will does not exclude grace; that the latter is not irresistible; that God does predestinate his and choose us, but that he will glorify those only who make their calling and election sure by good works.

16. That faith in no wise excludes works, especially those of charity; and that men are not justified by faith only.  Then follows a list containing thirty-nine errors maintained by the heretics of the time. Of the forty decrees on discipline the following may be noticed:

3-9. Relate to persons to be admitted to holy orders or to any benefices, and enact that they who are admitted to holy orders without being properly qualified are to be suspended until they are sufficiently instructed.

By canon 11 curates are compelled to residence, and to instruct their parishioners.

In 16 care is directed to be taken with the psalmody, and all profane tunes upon church-organs were to be scrupulously avoided.

33. Forbids printing the Holy Scriptures and works of the fathers without the consent of the diocesan.

34. Orders all persons to bring all books in their possession relating to faith or morals to their bishop for examination.

36. Of proper persons to be-licensed to preach. See Labbe, Conc. 14:432.

30. March 13, 1612, a council convened, and was presided over by cardinal du Peron, archbishop of Sens. The book of Edmund Ricker concerning the ecclesiastical power was condemned. See Labbe, Conc. 15:1628.

## Paris, Francois (1)[[@Headword:Paris, Francois (1)]]

             a French ascetic author, was born at Chantillon in the neighborhood of Paris, about the middle of the 17th century. He died in 1718 at an- advanced age. He was a servant in the house of Varet, grand-vicar of Sens, where, evincing great talents, he was educated for holy orders by his master, and was presented to the living of St. Lambert, near the monastery of Port-Royal-des-Champs. From this he removed — driven away, it is said, by fear of the wolves which infested the neighborhood — and became  sub-vicar at Saint Ettienne-du-Mont. He finally settled in Paris, where he died, Oct. 17, 1718. He published several works, among others, De Usage des sacrements de penitence et d'eucharistie (Paris, 1673, 1674, 12mo), in which he is said to have been assisted by his friends Arnauld and Nicole: — Les Psaumes en forme de prieres (ibid. 1690, 12mo); this work has reached more than ten editions: — Explication des commandements de Dieu (ibid. 1693, 2 vol's. 12mo): — Martyrologe, ou idee de la vie des saints (ibid. 1694, 12mo): — L'Evangile explique (ibid. 1693-1698, 4 vols. 8vo): — a good translation of the Imitation (ibid. 1706, 1728, 12mo). See Moreri, Grand Dict. Hist.

## Paris, Francois de (2)[[@Headword:Paris, Francois de (2)]]

             commonly known as the Abbe Paris, was born at Paris June 30, 1690. His father, being an eminent counselor of the Parliament, designed him, as his oldest son, to succeed him in his office, and consequently bade him study law. But the son, determining to be an ecclesiastic, was admitted into holy orders, and in the disputes occasioned by the bull Unigelnitus, the attached himself vehemently to the Jansenist party. From that time, his conscience not permitting him to adhere to the rules necessary to occupy a curacy, he resolved to devote himself to retirement. Having made trial of different solitudes, he at length fixed upon a house in the suburb of St. Marceau, where he spent his time in prayer and the most rigorous acts of penance. His father having left him by will only one fourth of his wealth, Francois devoted himself to manual labor in order to increase the funds for charity which he distributed among the poor. He died in consequence of the severity of the discipline which he observed, May 1, 1727. He is chiefly celebrated for what occurred after his death. The Jansenists canonized him, and pretended that miracles were wrought at his tomb. One of the contemporaries of Francois de Paris writes as follows regarding these strange occurrences at the grave of this departed ecclesiastic “Several miracles have taken place, very opportunely, in cases of paralysis. The people sing of their own accord, and intone the Te Deum.

This gives great pleasure to the Jansenists. A begging friar, the other day, having thought proper to pass jests upon the assembled crowd, the people drove him away, and in consequence no one in the neighborhood will bestow any alms upon him for the future. The portrait of the bienheureux Paris has been engraved, and is cried about the- streets. The people will make a saint of him without the help of the court of Rome if this goes on.” One of the earliest of the supernatural phenomena attributed to his agency was the  cure of a young female named Anne Lefranc, who seems to have been in the last stage of consumption. No sooner was she laid upon the wonder- working tomb than the most distressing symptoms disappeared instantaneously, and within a few days her recovery was pronounced complete. As the event became a subject of loud and boastful exultation among the enemies of the Constitution, archbishop de Vintimille instituted an inquiry into the facts. One hundred and twenty witnesses came forward to verify the prodigy; forty were examined — among them the mother, the brother, and the sister of the patient, and the surgeons who had attended her — and their evidence proved by no means satisfactory upon several points of essential importance. The archbishop decided that in the face of so many inconsistencies and contradictions, the tale was unworthy of credit.

On July 24, 1731, he published a mandement to that effect; he condemned a dissertation which had been circulated in defense of the miracles, and prohibited all marks of special veneration at the tomb of M. Paris for the future. “Notwithstanding this,” says Barbier, such a crowd collected on the morrow, St. James's day, that by four o'clock in the morning it was not possible to get into the church of St. Medard, or into the little cemetery which contains the tomb.” Mademoiselle Lefranc appealed to the Parliament against the archbishop's decision; and by way of challenging further investigation, twenty-three cures of the capital laid before their diocesan reports of fresh marvels of the same kind, which now multiplied so rapidly that their very number became an argument of no small weight against them. It appears that those who resorted to the tomb were mostly females suffering. under various forms of nervous disease, partially paralyzed, or subject to hysterical affections. These poor creatures were seized with spasms or convulsions, which led to a state of delirious frenzy; and not unfrequently, whether from abnormal tension of the imagination, or from the action of some occult physiological cause, such paroxysms were followed by an abatement of the morbid symptoms. The nervous system was relieved; the crippled limb resumed its functions; a healthy reaction set in, and infirmity for the time took flight. Such phenomena are, and always will be, popularly classed as supernatural; but it is evident that they are so designated in a relative sense — relatively, that is, to our own feeble ideas and apprehensions of the organic economy of nature. The terms natural and supernatural serve, in fact, only to express the limitations and imperfections of human knowledge. The noted case of the abbe Btecheran, though it was so confidently appealed to by the Jansenist agitators, will not stand the test of sober and rational criticism.  Throughout the year 1731 the ferment continued to increase. One case produced an extraordinary sensation: that of a woman who, being in sound health, pretended to be paralytic, and proceeded to St. Medard in a spirit of mocking incredulity.

Her folly was promptly punished; she was struck with real paralysis of the whole of the right side, and was carried away on a litter to the Hotel Dieu, in the midst of an excited crowd, who proclaimed this novel portent through the streets. The proverbal recording the event was signed by twenty-six persons of established credit in various sections of society, including magistrates of the Parliament and canons of Notre Dame. Individuals of high rank were to be seen from time to time among the throng of devout suppliants at the shrine of the Jansenist saint the princess-dowager of Conti, the marquis de Legale, the vicomte de. Nesmond, the chevalier Folard (a literary writer of considerable reputation), the historian Rollin, and a counselor of the Parliament named Carre de Montgeron. The last-named personage received, according to his own account, a most memorable recompense for his assiduous pilgrimages to St. Medard. He was converted, by an inscrutable and irresistible impulse, from the extreme of skepticism to a profound acceptance of the whole cycle of Catholic belief. Montgeron recorded his own experience, together with his convictions of the truth of the miracles, and the grounds on which he formned them, in a quarto volume, entitled La verite'des miracles operes par l'intereession de M. de Paris. He was imprudent enough to present this work to Louis XV, whereupon a lettre de cachet consigned him to the Bastile; and, after being transferred from one place of confinement to another, he ended his days a prisoner in the citadel of Valence. The. convulsionist movement thus ran its course through various stages, until it reached an ultimate development of undisguised indecency, immorality, and impiety. At this point it was obviously impossible that it could be any longer defended or countenanced by men of respectable character; and the leading Jansenists were accordingly compelled to repudiate all connection with it, both for themselves and for their cause. Bishops Colbert, Caylus, and Soanen had declared in favor of the earlier manifestations; but with regard to the absurdities and excesses which followed they used the language of unqualified condemnation.

The most influential of the appellant clergy took the same line; the famous Duguet, Jerome Besoigne, author of the Histoire de Port-Royal, Boursier, Delan, D'Asfeld, Petitpied, and others, earnestly reprobated the prevailing mania, and deprecated the obloquy which it brought upon their party. Petitpied, a veteran controversialist of well-known ability, drew up in 1735 a  consultation, which was signed by thirty doctors of the Sorbonne, to serve as a public manifesto of their sentiments at this crisis. These divines solemnly denied that the convulsions were the work of God, and declared them to be more probably a device of Satan. It was madness, they said, fanaticism, scandal, blasphemy, to attribute to God what could not possibly proceed from him. A reply was immediately put forth on behalf of the convulsionists, who taunted the doctors with deserting their colors and betraying their convictions. “Though standing on the same footing with them in point of principle, they now sought to deprive them of the most cogent proofs and arguments whereby those principles were established; after having furnished them with arms, they had cut away from them the vantage-ground on which they hoped to confound their enemies and win the battle.” The appellants were thus divided against themselves; the learned, the right-minded, the moderate found it necessary to stand aloof from the thorough-paced enthusiasts, drawing a broad distinction between different epochs of the same movement. Some miracles they accepted as authentic, others they branded as delusions of the devil. The public did not fail to animadvert on the inconsistency; and the general result was to cast discredit and ridicule upon the system which had given birth to the thaumaturgic claims. The government of France, which had shown exemplary forbearance with this strange outburst of fanatical delusion, was at length obliged to put a stop to the deceptions by closing the church-yard of St. Medard, in which the bones of Francois de Paris rest. It was walled up in January, 1732. Paris is the author of several commentaries on the New Testament. They were published after his death. See Jarvis, Hist. of the Church of France, vol. ii, chap. viii; Journal of Sacred Literature, 28:71 sq. SEE JANSENISTS. (L. B.)

## Paris, Matthew[[@Headword:Paris, Matthew]]

             an English Benedictine monk of the Middle Ages, noted as the best Latin chronicler of the 13th century, was born about 1195. He joined the order at St. Albans in 1217. He was soon marked as a man of the highest character, and distinguished as a musician, poet, orator, theologian painter and architect. His practical talents were turned to the reformation of monastic discipline, on which account he was sent to Norway by the pope. After his return to England Matthew Paris stood high in the favor of king Henry III, who used to converse with him in the most familiar manner, and who derived from him much historical information. Paris had besides a large number of influential friends, and a wide circle of acquaintances among the  clergy. After the departure of Roger of Wendover, in 1235, Paris was chosen to succeed him as analist of the monastery. A man of his marked probity could not be expected to discharge this duty in any politic spirit, and he reproved vice without distinction of persons, and did not even spare the English court itself: at the same time he showed a hearty affection for his country in maintaining its privileges against the encroachments of the pope and his creatures and officers who plied all their engines to destroy and abolish them. Of this we have a clear though unwilling evidence in Baronius, who observes that Matthew Paris remonstrated with too sharp and bitter a spirit against the court of Rome, and that, except in this particular only, his history was an incomparable production. But if it did not find hearty recognition among his learned coreligionists, the people did not withhold their approbation, and as far down as the days of the Reformation Englishmen pointed with pride to this the most considerate and trustworthy Latin chronicler. This work is entitled Historia Major, and consists of two parts: the first, from the creation of the world to William the Conqueror; the second, from that king's reign to 1250. He carried on this history afterwards to the year of his death in 1259. Rishauger, a monk of the monastery of St. Albans, continued it to 1272 or 1273, the year of the death of Henry III. Paris made an abridgment of his own work, which he entitled Historia Minor. The MS. of this work is in the British Museum. He also published some other pieces explanatory of his Historia Major. An account of these papers may be seen in Basle. The first edition of the Historia Major was published at London by archbishop Parker in 1571, and was reproduced at Zurich in 1606; later and more complete editions are those of London in 1640-41, and in 1684. An English translation was published in Bohn's Antiquarian Library. Matthew Paris died in 1259. See Inett, Eccles. Hist. of England; Burton, Ch. Hist. of England.

## Parish[[@Headword:Parish]]

             is now generally used to designate a certain extent of territory in city or country, with its church and church equipments. The word is from the Greek παροικία, which signifies habitation, sojourning, or living as a stranger or inmate; for so it is used among, the classical Greek writers. The Septuagint translates the Hebrew. word גֵּר, a foreigner, by πάροικος (Gen 15:13, etc.), and the word מָגוֹר, a dwelling-place, by παροικία (Psa 119:54). The primitive Christians seem to have obtained the word from the Jews. These were in the habit of calling  sojourners in a society — i.e. Jews who had come from foreign parts and established themselves either in a synagogue of their own or a temporary place of worship — the παροικία. At the beginning of Christianity its adherents were very much in the condition of these Jewish sojourners. The primitive Christians lived, as we know, in a retired condition, sequestered from the world; and little mixing with its affairs. For this reason St. Peter addresses them ώς παροικους, etc., “as strangers and pilgrims” (1Pe 2:11).

This number of strangers in the heathen cities was called the παροικία, over which there was set, by apostolical authority, a bishop, a προεστώς, a chazan, an inspector, or a rosh cohel, a head of the congregation; all which names denoted the episcopal authority, and which in a little time centered in the one most usual name of ἐπίσκοπος, or bishop, as is plainly seen by the Ignatian epistles. Thus the ἐπισκοπος and παροικία became relative terms; he that had the superintendency of the congregation, whether one or more, was called the bishop, and the congregation under his care was called the παροικία. Hence, in the earliest days of the Greek Church, the word παροικία was used to signify what we now call a diocese; and thus, in the apostolic canons, a bishop that leaves his diocese for another is to be reduced to lay-communion. Hence it is said, “The bishop of the diocese of Alexandria departed this life.” And again, “the glory of the diocese of Caesarea.” The Latins took up the same way of expression, from the Greek, denoting a diocese by the word parochia, which mode of expression lasted- until after the time of Charlemagne. But it is to be observed that when the word parochia signified a diocese, the word diocesis signified a parish. So in the Council of Agatha, presbyter dum diocesin tenet, “while the presbyter is in possession of his living.” And in the third Council of Orleans, diocesis is the same with basilica, a parish church.

The distribution into parishes appears to be comparatively modern. Originally all the clergy were (in the opinion of the Episcopalian churches) but coadjutors of the bishop, and served in his church, at which all the faithful assembled. Necessity, no doubt, and convenience gave rise to the division of parishes; for when the number of believers so increased in large and populous cities that a single church could not care for them, there was a necessity of erecting other churches. At Alexandria, and afterwards at Rome. a number of minor churches were opened, which were served by the clergy, at first not permanently attached to them, but sent from the principal or bishop's church, and in progress of time permanently fixed in  the charge. The city of Rome had above forty such churches, there called tituli (q.v.), before the end of the 3d century. In France the Council of Vaison speaks of country parishes in the beginning of the 5th century. In England we have not so early an account of them, because the records we have remaining of the ancient British Church make no mention of parishes. Dugdale and others think Honorius, the fifth archbishop of Canterbury, divided so much of the nation as was converted into parishes about the year 640; but others understand this division rather of dioceses than parishes. In England the first legislation on the subject occurs in the laws of Edgar, about 970.

The parochial division of districts seems in great measure to have followed the civil distribution into manors, or other feudal divisions of territory; and it is probable that it is to the same state of things the English owe the practice of lay patronage, the priest officiating in a manorial church being chosen, with the bishop's consent, by the lord of the manor. The parochial revenue; however, by no means followed the same rules which now prevail. Settlement in a parish, whether in city or country, did not immediately entitle a man to the revenue arising from that cure, whether in tithes, oblations, or any other kind; for anciently all Church revenues were delivered into the common stock of the bishop's church, whence, by direction and approbation of the bishop, a monthly or annual division was made among the clergy under his jurisdiction. At Constantinople no parish church had any appropriated revenues till the middle of the 5th century. In the Western Church, particularly in Spain, in the middle of the 6th century, the bishops and city clergy still had their revenues out of a common fund. SEE MENSA. But the country clergy were upon a different footing; and from this time we may date the appropriation of revenues in Spain to the country parochial churches. In Germany and France the revenues of the parochial churches seem to have continued in the hands of the bishops some ages longer. Broughton says: Some are of opinion that. the bishops had their portion of the ecclesiastical revenues with the parochial clergy for a considerable time after the first settlement of parishes; for they suppose that originally the bishop's cathedral was the only church in a diocese from whence itinerant or occasional preachers were sent to convert the country people, who for some time resorted to the cathedral for divine worship. Afterwards; by degrees, other churches were built for the convenience of such as were at too great a distance from the cathedral, some by the liberality of the people themselves, others by the bishops, and others by the Saxon kings; but chiefly the lords of manors were the great instruments in this work of  founding parish churches. The bishops seem voluntarily to have relinquished their title to parochial revenues, though whether they made any canon about it is uncertain.” At first, all ecclesiastical income, from whatever district, was carried into a ‘common' fund, which was placed at the disposal of the bishop, and was generally divided into four parts-for the bishop, for the clergy, for the poor, and for the Church. By degrees, however, beginning first with the rural parishes, and ultimately extending to those of the cities, the parochial revenues were placed at the disposal of the parish clergy (subject to the same general threefold division, for the clergy, for the poor, and for the Church); and in some places an abusive claim, which was early reprobated, arose upon the part of the lord of the manor to a portion of the revenue. Properly, a parish has but one church;' but when the district is extensive, one or more minor (succursal) churches, sometimes called “chapels of ease,” are permitted.

“In the law of England, a parish is an important subdivision of the country for purposes of local self-government, most of the local rates and taxes being confined within that area, and to a certain extent self-imposed by the parties who pay them. The origin of the division of England into parishes is not very clearly ascertained by the authorities. Some have asserted that the division had an ecclesiastical origin, and that a parish was merely a district sufficient- for one priest to attend to. But others have asserted that parishes had a civil origin long anterior to ecclesiastical distinctions advantage being merely taken to engraft these on so convenient an existing subdivision of the country; and that a parish was a subdivision of the ancient hundred, known as a hill or town, and through its machinery the public taxes were anciently collected. Hobart fixes the date of the institution of civil parishes in 1179, and his account has been generally followed. Much difficulty has occasionally arisen in fixing the boundaries of parishes. Blackstone says the boundaries of parishes were originally ascertained by those of manors, and that it very seldom happened that a manor extended itself over more parishes than one, though there were often many manors in one parish. Nevertheless, the boundaries of parishes are often intermixed, which Blackstone accounts for by the practice of the lords of adjoining manors obliging their tenants to appropriate their tithes towards the officiating minister of the church, which was built for the whole. Even in the present day these boundaries  often give rise to litigation, and the courts have always decided the question according to the proof of custom. This custom is chiefly established by the ancient practice of perambulating the parish in Rogation-week in each year. SEE PERAMBULATION.

There are some places as to which it is uncertain whether they are parishes or not, and hence it has been usual to call them reputed parishes. There are also places called extra-parochial places, which do not belong to any parish, such as forest and abbey lands. In these cases the persons inhabiting were not subject to the usual parochial rates and taxes, and other incidents of parochial life. But in 1857 a statute was passed which put extra-parochial places upon a similar footing to parishes, by giving power to justices, and in some cases to the Poor-law Board, to annex them to adjoining parishes, after which they are dealt with in much the same way as other places. One of the chief characteristics of a parish is that there is a parish church, and an incumbent and churchwardens attached to it, and by this machinery the spiritual wants of the parishioners are attended to. These several parish churches, and the endowments connected therewith, belong in a certain sense to the nation, and the incumbents are members of the Established Church of England, and amenable to the discipline of the bishops and the spiritual courts. The private patronage, or right of presenting a clergyman to an incumbency, is technically called an advowson, and is generally held by an individual as a salable property, having a market value. The patron has an absolute right (quite irrespective of the wishes of the parishioners) to present a clerk or ordained priest of the Church of England to a vacant benefice, and it is for the bishop to see to his qualifications. The bishop is the sole judge of these qualifications, and if he approves of them, the. clerk or priest. is instituted and inducted into the benefice, which ceremony completes his legal title to the fruits of the benefice. The incumbents of parish churches are called rectors, or vicars, or perpetual curates, the distinction being chiefly founded on the state of the tithes. When the benefice is full, then the freehold of the church vests in the rector or parson, and so does the church-yard; but he holds these only as a trustee for the use of the parishioners. There are certain duties which the incumbent of the parish church, is bound by law to perform for the benefit of the parishioners.

He is bound, as a general rule, to reside in the parish, so as to be ready to administer the rites of the Church  to them. The first duty of the incumbent is to perform public worship in, the parish church every Sunday, according to the form prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer, which is part of the statute-law of England. He must adhere strictly to, the forms and ceremonies, and even to the dress prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer and Canons. The incumbent is also bound to baptize the children of all the parishioners, and to administer the rite of the Lord's Supper to the parishioners not less than three times each year. The incumbent is also bound to allow the parishioners to be buried in the church-yard of the parish, if there is accommodation, and to read the burial-service at each interment. He is also bound to marry the parishioners on their tendering themselves, and complying with the marriage acts, within the parish church and during canonical hours, and it is said he is liable to an action of damages if he refuse. In respect to burials and marriages, certain fees are frequently payable by custom; but unless such a custom exists, no fee is exigible for performance of these duties. In many cases, where one church had become insufficient for. the increased population, the old parish has been subdivided under the Church Building Acts, the first of which was passed in 1818, into two or more ecclesiastical districts or parishes, for each of which a new church was built, and an incumbent appointed. The incumbents in these ecclesiastical parishes have generally been provided for by the incumbent of the mother-parish or by voluntary- benefactors; and by the aid of pew-rents. But these ecclesiastical parishes, so far as the poor and. other secular purposes are concerned, make no change in the old law. Another incident of the parish church is that there must be churchwardens appointed annually, who are accordingly leading parochial officers, and whose duty is partly ecclesiastical and partly civil. Their civil duties consist chiefly in this, that they must join the overseers in many of the duties arising out of the management of the poor, and incidental duties imposed by statute. But their primary duty is to attend to the repair and good order of the. fabric of the church. The common law requires that there should be two churchwardens one of whom is appointed by the incumbent, and the other is chosen by the parishioners in vestry assembled, but sometimes this rule is varied by a local custom. The appointment and election take place in Easter-week of each year. In electing the people's churchwarden there is often  much local excitement, and it is common to poll the parish, all those who pay poor-rates being entitled to vote, the number of votes varying according to the rent, but no person having more than six votes. SEE CHURCH WARDENS.

The next most important business connected with the parish is that which concerns the poor, the leading principle being that each parish is bound to pay the expense of relieving its own poor. Another important feature of the parish is that all the highways within the parish must be kept in repair by the parish, i.e. by the inhabitants who are rated to the poor. The above duties in reference to the parish church, the poor, and the highways are the leading duties attaching to the parish as a parish: but over and above these, many miscellaneous duties have been imposed on the parish officers, particularly on the overseers and churchwardens. In nearly all cases where the parish, as a parish, is required to act, the mode in which it does so is by the machinery of a vestry. A vestry is a meeting of all the inhabitants householders rated to the poor. It is called by the churchwardens, and all questions are put to the vote. Any rate-payer who thinks the majority of those present do not represent the majority of the whole parishioners is entitled to demand a poll. At these meetings great excitement, often prevails, especially in meetings respecting church- rates. Wherever a parish improvement is found to be desirable, the vestry may meet and decide whether it is to be proceeded with, in which case they have powers of rating themselves for the expense. Such is the case as to the establishment of baths and wash-houses, watching and lighting. Returns are made of all parish and local rates to Parliament every year. The parish property, except ‘the goods of the parish church, which are vested in the churchwardens, is vested in the overseers, who hold and manage the same, requiring the consent of the Poor-law Board in order to sell it. Of late a statute has authorized benefactors to dedicate greens or playgrounds to the inhabitants of parishes through the intervention of trustees.” — Chambers.

In Scotland the division into parishes has existed from the most ancient times, and is recognized for certain civil purposes relative to taxation and otherwise, as well as for purposes purely ecclesiastical. The Court of Session, acting as the commission of teinds, may unite two or more parishes into one; or may divide a parish, or disjoin part of it, with consent  of the heritors (or landholders) of a major part of the valuation; or apart from their consent, if it be shown that there is within the disjoined part a sufficient place of worship, and if the titulars of triends or others who have to pay no less, than three fourths of the additional stipend, do not object. By Acts 7, 8 Vict. c. 44, any district where there is an endowned church may be erected into a parish quoad sacra, for such purposes as are purely ecclesiastical. Endowed Gaelic congregations in the large towns of the Lowlands may similarly be erected into parishes quoad sacra. The principal application of the parochial division for civil purposes relates to the administration, of the poor-law. Under the old system the administrators of the poor-law were the kirk-session in county parishes, and the magistrates, or certain managers selected by them, in burghal parishes. The Acts 8, 9 Vict. c. 83, which remodeled the poor-law of Scotland, retained the old administrative body so long as there was no assessment; but, on a parish being assessed, substituted for it a new one, consisting in rural parishes of the owners of heritable property of £20 yearly value, of the magistrates of any royal burgh within the bounds, of the kirk-session, a certain number of members chosen by the persons assessed; and in burghal parishes of. members, not exceeding thirty, chosen by the persons assessed, four members named by the magistrates, and not above four by the kirk-session or sessions. The Board of Supervision may unite two or more parishes into a combination for poor-law purposes. There is not the same extensive machinery for parochial self-government that exists in England. The burden of supporting the fabric of the church falls on the heritors, and there are no churchwardens. Highways are not repairable by the parish, and there are no elections of surveyors or way-wardens. The meeting of the inhabitants in vestry, which so often-takes place in England, is unknown in Scotland, and hence the rate-payers do not interest themselves so much in local affairs. Many of the duties which in England are discharged by parochial officers, are in Scotland discharged by the sheriff-clerk, a county officer. In Scotland there is a school in every parish, while in England the parochial school is unknown. SEE PARISH-SCHOOL.

In Ireland the parish system has undergone considerable modification. It is in its present condition far more liberal than the Church of England parochial system, and may be fairly pronounced republican in character. There is, first, in each diocese a committee of “patronage” or appointment, consisting of the bishop, with two clerical and one lay member, elected by the Diocesan Synod. Then in each parish the parishioners, who must be  members of the Church of Ireland, elect three lay communicants to be nominators for the parish. When a vacancy occurs, these two bodies form a Board of Nomination, in which the diocese, in its three orders, bishop, presbyters, and laymen, and the parish, are both fairly represented. The bishop is ex officio president, and has both an ordinary and a casting vote. Provision is made for filling vacancies in both branches of this board. If the bishop should not be satisfied with the fitness of the clergyman so nominated, he may decline to institute; but, if required, must give him his reasons in writing. Provision is also made for an appeal in behalf of the clergyman so rejected. If no nomination is made to the bishop in three months after a vacancy, the appointment lapses to the bishop. If the nominators of any cure shall signify top the bishop, in writing, their desire to leave the nomination to him. he may institute any duly qualified clergyman whom he may think fit. A clergyman resigning cannot withdraw from the duties of his cure until his resignation has been accepted and registered by the bishop and notified to the churchwardens. Nor can an incumbent be removed without his own consent, unless upon the decision of a competent tribunal. These regulations seem fairly to consider the rights of all parties. A parish cannot be kept vacant by its own perversity or negligence, nor any loyal parish unduly obstructed in its choice. A clergyman is not to be dismissed without canonical cause, and by authority, nor yet to be obtruded upon an unwilling people. The bishop's ultimate responsibility and prerogative is recognized, and a fair opportunity given to keep the clergy employed, and to put the right man in the right place. There is besides a general sustentation fund, which is to become the chief support of the clergy, and is intended to give to the ministry an income irrespective of employment, so that congregations may not at their will withhold the pastor's salary.

In the United States the Protestant Episcopal Church adheres to the parish idea. The whole of each diocese is divided into parishes, and the spiritual wants of each geographical parish are confided to the local Church and its pastor. But the parish is of course purely ecclesiastical. There were, however, in our colonial days parishes set off and named by the civil authority. These existed in South Carolina, Virginia, and Maryland, almost coeval with their settlement as colonies of Great Britain. We find notices of such parishes in Virginia as far back as 1629, in Maryland in 1692, in South Carolina in 1708, created such by acts of the colonial assemblies. When the Church was in process of time, established in any of these civil  parishes, the ecclesiastical was made coextensive with the colonial parish. The power to divide these parishes is acknowledged to reside in the Diocesan Conventions; and in several dioceses (e.g. Virginia and Maryland) they have legislated fully on the subject. Most of the Episcopal parishes however are of the second class named, and simply mean the congregation statedly worshipping in any given church. . So intermingled are the congregations in large towns and cities, that legislation upon this subject is both delicate and. difficult. The 31st canon of 1832 thus speaks:

“No clergyman belonging to this Church shall officiate, either by preaching, reading prayers, or otherwise, in the parish or within the-parochial cure of another clergyman, unless he have received express permission for that purpose from the minister of the parish or cure, or, in his absence, from the churchwardens and vestrymen, or trustees of the congregation. Where parish boundaries are not defined by law or otherwise, each city, borough, village, town, or township in which there is one-Protestant Episcopal church or congregation, or more than one such church or congregation, shall be held, for all the purposes of this canon, to be the parish or parishes of the Protestant Episcopal clergyman or clergymen having charge of said church or churches, congregation or congregations. And in case of such a vicinity of two or more churches, as that there can be no local boundaries drawn between their respective cures or parishes, it is hereby ordained that in every such case no minister of this Church, other than the parochial clergy of said cures, shall preach within the common limits of the same, in any other place than in one of the churches thereof, without the consent of the major number of the parochial clergy of the said churches.”

In Massachusetts law a parish signifies an ecclesiastical society, without local reference — that is, those inhabitants of a town who belong to one Church, though they live among people belonging to other churches. The civil functions of the parish officers are now performed in the main by the town organization. The term parish is also used in a popular but inaccurate way to signify the members of the congregation worshipping in any local church of any denomination. It may not be out of place here to add that the Protestant Episcopal notion of the parish is fast dying out in this country. There is now an. agitation on foot to give it greater efficiency by creating such a sustentation fund as the Irish Church has established; but if that should fail, it is likely the parish system will have to be altogether  abandoned, or be confined to the narrow limits of its own membership. In 1867 the parochial distribution, gave rise to a most animated discussion. Dr. Stephen Tyng Jr., by invitation of the deceased principal editor of this Cyclopoedia, preached in a Methodist church (St. James's) at New Brunswick, N. J. The rector of the Protestant Episcopal church held his ground invaded, as Dr. Tyng had not asked his consent, and the matter was carried to the highest courts in the Protestant Episcopal Church. There has never been a definite settlement reached. Dr. Tyng, though an offender against the canon, remains in that Church, and his own congregation support the action, frequently repeated since by him and other clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church. One of the ablest editorials for the Low-Church view was presented by the American Presbyterian, March 26,1868. The High-Church view was taken by the New York Church Journal, and we refer to its pages for a general representation of the parish question from 1868 to our own time, especially to their publications of Dec. 9,1875, and Feb. 3, 1876. For general inquiry on the parish system we refer to Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 727 sq.; Coleman, Ancient Chrnistianity Exemplfied; Bingham, Christian Antiquities; Siegel, Christliche Alterthumer, 4:378 sq.; Hook, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Blunt, Hist. Dict. s.v.; Green, Short Hist. of the English People, p. 66 sq.; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s.v.; Freeman, Comparative Politics, p. 116, 417.

## Parish Chaplain[[@Headword:Parish Chaplain]]

             is an assistant stipendiary, temporary or permanent; the mediaeval curate, whose pay was six marks a year in 1347. In 1362 they had become scarce, preference being given by unbeneficed clergy to the office of mass priests, who celebrated annals only, without cure of souls. Very stringent regulations were then made in order to secure curates, while the pay of the others was not to exceed five marks a year.

## Parish Churches[[@Headword:Parish Churches]]

             existed in a monastic or cathedral church, as at Norwich, Kilkenny, Carlisle, Chester, Salisbury, and Hereford. Spanish cathedrals have usually an attached sagrario or parroquia, or parish church, which communicates with the main building; at Strengnas, in the south aisle, there is a peasants church. Nice, like Manchester and Ripon, are also parish churches. The Austin canons of Thornton, Carlisle, and Christchurch, and the secular canons at Hereford and Chichester, left the naves open for the parish altar;  the Benedictines, who at Rochester, Westminster, St. Alban's, and other places, built a separate parish church, yet tolerated it within the nave at Bodmin and Tynemouth. At Romsey, Marrick, St. Helen's (Bishopsgate), Croyland, and Dunstable, the north aisle, and at Leominster the south aisle, formed a parish church. At Lincoln bishop Sutton removed the parishioners of St. Mary Magdalene out of the nave. In order to give still further relief at Chichester, Scarborough, and Manchester, side chapels were erected externally to the nave aisles; a large chapel at York and a church of St. Cross at Ely were appended on the north, as at Rochester and Waltham on the south, of the nave; and at Sherborne a western ante-church.

## Parish Clerk[[@Headword:Parish Clerk]]

             in England, is an officer of the parish of some importance, his duty being to lead the responses during the reading of the service in the parish church. He is appointed by the parson, unless some n other custom of a peculiar kind exists in the parish. ) He must be twenty years of age, and has his office for life, but is removable by. the parson for sufficient cause. By the statute 7 and 8 Vict. c. 59, a person in holy orders' may be elected a parish clerk. Under some of the Church Building Acts governing the new churches built in populous parishes, he is annually appointed by i the minister. The salary of the parish clerk is paid out of the church-rate.

## Parish Priest[[@Headword:Parish Priest]]

             (1.) A mediaeval reader in a parish church in 1127; a temporary assistant in choir to a resident incumbent, without cure of souls. In 1287 he received forty shillings a year, while the chaplain had five marks, and the mass priest was paid fifty shillings. He is called a temporary vicar in 1408.

(2.) In 1362, a curate in a parish church.

(3.) A rector or vicar in 1268; called by John de Athon perpetual curateor perpetual vicar. The temporary parish priests only preached if they had a license. Either of the three meanings of the word can only be ascertained by the context of the passages in which it occurs. Annual chaplains, in 1236, were required not to be removed by the rectors without reasonable cause. In 1305 these stipendiaries, or chaplains, were often maintained by their friends; they attended choir in surplice, and could only celebrate mass, bury, and hear confessions by the permission of the incumbent. SEE CURATE.

## Parish Schools[[@Headword:Parish Schools]]

             have existed in the Church since the 6th century. Of course we refer to schools for secular instruction. Catechetical schools existed much earlier. SEE CATECHETICS. In the 7th century we find enactments regarding parochial or parish schools. (See Council of Constantinople, A.D. 680, and of Trulla, A.D. 692.) In later times many of these schools were abandoned. and the instruction of the young entrusted to the monastic establishments. After the Reformation parochial schools became quite common in Germany, but with the modern provisions for instruction by the state the parochial schools have been abandoned, except by the Romanists and the Jews. The latter call them Congregational Schools.

In England there is no such thing as a parish school — that is, a school existing for the benefit of the parishioners, endowed by the state. or supported by taxes on the parishioners. Every school beyond charity schools is more or less voluntary in its character, and endowed, if at all, by private benefactors. In Scotland, however, it is essential that in every parish there shall be a parish school, for a statute of 1696 made it compulsory on the heritors — i.e. the chief proprietors — to provide a school-house, and to fix a salary for the teacher. If the heritors neglected to supply a school- house, the presbytery was empowered to order one at the expense of the heritors.

In Scotland, as early as the reign of David I, there were grammar schools in the principal towns, and in many of the monasteries. There were also “lecture schools,” as they were called, in which the young were taught to read the vernacular language. These seminaries were placed under the superintendence of the clergy, who held a monopoly of the learning of these remote times. We find, for example, in the cartulary of Kelso that all the churches and schools in Roxburgh were bestowed by David I on the monastery of Kelso, and the schools of Perth and Stirling were confirmed to the monks of Dunfermline by Richard, bishop of St. Andrews, from 1163 to 1173. The first effort of the Scottish Parliament to promote the education of the people was made in the year 1494, when it was enacted, under a penalty of twenty pounds Scots, that all barons and substantial freeholders “should put their eldest sons and heirs to the schools, from they be six or nine years of age and to remain at the grammar schools until they be competently founded and have perfect Latin; and thereafter to remain three years at the schools of arts and jure (law), so that they have  knowledge and understanding of the laws, through the which justice may remain universally through all the realm.” No provision, however, was made for the education of the common people until the period of the Reformation. In the First Book of Discipline, ch. 7, the importance of schools is strongly inculcated, in order that the youth may have knowledge and learning to profit and comfort the Church. It is declared to be a matter of necessity that “every parish should have one schoolmaster appointed — such a one, at least, as might be able to teach grammar and the Latin tongue, if the town were of any reputation. If it were a country parish, where the people convened to the doctrine only once in the week, then must either the minister or the reader there appointed take care over the children and youth of the parish, to instruct them in the first rudiments, and especially in the Catechism, as we have it now translated in the Book of Common Order, called the ‘Order of Geneva.'“ It was further provided that “no father, of whatsoever rank, should use his children at his own fancy, especially in youth, but that all were to be compelled to bring up their children in learning and virtue. The rich and powerful were to be exhorted, and, by the censure of the Church, compelled to dedicate their sons to the profit of the Church and commonwealth; and this was to be done at their own expense.

The children of the poor were to be supported at the charge of the Church if they showed a genius for letters.” It was also appointed that when the ordinary curriculum had been passed through, “the children should either proceed to further knowledge, or else they must be set to some handle craft, or to some other profitable exercise; providing always that first they have the knowledge of God's law and commandments, the use and office of the same, the chief articles of the brief the right forme to pray unto God, the number, use and effect of the sacraments, the true knowledge of Christ Jesus, of his offices and natures, and such other points, without the knowledge whereof neither any man deserves to be called a Christian, neither ought any man to be admitted to the participation of the Lord's table.” At this period, however, there was no law which compelled the heritors or parishioners to establish schools or to provide salaries for the teachers. The Church courts of the ministers, in their several parishes, exerted themselves strenuously to supply this defect. Measures were taken by many of the kirk-sessions to provide education for the poor out of the parochial funds, and in cases of youths of promising ability and remarkable diligence, it was not of communion to give an additional sum to prepare them for the university. It was declared that “gif ony puir refuis to come to school, help of sic thing as thay neid and requyr shall be  refused to them. And as for sic as ar able to sustein ther bairnes at the school, and do ther dewtie to the teacher for them, thay shall be command it to put them to the school, that thay maybe brought up in the fear of God and virtue; quhilk if thay refuise to do, thay shall be called before the sessioun and admonished of their dewtie.”A number of the ministers established and endowed schools at their own expense. Their zealous efforts to promote the education of the people were attended with great success. It appears from a report of the visitation of a number of the parishes in the synod of Fife in 1611 and 1613 that at that early period, of the parishes visited, “those which had were more than double in number to those which had not schools.”

In 1616 the privy council empowered the bishops, in conjunction with the heritors, to establish a school in every parish in their respective dioceses, and to assess the land for that purpose, for the advancement of true religion, and the training of children — “in civility, godliness, knowledge, and learning.” This act; however, was not vigorously carried out, and in 1626 an effort was made by Charles I to remedy the defect. The act of the privy council in 1616 was confirmed by the Parliament in 1633, and under its authority a number of additional schools were erected in the more cultivated districts of the country. Five years later the General Assembly gave directions “for the settling of schools in every parish, and providing entertainment for men able for the charge of teaching youth.” A representation was made to his majesty that the “means hitherto appointed for schools of all sorts have both been little and ill paid,” and presbyteries were ordered to see “that every parish should have a school where children are to be bred in reading, writing, and grounds of religion.” The revival of the Presbyterian form of Church government, which took place at this period, gave a powerful impetus to the cause of education, and there is good reason to believe that soon after that time schools were generally established in almost every part of the Lowlands of Scotland. We are told by Kirkton that before the restoration of Charles II “every village had a school, every family almost had a Bible; yea, in most of the country all the children of age could read the Scriptures.” The dissensions which soon after broke out in Scotland unfortunately prevented the nation from reaping the benefits of this judicious policy, and threatened to reduce the whole country to a state of absolute barbarism. After the Revolution, however, had established peace and order in the kingdom, an act was passed in 1696 which declared that “there be a school founded and a schoolmaster appointed in every parish (not already provided), by advice of the presbyteries; and to this purpose that the heritors do in every congregation meet among themselves and  provide a commodious house for a school, and modify a stipend to the schoolmaster, which shall not be under 100 merks (£5 11s. 1 1/3 d.), nor above 200 merks (£11 2s. 22d.), to be paid yearly at two terms.”

The teacher was required to subscribe the Confession of Faith, and to promise to conform to the Worship and to submit to the discipline of the Established Church. The right of appointing the schoolmaster and selecting the branches to be taught was vested in the heritors of each parish; while the duty of examining the teacher before his induction to office, and of judging of his qualifications, and of superintending and visiting the school, was intrusted to the presbytery. This famous act laid the foundation of Scotland's proudest ‘distinction,' and has proved one main source of her subsequent prosperity. For more than a century after the enactment of this law the Scottish parochial schools were wholly overlooked by the legislature. The monuments of the schoolmasters, in consequence, remained stationary, while those of every other profession and trade increased; and therefore their social status, acquirements, and influence were greatly deteriorated. Their depressed condition at length attracted the attention of the legislature, and in 1803 an act was passed which declared “that the salary of each parochial schoolmaster in every parish in Scotland should not be under the sum of 300 merks Scots (£16 13s. 4d.) per annum, nor above the sum of 400 merks (£22 4s. 5.5d.), except in cases where it is necessary to have-two or more parochial schoolmasters in one parish.” The heritors were also required to provide a dwelling-house, of not more than two rooms, for the teacher. At the same tine the right of electing the' schoolmaster and managing the school was limited to those heritors who possessed a hundred pounds Scots of valued rent, and to the minister of the parish; and the teachers were placed wholly under the jurisdiction- of their respective presbyteries, and were deprived of the right of appeal to the superior courts. The act further provided that the salaries are to be revised every twenty-five years, the average price of oatmeal during the preceding twenty-five regulating the salaries during the succeeding twenty- five. At the first revision, in 1828, an addition was made. to the salaries of the parochial teachers-the maximum was raised to £34 4s. 4d., and the minimum to £25 13s. 3d.; but these sums were reduced nearly one third at the second revision, which fell due in 1853, but was delayed by temporary acts until 1857.

Various attempts were made during the interval to increase the emoluments of the schoolmasters, and to adapt the system to the existing state of the country, but the prejudices and conflicting interests of rival sects rendered them abortive. At length an act was passed in the  session of i861, mainly through the exertions of lord-advocate Moncrieff, which has made a number of important changes in the constitution of the parochial schools. The minimum salary has been raised to £35 and the maximum to £70 a year, with a house of not less than three apartments, besides the kitchen. Instead of the examination by the presbytery, the schoolmaster elect is to be examined by a board chosen by the university court of one or other of the four Scottish universities, and composed of six professors (three of whom must be professors of divinity), or by their deputies, one half of whom must be graduates of arts, and the other ministers or licentiates of the Church of Scotland. The electors may, if they shall see fit, nominate two or. three persons to be tried by the examiners, whose duty it shall be to determine which of them is the best qualified for the office. The parochial teachers are not now required to subscribe the Confession of Faith or the formula of the Established Church, or to profess that they will submit themselves to its government and discipline. But before induction into office the schoolmaster elect must solemnly declare that in the discharge of his official duties he will never endeavor, directly or indirectly, to inculcate any opinions opposed to the divine authority of the Holy Scriptures or to the doctrines contained in the Shorter Catechism; and that he will faithfully conform thereto in the instruction of his pupils; and that he will not exercise the functions of his office to the prejudice or subversion of the Church of Scotland, as by law established, or of its doctrines and privileges. If any schoolmaster should be guilty of contravening this declaration, the secretary of state may, on the complaint of the presbytery or heritors, appoint a commission to inquire into the case, and to censure, suspend, or deprive the offender, as they shall find to be just, provided that this sentence shall not take effect until it has been confirmed by the secretary of state. A schoolmaster charged with immoral conduct, or cruel and improper treatment of his scholars, is henceforth to be tried, not by the presbytery, but by the sheriff of the county, on a complaint being made by the heritors or minister, or of any six heads of families in the parish whose children are attending the school. The sheriffs decision is final, and not. subject to review. When the schoolmaster of any parish is disqualified, through infirmity or old age, or has been found, on a report by one of her majesty's inspectors of schools, to have failed, from negligence or inattention, efficiently to discharge his duties, a meeting of the heritors and ministers may compel him to resign his office. But they are empowered to grant him a retiring allowance, amounting to at least two thirds of his salary.

## Parish, Elijah, D.D[[@Headword:Parish, Elijah, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 7, 1762, at Lebanon, Conn. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1785, and was ordained pastor in Byfield, Mass., Dec. 20, 1787, where he labored until his death, Oct. 15, 1825. He published, An Oration on the Fourth of July (1799): — An Oration on the Twenty-second of February (1800): — the three following in company with the Rev. Dr. Morse, A Gazetteer of the Eastern and Western Continents (1802): — A Compendious History of New England (1809): — A System of Modern Geography (1810): — A Eulogy on Professor John Hubbard, of Dartmouth College (1810): — in company with the Rev. Dr. M'Clure, A Memoir of the Rev. Dr. Eleazer Wheelock, first President of Dartmouth College (1811): — A Sacred Geography or Gazetteer of the Bible (1813); and several occasional sermons. A volume of his sermons, with a Memoir, was published in 1826. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 2:268.

## Parishioners[[@Headword:Parishioners]]

             in 1250, 1281, and 1305, were required to find in every church a chalice, principal vestment, a silk cope for principal festivals, two others for rectors of the choir on those days; a processional cross, a cross carried before the dead, a bier, a holy-water vessel, with salt and bread; osculatory, paschal candlestick, censer, lantern, and little hand-bell (for preceding the viaticum); two candlesticks for acolytes before the gospel; a legendary, antiphonar, grail, psalter, tropar, ordinal, missal, and manual; high-altar frontal, three surplices, a pyx, rogation banners, bells and ropes; a font with lock and key chrismatory, images, the image of the patron saint, the church light (before the altar); the repairs of the nave and tower, glass windows, aisles, and churchyard fence. In 1014 parishioners were called the priest's hyrmen, or hyremen. In 994 the only church furniture expressly required comprised holy books, houses, vessels, and mass vestments. The sovereign is the parishioner of the archbishop of Canterbury.

## Parisian Sanhedrim[[@Headword:Parisian Sanhedrim]]

             The year 1789, which marked an entirely new epoch in the history of Europe, was not without influence on the history and condition of the Jews. The contest between tradition and revolution, between the ancient order of things and the new lights, concerning the Jews and their position in society, began with that year in France. Two years before the Academy  of Metz had convened an assembly to consider the best means of making the Jews happier and more useful to society at large. One of the prize essays on that occasion was written by the abbe Gregoire (q.v.): Essai sur la regeneration morale, physique, et politique des Juinfs (Metz, 1789), and another by Salkind Horwitz, afterwards librarian of the Royal Library at Paris — Apologie des Juifs (ibid. 1789). The revolution which occurred a little while later triumphantly decided the question, and through the influence of Mirabeau and Rabaut St. Etienne, the National Assembly, in 1791, admitted the Jews of France to equal rights with other citizens. During the supremacy of Napoleon the condition of the Jews in France remained on the same footing as during the Reign of Terror. He only showed severity towards the Jewish population in the provinces of the Rhine, where they had long been in ill repute on account of their usury. Thus in 1808 he issued an imperial edict, imposing on every Jewish creditor who would go to law against a debtor the obligation to procure a certificate of good conduct, attested by the local authorities, declaring that the said creditor was not in the practice of taking usury or pursuing any disgraceful traffic.

Two years prior to this edict, in 1806, Napoleon conceived the idea of turning the peculiar talents of his Jewish subjects to his own advantage. He had doubtless discovered that their skill as financiers was unrivaled; that their commercial correspondence and intercourse throughout Europe was more rapid and trusty than any other; that the secret:ramifications of their trade in various countries gave them a great advantage over all their rivals in the world of traffic; and he purposed to convert them into devoted auxiliaries by more favorable measures and more ostentatious protection.” As a preliminary step, he astonished Europe by summoning a meeting of the Grand Sanhedrim, to which deputies consisting of the most eminent and learned rabbins were to be sent, not only from France, but from all those adjacent countries over which the influence of Napoleon extended. It was on July 28, 1806 (by a mistake, upon the Sabbath-day), that this Sanhedrim began to sit, and nominated as president Abraham Furtado, a distinguished Portuguese of Bordeaux. The assembly consisted of a hundred and ten members, and among these were such men of distinction as Goudchaux, Cremieux, Cerf-Beer, Cologna, Rodrigues, Avigdor, and others. This assembly being constituted by order of the emperor, three imperial commissioners — Mole, Portalis, and Pasquier — presented themselves during the sitting with twelve questions, to answer, which was to be the first and principal occupation of the Sanhedrim. The questions were as follows:

1. Is polygamy allowed by the Jewish law?

2. Is divorce recognized and permitted among them?

3. Are Jews allowed, by their regulations, to intermarry with Christians?

4. Would the Jews in France regard the French people as strangers or as brethren?

5. In what relation would the Jews stand towards the French, according to the Jewish law?

6. Do those Jews who are born in France consider it their native land? and are they bound to obey the law and customs of the country?

7. Who are the electors of the rabbins?

8. What legal powers do the rabbins possess?

9. Are the elections and authority of the rabbins grounded on law, or merely on custom?

10. Are the Jews forbidden to engage in any business?

11. Is usury to their brethren prohibited by the law?

12. Is it lawful or unlawful to practice usury with strangers?

To these twelve searching inquiries the Sanhedrim, after due and careful deliberation, sent the following answers:

1. Polygamy is unlawful, being declared such by the synod of rabbins held at Worms in 1030.

2. Divorce is allowed by the Jewish law for various causes; but on this subject the Jews cheerfully obey the decisions of the civil laws of the land in which they may happen to reside.

3. Intermarriages with Christians are not forbidden; but as differences and disputes often arise as to the ceremony of marriage and the education of children, such unions are generally regarded as inexpedient.

4. The Jews in France recognize the French people, in the fullest sense, as their brethren.

5. The relation of the Jew to the Frenchman is the same as the relation of the Jew to the Jew, the only distinction between them being that of religion.

6. The Jews, even while they were oppressed by the French monarchs, regarded France as their country. How much more readily will they do so after they have been admitted to equal rights.

7. There is no definite and uniform rule in reference to the election of rabbins. They are usually chosen by the heads of each family in the community.

8. The rabbins have no judicial power; that belongs, exclusively to the Sanhedrim. As the Jews of France and Italy enjoyed the equal protection of the laws at that lime, there was no necessity to confer any jurisdiction or authority on their teachers.

9. The election and authority of the rabbins are governed solely by custom.

10. There is no law which forbids the Jew to engage in any kind of business. The Talmud enjoins that every Jew shall be taught some trade.

11 and 12. The Mosaic law forbids unlawful interest: but that was a regulation intended for an agricultural people. The Talmud allows interest to be taken from brethren and strangers, but forbids usury.

Napoleon expressed himself satisfied with these answers of the Sanhedrim. On Feb. 9, 1807, the second Sanhedrim was convoked, to which Jews from other countries, and especially from Holland, were invited, that the principles laid down by the first Sanhedrim might acquire the force of law among the Jews in all parts. The answers of the former were sanctioned, and a plan of reform adopted exactly suited to the emperor's purpose. The Jews, and even the rabbins, were to be governed by consistories, which, of course, were to be governed by Napoleon.

Art. 12 of this plan defines the duties of the consistories: “The functions of the consistories shall be, 1st, to see that the rabbins do not, either in public or private, give any instructions or explanations of the law in contradiction to the answers of the assembly, confirmed by the decision of the Great Sanhedrim.” Art. 21: “The functions of the rabbins are, 1st, to teach  religion; 2d, to inculcate the doctrines contained in the decisions of the Great Sanhedrim; 3d, to represent military service to the Israelites as a sacred duty, and to declare to them that while they are engaged in it the law exempts them from the practices which might be incompatible with it.” Art. 22 fixes the salaries of the rabbins.

It is almost inconceivable that any Jew could approve, much less praise, this system of spiritual tyranny imposed by a Gentile despot. Yet Jost says, “The effects of these deliberations, to which the emperor gave his assent, were peculiarly beneficial.” See Tama, Collection des Proces-Verbaux et Decisions du .Grand Sanhedrim (Par. 1807, 8vo); id. Collection des Actes de l'Assemblee des Israelites de France et dui Royaume d'Italie (ibid. 1807, 8vo); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 11:290 sq., 620 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, iii. 328 sq.; Dessauer. Geschichte der Israeliten, p. 475 sq.; Stern, Gesch. d. Judenth. seit Mendelssohn, p. 138 sq.; Schmucker, History of the Modern Jews, p. 256 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 364 sq.; — Huic, History of the Jews, p. 216 sq.; H. Adams, History of the Jews, 2:154 sq.; M'Caul, Sketches of Judaism, and the Jews, p. 54 sq.; id. The Old Path, p. 366 sq.; Milman, History of the Jews (New York, 1870), 3:414 sq.; Palmer, History of the Jewish Nation (Lend. 1874), p. 297 sq. (B.P.)

## Parisis, Pierre Louis[[@Headword:Parisis, Pierre Louis]]

             a French prelate, was one of the greatest luminaries of the French episcopacy. He was born in 1795. In 1835 he was consecrated as bishop of Arras. Later he became bishop of Boulogne and St. Omer, and those eminent positions he filled until his death, Jann. 28. 1866. Paris is was the founder and editor of the Revue des sciences ecclesiastioues, and the author of some apologetical works, as Jesus Christ is God (French and German), written against Renan's Vie de Jesus; and on Divine Truth, also translated into German. See Liferarischer flandlceiser fur das katholische Deutschland, 1864, p. 64 sq., 110; 1865, p. 117; 1866, p. 355.

## Parisot, Pierre[[@Headword:Parisot, Pierre]]

             a noted French Capuchin missionary, was born at Bar-le-Duc in 1697. In 1736 he went as a missionary to the East Indies; but having quarreled with the Jesuits, they had him removed to America. He returned to Europe in 1744, and soon after published a work, entitled Historical Memoirs relative to the Missions in the Indies, which gave such offense to his own  order as well as the Jesuits that he withdrew to England, where he established two manufactories of tapestry. After visiting part of Germany and the Peninsula, he at length returned to his native country, became reconciled to his order, and again abjured it. Parisot died in 1770. His most important work is a History of the Society of Jesus, from its First Foundation by Ignatius Loyola.

## Parity[[@Headword:Parity]]

             in ecclesiastic judicial parlance, signifies the equality of rights of different religious denominations inn their relations to the state; those states. therefore, are parital which have granted equal rights to the several churches established in their domains. The principle of parity, totally unknown to Christian antiquity and the Middle Ages, has but gradually attained recognition since the Reformation. It was at first, and that only partially, acknowledged in the relations of the Lutheran estates to the German empire, by the Augsburg (religious) compact of 1555, which however excluded the Reformed (Calvinistic) Church; yet for the single territories the professed creed of the reigning prince was determinative. In the Peace of Westphalia (1648) this territorial principle was restricted or abolished; but the denominational character, in spite of the imperial statutes, continued in the single territories with manifold restrictions. The Netherlands, after their struggle for liberation, and Cromwell and the English commonwealth of the 17th century, were the first to pronounce and practice the principle of religious toleration (q.v.) at least of all evangelical sects; in Germany it was the great elector who carried out the parity of the Reformed with the Lutheran Church at the Westphalian peace. But only after the principle cujus reqio, ejus religio the maxim prevalent in the 15th and 16th centuries had yielded to the influence of the doctrine of universal human rights, the idea of the state parity for the different churches came to prevail, and is now incorporated in the constitutions of the European states. In Germany parity was formally declared only as late as the act of the Rheonish Confederation, by art. xvi; in 1806. In America it has been acknowledged since the establishment of the Union; in Pennsylvania it had been introduced by William Penn, who may properly be considered the founder of our parity idea. In the details, the position of the several religious corporations towards the state is regulated according to the constitution and law of the land;the peculiar motive idea is that every one of the generally recognized, religious communities shall enjoy equal rights and equal protection in the state; and in this aspect parity is only a  part of universal freedom in religious matters. Parity asks no more than that the state deal equally with every religious denomination, but by no means that it permit every one to draw the full practical consequences, irrespective of the, communal life of the state. Thus, for instance, the reservation of the “placet” (q.v.) was not incompatible with parity.

## Parizek, Alexius Vincenz[[@Headword:Parizek, Alexius Vincenz]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Austria, was born at Prague, November 10, 1748. In 1765 he joined the Dominicans, and received holy orders in 1771. For a time tutor at the grammar school in Prague, he went, in 1783, to Klattau, Bohemia, as director of the German grammar-school. In 1786 be was made episcopal notary at Budweis, in 1802 doctor of theology, in 1811 dean of the theological faculty at Prague, and died April 15, 1822. He is the author of a number of ascetical works, for which see Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:258, 350. (B.P.)

## Park, Calvin, D.D[[@Headword:Park, Calvin, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Northbridge, Massachusetts, September 11, 1774. He graduated from Brown University in 1797, three years after was appointed tutor in the university, and in 1804 was elected professor of languages. From 1811 to 1825 he was professor of moral philosophy and metaphysics. In 1800 he was licensed to preach, in 1815 ordained an evangelist, and from 1826 to 1840 was pastor of the Evangelical Congregational Church at Stoughton. He died there, January 5, 1847. His literary taste was exquisite, and he instinctively perceived the beauties and defects of a literary performance. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:460.

## Park, Roswell, D.D[[@Headword:Park, Roswell, D.D]]

             an Episcopal minister and educator, was born at Lebanon, Connecticut, October 1, 1807. He was educated at Union College, and at West Point Military Academy, where he graduated in 1831. He then served as a lieutenant of engineers until September 1836, when he accepted the chair of natural philosophy and chemistry in the University of Pennsylvania, a  position which he held until 1842. He took orders in the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1843, and taught and preached in Pomfret, Conn., from 1846 to 1852. He became president of Racine College in the latter year, and chancellor in 1859. He founded a school in Chicago in 1863, and died there, July 16, 1869. Dr. Park published, Selections of Poems (1836): — A Sketch of the History and Topography of West Point, etc. (1840): — Pantology (1841): — Hand-book for American Travellers in Europe (1853). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Park, Thomas, F.S.A.[[@Headword:Park, Thomas, F.S.A.]]

             was born in 1759. He was brought up as an engraver, but gave his attention to literary pursuits. He was the author of one hymn that has found its way into various collections — “My soul, praise the Lord; speak good of his name.” He was employed in the editorship of various books, including the Works of J. Hammond (1805), the Works of John Dryden (1806), the Works of T. Wharton; a work called Nugoe Antiqua, by Sir J. Harrington; and the Works of the British Poets, in 42 small volumes (1808). The Harleian Miscellany was published under his direction in the same year. He died in 1834. (S. S.)

## Parker Society[[@Headword:Parker Society]]

             is the name of an English organization of churchmen started in 1841, for the purpose of a complete republication of the writings of the Reformation. We append a list of the works published and proposed to be published by the Parker Society:

In royal octavo — Becon, Cranmer, Jewell, Whitgift, Tindal, Frith, and Barnes; Bullinger's Decades; Alley, Whittaker. In demy octavo — Ridley, Pilkington, Philpot, Fulke, Nolwell, Coverdale, Parker, Bale, Rainolds, Sandys, Hutchinson, Grindal, Hooper, Latimer, Bradford, Fox, Taverner, and some others. Royal authors — Documents of the reign of Edw VI — Documents relative to the reign of queen Mary; Documents of the reign of queen Elizabeth; Zurich Letters (two series); Letters and Documents from archbishop Parker's MSS. in CC.C.C.; occasional Services of queen Elizabeth's reign; the Homilies; some volumes of Sermons preached before king Edward VI and queen Elizabeth at Paul's Cross, in the universities, and on various occasions; several volumes of Tracts and Small Pieces; various Letters and Documents; the Reformation legum Ecclesiasticarum; queen Elizabeth's Prayer-book; Devotional Poetry of the sixteenth cenutury; Christian Meditations and Prayers, and some other devotional manuals. It was calculated that the works above stated might be in about eighteen or twenty volumes royal octavo, and fifty volumes demy, and the whole might be completed in sixteen years from the commencement. A few pieces of peculiar interest would probably be printed as facsimiles, and these were to be the sizes of the originals.

## Parker, Alexander[[@Headword:Parker, Alexander]]

             a noted Quaker preacher, one of the most intimate friends and frequent companions of George Fox in his Gospel labors, was born about 1628. Like most of his brethren in the ministry, he suffered much for his religious testimony, and was diligently engaged in the Lord's service. There is little to be found on record concerning this saintly man. The latter part of his life he spent in London, where he died in peace with man and God, Jan. 8,1689. See Janney, History of the Friends, 2:433, 434.

## Parker, Alvin H[[@Headword:Parker, Alvin H]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Castleton. Vt., in 1795. He graduated at Middlebury College, Vt.; studied divinity in the theological seminary of Princeton, N. J., and was licensed and ordained by the Philadelphia Presbytery in 1825. His first call was to the Church at Cold Spring, Cape May County, N. J.; and he afterwards preached at Salem, N. J., and' Middletown and Ridley churches in Delaware County, Pa. He was without charge some time previous to his death, which occurred July 6,1864. Mr. Parker was a good preacher and an excellent pastor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p.140. (J. L. S.)

## Parker, Benjamin Clark Cutler[[@Headword:Parker, Benjamin Clark Cutler]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, son of bishop Samuel Parker of New England, was born at Boston, June 6,1796, and was educated at Harvard University, class of 1822. He determined to enter the sacred ministry; and, after pursuing his studies very carefully and assiduously, he was ordained priest May, 17, 1826. He then preached in various places, and finally took charge of the “Floating Chapel for Seamen” in New York City, where he labored fifteen years with ability and fidelity. He died at New York Jan. 28, 1859.

## Parker, Charles Carroll, D.D[[@Headword:Parker, Charles Carroll, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Underhill, Vermont, September 26, 1814. He graduated from the University of Vermont in 1841; studied one year at the Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.; taught at Burlington, Vermont, one year; was a Congregational pastor at Tinmouth from 1848 to 1854; thereafter served at Waterbury until 1867; at Boston Centre, Me., until 1868; at Goshen until 1871, and finally, as a Presbyterian minister, at Parsippany, N.J., until his death, February 15, 1880.

## Parker, H.J., D.D[[@Headword:Parker, H.J., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Cavendish, Vermont, November 12, 1812. He was converted at eighteen, graduated from Harvard College in 1840, studied theology at Newton, was ordained in 1842, became pastor at Burlington, Vermont, in 1844; in 1854 removed to Beaver Dam, Wisconsin, in 1856 became pastor there; in 1861 removed to Austin,  Minnesota, in 1872 to California, and died at Riverside, January 30, 1885. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Parker, Joel, D.D[[@Headword:Parker, Joel, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born at Bethel, Vermont, August 27, 1799. He graduated from Hamilton College, N.Y., in 1824; was ordained in 1826, and settled at Rochester, where he remained until 1830; was pastor of Dey Street Church, New York city, from 1830 to 1833; at New Orleans from 1833 to 1838, and at the Broadway Tabernacle, New York city, from 1838 to 1840. He was chosen president and professor of sacred rhetoric in the Union Theological Seminary in the latter year, and retained the position two years. During the next ten years he served the Clinton Street Church, Philadelphia. He became pastor of the Bleecker Street Church, New York city, in 1852 and of the Fourth Avenue Presbyterian Church in 1854. He died in New York city, May 2, 1873. Dr. Parker was for some time associate editor of the Presbyterian Quarterly, and published, among other works, Lectures on Universalism (Rochester, 1829): — Morsels for a Young Student (about 1832): Reasonings of a Pastor with the Young of his Flock Sermons on Various Subjects (1852). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             a noted minister of the Church of the New Jerusalem, was born in Harbourne, England, in 1823, and early joined the Wesleyans. He was but moderately educated, and for many years followed the trade of brass- finishing. In 1855 he was led to change his Church relations through the instrumentality of the Rev. Dr. Bailey, of London. Mr. Parker now became a most ardent advocate of Swedenborgian doctrines, and engaged in discussions both publicly and privately. In 1863 he removed to Canada, and settled Toronto. In 1868 he finally entered the ministry. He had previously addressed large audiences on the New Jerusalem doctrines in the Toronto Park on Sunday afternoons, and became may my instrumental in gathering the Toronto New Church Society. After his ordination he was, most assiduous in his labors as the minister of the Toronto Society, making also many missionary tours into country places in Ontario and to the backwoods of Michigan, so that, besides those in Toronto who acknowledge Mr. Parker as the instrument of their introduction into the New Church, many isolated societies throughout Ontario and the West for the same reason remember him. In 1871 he severed his connection as pastor with the Toronto Society, and was engaged in missionary work for the General Association of the New Church in Canada, when, admonished by serious symptoms of disease, he returned to Toronto for medical advice, but never made any promising rally. He died Aug. 25, 1872. Mr. Parker enjoyed the confidence, and esteem of his own Church people to a remarkable degree. As a speaker his manner was earnest and his voice pleasing; his reasoning powers having been of a high order, he sought truth natural, scientific, and spiritual very earnestly, and he had the faculty of expressing his convictions to others in simple language. He was a genial, kind-hearted man, with strong antipathies, to which he did not hesitate to  give expression. See The New Jerusalem Messenger, New York, Oct. 2, 1872. (J. H. W.)

## Parker, John (2)[[@Headword:Parker, John (2)]]

             an Irish prelate, was born in Dublin, and was made a petty canon of St. Patrick's in 1642. He was subsequently prebendary of St. Michan's and dean of Killala, whereupon he took his degree of bachelor of divinity in Trinity College, Dublin. He was chaplain to the marquis (afterwards duke) of Ormond. In 1649 he was cast into prison by Cromwell, on suspicion of having been employed as a spy by the marquis, who was then laboring to restore Dublin to the king. On his release he was promoted to the bishopric of Elphin, whence he was translated, in 1667, to Tuam, and in 1678 to the archdiocese of Dublin. With his sees he held in commendam the rectory of Gallowne, the treasurership of St. Patrick's, Dublin, and the prebend of Desertmore, in the church of St. Finbar, in the diocese of Cork. He died December 28, 1681. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 283.

## Parker, Linus, D.D[[@Headword:Parker, Linus, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born at Rome, N.Y., April 23, 1829. He went to New Orleans in his sixteenth year, at once joined the Poydras Sunday-school, and became a dry-goods clerk. He volunteered in the Mexican war, and soon after his return received license to preach, and in 1849 entered the Louisiana Conference, in which he filled the most important appointments, including the presiding eldership (1870), the editorship of the New Orleans Christian Advocate (in connection with his ministerial labors), and membership in the General Conference, until his election as bishop in 1882. He died in this latter work, March 5, 1885. He was a most faithful pastor, a loving friend, and a graceful writer. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1885, page 159.; Simpson, Cyclop. Of Methodism, s.v.

## Parker, Matthew[[@Headword:Parker, Matthew]]

             an eminent English prelate, noted especially for his connection with the Nag's-Head Consecration, is so closely related to the history of his own times that the period of his activity is regarded as a chapter in Church history, or, as some have it, “archbishop Parker's history is that of the Church of England.” He was born at Norwich Aug. 6, 1504, and was educated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. While at the university he was a distinguished student, especially of the Scriptures and of the history of the Church, even to antiquarian minuteness; yet, in spite of his strong leaning to the past, he was from an early period favorably disposed towards the doctrines of the Reformation. He was first created Bible-clerk, or scholar, and afterwards fellow of his college. He was so conspicuous for learning that he was among other eminent scholars invited by cardinal Wolsey to Oxford, to furnish and adorn his new magnificent foundation. This invitation Parker did not choose to accept; but, residing in his own college, he pursued his studies with the greatest application for five-or six years; and, in this period having read over the fathers and councils, acquired a thorough knowledge of divinity.

He was ordained a priest in 1527, and lived in close intimacy with some of the more ardent Reformers. In 1533 he was appointed chaplain to queen Anne Boleyn, who though it very highly of him, and not long before her death exhorted her daughter Elizabeth to avail herself of Parker's wise and pious counsel. In 1535 he obtained the deanery of the monastic college of Stoke-Clare in Suffolk — Roman Catholicism, it must not be forgotten, being still the professed religion of the land, as Henry had not yet formally broken with the pope. Here the studious clerk continued his pursuit of classical and ecclesiastical literature, and at the same time set himself to correct the prevailing decay of morals and learning in the Church by founding a school in the locality for the purpose of instructing the youth in the study of grammar and humanity. Here, too, he appears for the first time to have definitely sided with the reforming party in the Church and State; the sermons which he then preached contain bold attacks on various Romish tenets and practices. In 1537, after the queen's death, Parker was made one of the king's chaplains, and continued in the bold and uncompromising course notwithstanding that complaint was entered against him to lord-chancellor Audley. In 1538 Parker took the doctorate in divinity; in l541 he was  installed prebend in the cathedral of Ely; in 1542 he was presented with the rectorate of Ashen, in Essex, conveniently situated both for Cambridge and Stoke; and when, in 1544, he resigned this living, he was presented with the rectorate of Birmingham, in Norfolk. In this year he also received further expression of royal favor by being made master of Corpus Christi, or Benet College, his alma mater at Cambridge. In the year following his college elevated him to the vice-chancellorship, and presented him with the rectory of Landbeach, in Cambridgeshire. In 1547 he renounced the obligations of priestly celibacy and married a daughter of a Norfolk gentleman. As this step caused much agitation, he drew up his defense, entitled De Conjugio Sacerdotum. By Edward VI he was nominated to the deanery of Lincoln in 1552; and under this prince, as under king Henry, he lived in greet reputation and affluence. But in queen Mary's reign he was deprived of all his preferments, because he was married, as it was pretended; but the real cause was his zeal for the Reformation. Parker was so disliked by the papists that he was even obliged to hide himself, though it does not appear that the Romish emissaries cared to find him in his concealment. His low circumstances he endured with a cheerful and contented mind; and during his retirement turned the book of Psalms into English verse, and rewrote and considerably. enlarged his De Conjugio Sacerdotum.

The death of Mary and the accession of Elizabeth called Parker from his learned retirement. Sir Nicholas Bacon, now lord-keeper of the great, seal, and Sir William Cecil, secretary of state, both old Cambridge friends, heartily recommended Parker for the archbishopric of Canterbury, and the queen, approving of their choice, caused his consecration in Lambeth chapel, Dec. 17, 1559, by Barlow, bishop, of Chichester; Scory, bishop of Hereford; Coverdale, bishop of Exeter; and Hodgkin, suffragan-bishop of Bedford. We mention this circumstance so minutely because the Romanists invented a tale afterwards that he had been consecrated at the Nag's-Head inn or tavern in Cheapside. But this notorious and improbable falsehood has been fully confuted by Mason (Vindication of the Church of England concerning the Consecration and Ordination of Bishops [1633, fol.]), by Bramhall (Consecration of Protestant Bishops Vindicated), and by Courayer (Defence of the Validity of English Ordinations [1728, 3 vols. 8vo]), and withal is disproved by many Catholics. so that to believe it nowadays requires more than even popish credulity. The period now opening up is one of the most remarkable in English history. Parker held  the archbishopric for more than fifteen years. These were years of changes in the State and in the Church. First of all there was the restoration of the Church Establishment to the condition which it had enjoyed previous to the accession of bloody Mary (q.v.). And this of itself was no easy matter in the unsettled state of ecclesiastical affairs. The hierarchy was dissolved, and the current of religious opinions directed into strange and untravelled channels. A strong spirit of dissension had developed within the very heart of the establishment — the germs of Puritanism had begun to spring up. There can be no doubt that all this was attributable to the caprices of the new monarch herself. She has pledged herself to a restoration of Protestant principles, and yet was so much addicted to various popish practices, such as the idolatrous use of images and was so strongly, we might say violently, in favor of the celibacy of the English clergy, that several parties developed within the Church, some favoring her, others opposing her; some approving her notions, others insisting upon a less or a more decided radical departure. Possibly all the factions, might by wise and considerate action have been harmonized. But then came the great difficulty of satisfying also those who, having been abroad while the papists controlled, now, on their return home, desired the adoption of the Swiss or Continental doctrines and practices in toto. Parker himself, being rather of a conservative turn of mind, had been chosen for the archbishopric, just as the primates of England are generally chosen for their willingness to be passive instruments of the government. The dignity of their office has, in their judgment, culminated in obedience to the policy and the passions of the sovereign. Cranmer's chief work had been to celebrate and then to undo royal marriages, to carry out the law of the six articles, to publish the Bible when it pleased the king that his subjects should read it, and to recall that book when the king found that its circulation was becoming dangerous to his pretensions. Parker's office was to carry into execution the law which made it criminal not to conform to the Prayer-book, and high- treason itself to refuse to take the- oath of spiritual supremacy. Parker assumed this task, and endeavored to carry it out to the letter. He had never seen Protestantism under any other form than that which it wore in Edward's reign. He had no thought of reconstructing a Church upon some alleged reference to Scripture merely. Imbued with a deep veneration for antiquity, he simply desired the elimination from the English religious system of what recent inquiry had detected as undeniable blemishes. Puritans and Lutherans must stand aside, the establishment must be preserved at all hazards, and everything that savored of a mutinous  individualism incompatible with a hierarchical organization, must be rigorously repressed. This very attitude forced him into intolerant and inquisitorial courses, the result of which was most damaging to the interests of English Protestantism. The Church was divided into factions, a reign of terror and persecution was inaugurated that constituted the germs of the revolution which at one time threatened to destroy the very life of the English nation.

Archbishop Parker has been, however, too severely criticized, or at least misunderstood, by the Puritans and English dissenters generally, for it must be considered that he was driven, rather by the attitude of the queen than by his own choice, into severe measures; and yet it should be borne in mind, too, by his apologists that as he grew older he became harsher, the conservative spirit increasing with his years. To forbid “prophesyings” or meetings for religious discourse was something very like persecution, though probably something very like treason to the Church was talked in these pious conventicles. The archbishop, we must remember, was not alone responsible for the severe treatment of the innovators, as those were called who dared to dissent from the Act of Uniformity. In 1565 the queen ordered the primate and other English bishops to see that uniformity was maintained in the Church of her realm. For several years the measures adopted were of so mild a nature that the dissenters maintained a passive relation; but in 1572, made bold by the encouragement of the earl of Leicester. the Puritans put forward a sarcastic Admonition to Parliament, in which, among denunciations of the Prayer-book and the hierarchy, they proceeded to recommend the institution of a new Church, whose “holy discipline” should copy the Presbyterian models then exhibited in Scotland and Geneva. Thus a favorable termination of the contest was made almost impossible. This was an open defiance of the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy and of the temporal constitution of England so closely interwoven therewith. The hour seemed to have brought a most important. epoch, and the archbishop, though violent and determined, was yet wise enough to comprehend the situation. Severity was most unlikely to check the Diciplinarians, and hence primate Parker determined upon a literary examination of the Puritan platform. John Whitgift first prepared an answer; later, when Cartwright returned from abroad he also answered the admonition. Both these great champions of the establishment proved most valuable aids to the archbishop, but they failed to convince their adversaries. A few concessions at the beginning of the queen's reign would  have satisfied such men as Fox, Coverdale, and Humphrey; but now nothing less would have been satisfactory than an unconditional surrender of ecclesiastical patronage, ecclesiastical revenues (including those of the monasteries), and inquisitorial powers. Just as the contest waged hottest, archbishop Parker was suddenly stricken with death, May 17, 1575.

Fuller (who must have his pun, however bad) says of him: “He was a Parker indeed, careful to keep the fences.” But if we cautiously consider the times and the circumstances, we must pronounce him to have been a good man, generally judicious, and of considerable ability. When he was first drawn from his seclusion and studies, he seemed very sincerely and persistently to say, Nolo Episcopari, but at last he subordinated his judgment to the peremptory will of Elizabeth. Parker rejoiced that he was the first bishop who was consecrated without any of what he calls “the old idle ceremonies of the Aaronical garments, gloves, rings, sandals, slippers, mitre, and pall.” Neither must his vast literary labors be forgotten. It is to Parker we owe the Bishops' Bible, undertaken at his request, carried on under his inspection, and published at his expense in 1568. He had also the principal share in drawing up the Book of Common Prayer, for which his skill in ancient liturgies peculiarly fitted him, and which strikingly bears the impress of his broad, moderate, and unsectarian intellect. It was under his presidency, too, that the Thirty-nine Articles were finally reviewed and subscribed by the clergy (1562). Among other literary performances, we may mention that Parker published an old Saxon Homily on the Sacrament, by Elfric of St. Alban's, to prove that transubstantiation was not the doctrine of the ancient English Church. “Parker's good fortune in putting thus to shame and eventual silence the idle boasts of Rome has earned him a place beside another metropolitan, the illustrious Rabanus Maurus” (q.v.). Parker also edited the histories of Matthew of Westminster and Matthew Paris (q.v.), and superintended the publication of a most valuable nwork, De Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae, probably printed at Lambeth in 1572, where the archbishop, we are told, had an establishment of printers, engravers, and illuminators. He also founded the “Society of Antiquaries,” and was its first president; endowed the University of Cambridge, and particularly his own college, with many fellowships and scholarships, and with a magnificent collection of MSS. relating to the civil and ecclesiastical condition of England. and belonging to nine different centuries (from the 8th to the 16th). Of this collection, Fuller said that it “was the sun of English antiquity before it was eclipsed by that of Sir  Robert Cotton.” There is a minute and excellent catalogue of these MS. collections in the Public Library at Cambridge which has never been printed.

Those who desire a careful but churchly estimate of archbishop Parker must consult the Life written by the indefatigable Strype (Oxf. 1711), and Hook, Lives of the Archbishops. See also Soames, Hist. of the Ref. Ch. of England, 4:579 sq.; Strype, Annals, 1:262 sq.; Burmet, Hist. of the Ref. 3:387 sq.; Soames, Elizabethan Hist. p. 15 sq., 174 sq., 201-218; Hallam, Constit. Hist. of England, 1:252 sq., et al.; Cunningham. Reformers; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, 1:292, et al., esp. p. 299; Hardwick, Ch. Hist. (Reformation), p. 22 sq.; Middleton, Evangel. Biogr. 2:171 sq.; Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 14 sq.; Butler, Eccles. Hist. 2:449 sq.; Marsden, Ch. Hist.; Collier, Eccles. Hist. 2:542-549; Palmer, Ch. Hist. 1:450; Hume, Hist. of England, 4:201 sq.; Green, Short Hist. of the English People, p. 383 sq., 464 sq.; Froude, Hist. of England (see Index in vol. xii); and especially Gibbon's estimate in his Posthumous Works, 3:566.

## Parker, Nathan, D.D.[[@Headword:Parker, Nathan, D.D.]]

             a Unitarian minister of the Congregational body, was born at Reading, Mass., June 5,1782, and was educated at Harvard University, class of 1803. After graduation Parker spent one year in teaching at Worcester, Mass.; then studied theology; in 1805 was appointed tutor in Bowdoin College, Me.; in 1808 he was settled as pastor of a Congregational Church in Portsmouth, and there ministered until his death, Nov. 8, 1833, a little while after Andrew P. Peabody had been ordained his colleague. When the division of the Congregational body in New England into two parties was recognized, Parker took part as a professed Unitarian. Henry Ware, Jr., published a volume of Parker's Sermons, with a memoir (1835). See also Ware, Biographical Sketches of Unitarian Ministers, 2:25; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:411.

## Parker, Robert (1)[[@Headword:Parker, Robert (1)]]

             a Puritan divine of considerable learning and reading, was educated at Benet College, Cambridge, and .after graduation (1583) was made a fellow thereof. He was finally presented to the benefice of Wilton, in Wiltshire. In 1607 he was obliged to quit the country, and he found refuge in Holland, because he had dared to publish A Discourse against Symbolizing with  Antichrist in Ceremonies. Parker died in 1614. After his death was published De Politica Ecclesiastica Christi et Hierarchica opposita, libri tres, in quibus tam verae disciplinae fundamnenta, quamt omnes fere de eadem controversime, summo cum judicio et doctrina methodice pertractantur (Frankfl. 1616, 4to): — A Discourse concerning the Puritans (1641, 4to): — The Mystery of the Vials opened in the 16th Chapter of Revelation (1651, 4to): — Exposition of the Fourth Vial (1654, 4to). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.; Neal, Hist. of the Puritan.

## Parker, Robert (2)[[@Headword:Parker, Robert (2)]]

             a pioneer minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Fisling Creek, Luzerne County, Pa., March 30, 1792; was converted at the age of eleven years, and joined the Methodist Church. He entered the Genesee Conference in 1820, and continued a member thereof until his death, being forty-seven years in faithful, active work, and seven years superannuated. The Genesee Conference at the time above mentioned included Western and portions of Central and Northern New York, part of Pennsylvania, the whole of Upper Canada, and a part of Michigan. His first charge was Canisteo Circuit, and included Dansville and Painted Post. His last was Rogersville, which was included in his first circuit. His earlier circuits required three hundred miles' travel, which occupied six weeks' time. Riding from morning till evening twilight through thick forests marked only by Indian trails, swimming rivers, climbing hills and mountains. and preaching nightly in log hut or school-house or barn, or out of doors, summer and winter. this veteran did an amount of labor for his Master that few modern preachers conceive of. His life was one of remarkable purity and earnestness, he being always willing to work wherever there was work to do. For the last two years of his life he was almost entirely bereft of reason by a paralytic stroke. Yet he never lost his hold on the higher life, but prayed as intelligibly and eloquently, and sang the old familiar hymns as sweetly, as when in the vigor of manhood. He died in Sparta, N.Y., Dec. 3,1874. See Minutes of Annual Conferences M. E. Ch. p. 875; Conable, Hist. General Conf. ch. ii, § 1; Boehm, Autobiography.

## Parker, Samuel (2)[[@Headword:Parker, Samuel (2)]]

             son of bishop Samuel Parker, was an excellent scholar, but a man of singular modesty. He married a bookseller's daughter at Oxford. where he resided, and appears to have had a situation in the Bodleian Library. Parker declined taking the oaths at the Revolution, and therefore did not enter into orders. He published Bibliotheca Biblica; being a Commentary upon all the Books of the Old and New Testaments, gathered out of the genuine Writings of Fathers and ecclesiastical Historians, and Acts of Councils down to the Year of our Lord 451, etc.; comprehending the proper allegorical, or mystic, and moral Import of the Text, etc. [anonymous] (Oxf. 1720, etc., 5 vols. 4to). This is a commentary of profound learning and research. It is to be regretted that it was not carried beyond the Pentateuch: — An Abridgment of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius. His son founded the bookselling establishment at Oxford which still remains in the family.

## Parker, Samuel (3), D.D.[[@Headword:Parker, Samuel (3), D.D.]]

             an American prelate, was born in Portsmouth, N. H., Aug. 28, 1744, and passed A.B. in Harvard, 1764. He then became a teacher, and after having for nine years followed this profession, determined to enter the ministry. Though educated in the Congregational Church, he repaired to England for ordination by the bishop of London, and in 1773 became assistant in Trinity Church, Boston. During the Revolution he was in imminent peril for his royalist declarations, and was at length obliged to omit the prayers for the king. In 1779 he became rector of Trinity Church, New York, and was actively engaged as agelit for the propagation of the Gospel. In 1803, upon the death of bishop Bass, Parker was elected bishop. He died,  however, only a little while later, Dec. 6, 1804. Bishop Parker was distinguished for his benevolence. He was a devoted and considerate friend of the poor, who in his death. mourned the loss of a father. His publications are, The Annual Election Sermon before the Legislature of Mass. (1793): — A Sermon for the Benefit of the Boston Female Asylum (1803); and other occasional sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, v. 296.

## Parker, Samuel (4)[[@Headword:Parker, Samuel (4)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, one of the most eminent pioneers of Methodism in the West, was born in New Jersey about 1774. He was converted at fourteen; in the year 1805 he entered the itinerancy; in 1809-1813 was presiding elder on Indiana District, which was then one of the most important fields of the Church, and was greatly improved and enlarged under his labors; in 1814 he was on Miami District; and in 1815- 1819 on Kentucky District. An important position in the Mississippi Conference needed a strong man, and thither the bishops sent him in 1819, but he was soon stricken down with disease, and died Dec. 20 of the same year. His preaching was of the most eloquent and irresistible character. He possessed an exceedingly musical voice, a clear, keen mind, an imagination which, though never extravagant, afforded frequent and brilliant illustrations of his subject, while his ardent piety imparted wonderful tenderness and power to his appeals. Withal his personal appearance was striking. He was nearly six feet in height, and had a remarkably intellectual countenance, with a full forehead and a black piercing eye. Parker's whole life was one of ceaseless and glorious toil for the kingdom of Christ. He was one of the princes of Israel, and his early death deprived the Church of one of her most needed laborers in the West. He was a man of genius, and was called the Cicero of the Western Methodist ministry. See Minutes of the Annual Coferences, 1:358; Meth. Mag. 1825, art. Wm. Beauchamp, et al.; Stevens, Hist. of the Meth. Epis. Church 1:365),378; — Finley, Sketches of Western Methodism, p. 206; McFerrin, Hist. of Methodism in Tennessee, 2:321 sq.; Redford, Hist. of Methodism in Kentucky (see Index in vol. 2). (J. H.W.)

## Parker, Samuel (5)[[@Headword:Parker, Samuel (5)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Ashfield, Mass., April 23, 1779. He was of Puritan ancestry, noted for their piety and decided character. During  1798 and 1801 he pursued his preparatory studies under the superintendence first of the Rev. Mr. Strong, of Williamsburg, Mass., and afterwards of Dr. Smith of Ashfield. He graduated at Williams College in 1806. taught a year in the academy at Brattleboro, Vt., and in the fall of 1807 sent to Shelborough, Mass., and commenced theological study with the Rev. Theophilus Packard. In the pecuniary straits, as well as the demand for duty, he was licensed at the end of the year 1808 by the Northern Congregational Association of Hampshire County to go to Steuben County- , N.Y., and to Northern Pennsylvania. After three months there, he entered the Andover Theological Seminary, and graduated with the first class of that institution, immediately after which he was sent by the Massachusetts Missionary Society to Middle and Southern New York. In 1812 he was called to Danby N. Y.; was ordained and installed pastor Dec. 23 of that year and continued to labor there for fifteen years when he was called to become financial agent to New England for Auburn Theological Seminary. In 1830 he became pastor of the Church at Apulia, N. Y.; in 1833 of the Congregational Church at Middlefield, Mass.; and in 1835, 1836, and 1837 he made his exploring tour beyond the Rocky Mountains, under the American Board of Foreign Missions the result of which was the establishment of several missions. After his return he wrote his book on Oregon, and spent several years in lecturing and supplying pulpits temporarily. He died March 24, 1866. Mr. Parker was in character a bold, decided man, full of energy and. Resolution doing with his might whatever he undertook. His preaching was sound, doctrinal, and scriptural. He was a distinguished counselor in Church polity and discipline. Naturally a fine scholar, he took an interest in languages science, and art, as well as in the practical duties of life. He claimed to be the first to suggest the possibility of a railroad through the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific. He published the journal of an Exploring Tour beyond the Rocky Mountains, 1835, 1836, 1837 (Ithaca, 1838, 12mo; Lond. 1841, 8vo; 5th Amer. ed. Auburn, 1846, 12mo). See: North Amer. Rev. Jan. 1840, p. 129; Lond. Monthly Rev. Nov. 1838, p. 349; Lond. Athen. 1838, p. 790; Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 315; Record of the Alumni of Dartmouth College. (J. L. S.).

## Parker, Samuel, D.D. (1)[[@Headword:Parker, Samuel, D.D. (1)]]

             a prelate of the English Church, was born at Northampton in September, 1640. He was of Puritan extraction, and was marked by certain Puritan notions, when, as a young man, he entered Wadham College, Oxford. He  studied later at Trinity College. He was there brought in contact with persons of a very different, turn of mind, particularly with Dr. Ralph Bathurst, who is said by the writers of his Life to have been chiefly instrumental in drawing him away from the Puritans. Parker, at the Restoration, became a zealous advocate for episcopacy. He had an active pen, which he employed about the time of the Restoration, and for a few succeeding years, in repeated attacks on the Puritan, or, as it was then become, the Non-conforming party. The controversy is almost forgotten, and we think it needless to recount the titles of his tracts. One of his writings, A Discourse in Vindication of Bishop Branmhall (Lond. 1670), called forth the “Rehearsal Transposed” of Andrew Marvell, in which Parker was very severely handled, and to which he replied in A Reproof to the Rehearsal Transposed (Lond. 1673); but Marvell's wit was too much for him and in everything he subsequently wrote he showed how keenly he felt the castigation. He was favored and promoted in the Church. In 1667 he was made chaplain to archbishop Sheldon; in 1670 he became archdeacon, and in 1672 a prebendary of Canterbury, and had the livings of Ickham and Chartham.

When king James II contemplated the reunion of England with the general Church, with its head in the Roman pontiff, he looked among the English divines for persons who might be willing to assist in his designs, and, among other persons, he fixed upon Parker, who was made by him bishop of Oxford in January, 1686; and when Hough was deprived of the presidency of Magdalen College, it was given to Parker. It is said that he was then inclined to popery. It is very reasonable, however, we think, to believe that these favors were really the price of his religion, which he did not scruple to offer up as a willing sacrifice to his ambition. In this new change Parker became one of the Romish mercenaries, prostituting his pen in defense of transubstantiation and the worship of saints and images. To this purpose he published a piece, Dec. 16, 1687 — though, according to the printer's style, in 1688 — entitled Reasons for abrogating the Test imposed upon all Members of Parliament, anno 1678, Oct. 30, etc.; first written for the author's satisfaction, and now published for the benefit of all others whom it may concern. The papists, it is certain, made sure of him as a proselyte, and one of them tells us that he even proposed, in council, whether it was not expedient that at least one college in Oxford should be allowed the Catholics, that they might not be forced to be at such charges by going beyond the seas to study. In the same spirit, having invited two popish noblemen, with a third of the Church of England, to an entertainment, he drank the king's health, wishing a happy  success to all his affairs; adding that the religion of the Protestants in England seemed to him to be in no better condition than that of Buddha was before it was taken, and that they were next to atheists who defended that faith. Nay, so notorious was his conduct. that the cooler heads among the Romanists condemned it as too hot and hasty. Bishop Parker's authority in his own diocese was so very insignificant that when he assembled his clergy, and desired them to subscribe an “Address of Thanks to the King for his Declaration of Liberty of Conscience,” they rejected it with such unanimity that he got but one clergyman to concur with him in it (Burnet's History of my Own Times, vol. ii). Bishop Parker encountering contempt with all good men, trouble of mind threw him into a malady of which he died at Magdalen College, March 20, 1687. Sir James Mackintosh (Miscellaneous Works, 2:156) says that Parker refused on his death-bed to declare himself a Roman Catholic. However true or false this may be, it is certain he sent a “Discourse” to James, persuading him to embrace the Protestant religion, with a “Letter” to the same purpose, which was printed at London (1690, 4to).

Bishop Parker's only work of any permanent reputation is entitled De Rebus sui Temporis Commentarius, but it is disfigured by party virulence, and is in no respect trustworthy. This treatise was not published till 1726, when it was given to the world by his son, Samuel Parker (2). A translation of it by the Rev. Thomas Newlin was published in 1727. Bishop Parker was a most inveterate opponent of Cartesianism. In his Disputationes de Deo et divina providentia he contended in the scholastic spirit equally against the philosophy of Des Cartes and that of Hobbes, making no distinction between the mechanical features of each, and not discerning, that while the one was atheistic, the other was as strikingly theistic in its spirit and tendency. The other publications of bishop Parker are: An Account of the Government of the Christian Church for the first Six Hundred Years, particularly showing, I. The apostolical Practice of diocesan and metropolitical Episcopacy. II. The Usurpation of patriarchal and papal Authority. III. The War of Two Hundred Years between the Bishops of Romne and Constantinople for universal Supremacy (Lond. 1683, 8vo): — Religion and Loyalty; or a Demonstration of the Power of the Christian Church within itself, the supremacy of sovereign Power over it, the duty of passive Obedience, or non-resistance to it, exemplified out of the Records of the Church and the Empire from the beginning of Christianity to the end of the Reign of Julia) (Lond. 1684, 8vo): — Religion and Loyalty, the second part or the History of the Concuirrence of the imperial and  ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in the Government of the Church from the beginning of the Reign of Jovian to the end of the Reign of Justinian (Lond. 1685, 8vo): — History of his Own Time [translated], with an Account of his Conversion from Presbytery to Prelacy (Lond. 1728, 8vo) — The Era of the Church immediately after the Apostles (Tracts of Angl. Fathers, 3:138). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. ii, s.v.; Macaulay, Hist. of England, 2:321; iii 113 sq., 124-127; Perry, Hist. Ch. of England, 2:397 448, 480, 502; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England, 1:444 sq.; 2:109, 134 sq.; Debury, Hist. Ch. of England, p. 73 sq.; (Lond.) Gentleman's Magazine 70. 7 sq.

## Parker, Theodore[[@Headword:Parker, Theodore]]

             an American theologian of the extreme rationalistic order, was possessed of one of the brightest intellects of this century, and in many respects was  fitted by nature to lead and to teach. He is not noted, however, as the founder of any school in religion or philosophy.

Theodore Parker was born in Lexington, Mass., Aug. 21, 1810. He was descended from an old Puritan family. His grandfather and other near relatives were people of influence, and took a prominent part in the Revolutionary struggle. His father, John Parker, was a millwright and pump-maker by trade, but he also tilled a large farm, and was besides noted for rare intellectual culture. He possessed some scientific knowledge, and though much given to speculation in religion and philosophy, was withal a godly man. He rejected the predestination theory: into and as the Calvinists were then in the ascendency he came to dislike the Church. He was disinclined to believe all the miraculous in the Scriptures, but yet reverently accepted the authority of the Bible as, in a general sense, an inspired book, and not only went himself regularly to Church service, but also insisted upon daily worship in his family and their Church attendance. Theodore Parker's mother was a woman of more than ordinary ability and worth. She was well educated, and possessed of great personal beauty and poetic tastes. She was very domestic in her habits, and much devoted to her children; in short, was an example of sweet, fresh, and instructive piety. (As a youth Theodore Parker also enjoyed the advantages of a wholesome influence in his physical development. He was incited to activity in his father's shop and in the open field, and while he thus acquired habits of industry he also secured a well-developed frame and great physical endurance. His intellectual training depended largely on his own choice, and that was decidedly controlled by a thirst for knowledge. He was always studying, in school and out. In the summer noons, when others were enjoying a nap under the trees, he refreshed himself with his book. The extent of his reading was astonishing. Before he was eight years old he had read the translation of Homer and Plutarch, Rollin's Ancient History, and all the other volumes of history and poetry that came in his way. Books of travel and adventure were eagerly devoured. He went through Colburn's Algebra in three weeks. Nor did books alone engage his interest. He studied the stars and the flowers. The foreign fruits in Boston market, the husks and leaves that came wrapped around bales of goods from distant parts of the world, attracted his attention. Even the structure of the hills and the formation of the stones on his father's farm excited his curiosity. In the virtues of toil and economy his whole life was a school. In the summer he was employed in the usual labors of the farm and the workshop,  digging; plowing, haying, laying stone wall, mending wheels, repairing wagons, and making pumps, with as much conscience, if not with as much delight, as in the pursuit of his studies. The book was always near to fill tip the crevices of time. He wanted more books than his father could afford to give him, and he could obtain them only by work. His first Latin grammar was the gift of his father; the Latin dictionary was paid for by picking huckleberries when he was twelve years old. The gift of expression was as prompt as the gift of acquisition. He was an impassioned declaimer and a skilfull mimic. While yet a schoolboy he had all the political events of the day at his tongue's and, and greatly amused the gossips of the country tavern by his wise discussions of them. But his superiority called forth no jealousy among his comrades. He was always full of fun, and took part in play with the other boys in the most robust style. The testimonies to his moral character are of this stamp. He was modest, pure, single-minded, frank. and truthful. His thoughts were busy with literature; his appetite for knowledge so eager as to preserve him from the temptations of his age.

He began to teach at seventeen, taking charge of district schools in the neighborhood for four successive winters. The last place at which he taught school was Waltham, and so determined was he to improve himself that he would, frequently encourage his scholars to take up studies he was himself desirous of pursuing. Thus he formed a class in French after having taken only a very few lessons himself, and Spanish without having enjoyed the instruction of a master for a single hour. When just twenty he went to Cambridge to be examined for admission to Harvard College. He was admitted; but being a non-resident, and unable to pay the tuition fees, he was not entitled to the degree of A.B. In 1840, however, the degree of A.M. was conferred upon him honoris causa. On March 23, 1831, he went to Boston in fulfillment of an engagement to assist in the instruction of a private school. He transported thither eleven octavo volumes, his entire library, and fell to work with indomitable resolution and energy. He received fifteen dollars a month and his board for teaching Latin, Greek, French, and Spanish, mathematics, and all branches of philosophy. He taught six hours a day, and from May to September seven hours. He remained in Boston just one year; whether the engagement was closed on his motion or not we do not know; but this we do know, that the work proved too much for his strength. He needed air and exercise, but he needed society even more. He next opened a private school at Watertown, where he found much to encourage him — pleasant social relations, the  friendship of the Rev. Dr. Francis, the Unitarian clergyman there, and the promise of a wife in Miss Lydia D. Cabot, whom he married in 1837. Mr. Parker's achievements in scholarship during his residence in Watertown were remarkable. He pursued the study of Latin and Greek authors, and read the most of Cicero, Herodotus, Thucydides, Pindar, Theocritus, Bion, Moschus (the last four of which he translated), and AEschylus. He wrote for a Sunday school class a history of the Jews; increased his studies in metaphysics, taking up Cousin and the new school of French philosophers; and entered. upon a course of theology. Every Saturday he walked to Cambridge and to Charlestown for instruction in Hebrew. In addition to this, he devoted a portion of his time to the German poets, Goethe, Schiller, and Klopstock, and the works of Coleridge engaged a share of his attention. An occasional novel by Sir Walter Scott or a poem of Byron beguiled his leisure hours. “His studies,” says his biographer, Frothingham, “ran into the early morning. The landlady kept the lamps well supplied, but there was no oil in his lamp when the day broke.” In 1834 Parker entered the Cambridge divinity school, where he remained two years and three months. He was still so poor that he was obliged to eke out his scanty means by taking four or five pupils, and to practice the most rigid economy. In his journal he says that he did not take up the theological course without many misgivings, and that he had even taken preliminary studies looking towards the law as a profession, because he felt repelled by the doctrines which were taught in the pulpits, the notorious dullness of Sunday services, and the fact that the clergy did not lead in the intellectual, moral, or religious progress of the people. In this account of his experience as a minister, however, Parker is continually substituting his later conclusions for his early impressions. In certain cases we can detect great discrepancies between the statements. contained in. this document and the real facts. For example, among the “five distinct denials” of the popular theology with which he alleges that he entered upon his theological education, the first is “the ghastly doctrine of eternal damnation and a wrathful God.” This he states that he made way with somewhere from his eleventh to his tenth year. But he had forgotten the confession of his faith which he made in a letter to his nephew, Columbus Greene, on April 2, 1834 (compare the examination on this topic in Meth. Qu. Rev. Jan. 1873, p. 17, 18).

At the theological school Parker made a marked impression. He soon came to be regarded as a prodigious athlete in his studies. He made daily  acquaintance with books which were strange to many old Biblical scholars, and which the younger members of the school did not know even by name. He would dive into the college library and fish up huge tomes in Latin and Greek, which he would lug off to his room, and go into them with as much eagerness as a boarding-school girl goes into a novel. His power of speech also began to attract attention. He was the best debater, if not the best writer, in Divinity Hall. He finished his term at the divinity school in the summer of 1836, and, after preaching as a candidate in Barnstable, Greenfield, Northfield, and other vacant parishes in Massachusetts, accepted a call to settle in West Roxbury, where he was ordained in June, 1837. This was a quiet country place. His parish was small; and composed mostly of plain people, and his salary of six hundred dollars afforded no bewildering temptations; but the village was near Boston and Cambridge, and promised leisure for the work on which his heart was set. The absorbing pursuit of this period was the literature of the Bible. He devoted a share of his time to the Egyptian and Phoenician alphabets; he dallied with ancient inscriptions and coins; the Orphic poems attracted his attention; but the Bible literature led all the rest. Still, all literature in his eyes was sacred literature. All facts were divine facts. He came to look upon man as a progressive being, and developed by studies a theory very much like that of the modern development theorists, Lubbock, Tylor, Hittel, etc.; only he was more considerate to Christianity. Parker's journal is filled with curious inquiries into the mysterious phenomena of nature and life. To the last he was always gleaning accounts of miracle and prophecy. His reading was universal in its range. He took up Chapman the poet, Herrick, Wither, Drummond, Wotton Flecknoe, Surrey, Suckling.

There was honey for him in every flower. The early Christian hymns, the Milesian fables, Cupid and Psyche, Campanella, biographies of Swedenborg and other famous mystics were his mental recreations. Hume, Gibbon, Robertson were trifles; Schleiermacher, Bouterwek, Baur, Hegel, Leibnitz, Laplace were more serious. Bopp's Comparative Grammunar, Karcher's Analecta, Meiier's History of Religions, Rimannlus's History of Atheism (Latin) are examples of the solid reading. The books that were not at hand, Abelard, for instance, and Averroes, he sought from afar. Wilkinson aind Rosellini were familiar to him. Hesiod he commented on minutely. Plato was a constant companion. No book is mentioned without some notice of its contents and critical remarks. So extensive was his course of study that the truthfulness of his statements have been called in question; and Prof. Prentice, in his reviews (Meth. Qu. Rev. Jan. - Oct. 1873), after detailed  examination, pronounces Parker guilty of exaggeration and very, inaccurate in scholarship. “‘The truth is, that accurate scholarship was not his gift. Mr. Parker read too much, his life through, to read well; he attempted too many languages to know any accurately. The merest inspection will show not only that his mode of life was unfavorable to study but also that he had more than enough to busy his mind with.” We cannot endorse this harsh critique. Theodore Parker's' intellectual ability has been surpassed very rarely in this country. With naturally great powers, he had subjected himself to a thorough discipline, till he attained to a surprising degree of mental strength and vigor. His memory was very retentive: and it is said that he could repeat a whole volume of poetry, and would often learn by hearing a poem of four or five hundred lines from a single reading. It had been carefully cultivated, but not, as is too often the case, to the neglect of the other faculties. We must confess, however, that Parker's range of studies was too vast and too superficial to avail much, and that his intellectual constitution unfitted him for original work. True, his intellect was keen and subtle, and bored into everything, determined to find the kernel, if it had any. But it had no constructive power, and its range was lateral and horizontal, and lacked both height and depth. He saw sharply through sham reasoning in other people, could prick all wind- bladders with the needles of his criticism and satire, or, as Mr. Beecher has it, “he had a habit of striking at the root of things with very vigorous blows,” and hence was quick to run down a falsehood, but he was just as impotent to establish a truth. His intellect was colored mainly by his tempestuous sensibilities. He had not even enough of the intuitive faculty, ,notwithstanding his abundant nomenclature about the consciousness, which he learned from Kant, for intellectual sympathy, and hence he could not enter into other people's beliefs so as to understand them and get their outlook.

The society which Parker found at West Roxbury was of special value to his culture. His immediate neighbors were a choice circle of cultivated persons used to the refinements of life, accomplished in literature and art, with high tone of sentiment, and “that rich flavor of character which distinguishes people well bred.” In his student days at Cambridge, and in his earliest days of ministerial life, Theodore Parker had been a most ardent admirer of the Unitarian Channing. But gradually Emerson's influence came to predominate and crowded out Channing. In 1837 Parker and Channing read Strauss's Leben Jesu together, and in the discussion of their  own views on this subject it soon developed that Channing was a conservative and Parker a radical theologian. By 1839 Emerson's influence was most decidedly in the ascendency, and fast growing, though silently, to vast power. This is very clearly apparent in an article which Parker published about this time in the Boston Qu. Rev. on “Palfrey's Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities,” and in the Thursday lecture on “Inspiration,” preached in January, 1840, in which he talks about the folly of thinking that the divine goodness had exhausted itself, and the probability that new Christ would be manifested among mankind. He began to hint, too, that we might equal or even transcend Jesus Christ in spiritual insight and moral excellence. In November of this year he gave, further proof of his departure from conservative theology by attending the Chardon Street Convention, then held in Boston. This meeting was called to discuss the ministry, the Sabbath, and the Church. Men of all shades of opinion were invited, under the management of Edmund Quincy, to share in the deliberations. Parker was advised by Channing to keep clear of the affair, but was bent on going. Of course the convention was a motley throng, and the extremists took virtual possession of the meeting.

No candid and thoughtful believer had much chance of a hearing, and a questionable fame hangs over the convention. Parker seems to have taken no active part in their discussions; but a record in his journal shows that he meant to push his peculiar views: “I have my own doctrines, and shall support them, think the convention as it may.” In this mood he resolved to write a sermon on Idolatry, and he minutes the points for discussion. These will help us to detect the drift of his meditations. After a few well-delivered blows at mammon and love of a good name, he uncovers the real objects of the discourse by saying that the Church makes an idol of the Bible; that it loves Jesus Christ as God, though he is not God; that the Church, ministry, and Sabbath are regarded as divine institutions, though they are merely human. This sermon he preached on the occasion of the Rev. C. C. Shackford's ordination at Howes Place Church, South Boston, May 19, 1841. The discourse was entitled The Transient and the Permanent in Christianity, and in it he flatly repudiated the theory of the infallible and miraculous inspiration of the Bible. The general verdict was that the temper of the discourse was harsh and sarcastic. The more conservative Unitarians were shocked at such sentiments, and a general dissatisfaction arose that a man holding. these views should be recognized as a Unitarian clergyman. His connection with them could only be an embarrassment to them and a discomfort to himself; yet, on the pretext that the rights of free thought and  free speech were involved in the question, he refused to withdraw from them, as they would gladly have seen him do. They, on the other hand, refused to expel him from their association lest he should thus be afforded the position of a martyr. Yet he was punished for his heresy. For ecclesiastical and civil ostracism social proscription was substituted. People ceased to know him, ministers refused to exchange with him; he found the journals shut against him, and the effort was made to reduce him thus to silence. Debarred from the general privileges he had hitherto enjoyed, he withdrew himself altogether to his vicarage at West Roxbury, where, however the storm might rage elsewhere, he always found peace. It speaks well for him that all attempts to alienate the affections of his parishioners failed. They were his firm and constant friends. In this quiet abode he continued to study, read, think, and find domestic happiness; yet his eye watched the movement of the storm he had raised, and ever and anon he intervened in the conflict. Early in May, 1842, he sent the last sheet of his Discourse on Matters pertaining to Religion to the printer, and in somewhat more than a twelvemonth later his translation of De Wette's Introduction followed. Of the former work, we may say in this place that it was evidently an effort on the part of its author to clear what he conceives to be religion from entangling alliances. It is a vigorous rejection of the authority of the evangelical faith. The peculiar dogma of the book is the sufficiency of human nature for all its functions. “Man's religion is a joint development from the nature within him and the outward world. God, duty, and immortality are conceptions which arise of themselves in human souls. Out of these fundamental ideas all religious, systems have been built up.”

The autumn of 1843 found Parker so much worn out by toil that a voyage to Europe was recommended for recreation. A friend was near to supply the pecuniary needs of such a journey, and he set out September 9 to remain a whole year on the other side of the Atlantic. It proved no holiday trip for sight-seeing, but a serious pilgrimage. He returned like a student from his task. Unfortunately, however, his visit to the Old World had filled him with vast and ambitious schemes. The little church, of which he had borne a pencil-drawing on the fly-leaf of his European journal, in sight of the splendid cities with their vast cathedrals, had made him discontented with his circumscribed sphere, and he longed for broader fields and greater responsibilities. He deemed himself called to higher work. But how to get beyond his circumscribed circle of influence at West Roxbury, now that  even the most radical of Unitarian clergy dared not to invite him to his pulpit, was the question. His sympathizers were numerous in all the churches, and evinced their love for him by constantly crowding his little country church Sunday after Sunday, whither many came from the city to sit under his preaching. He soon saw very clearly that he must first leaven the little lump that came to his own door, and so he wrought with them until they were powerful and enthusiastic enough to promise his support in the metropolis; and in January, 1845, about a year and a quarter after his return from Europe, Parker removed to Boston, with a view of forming a permanent congregation in that city. It was as yet simply an experiment, but it proved successful. The masses are ever ready to applaud the destructive elements in society. Those who toil quietly to build up are hardly known, but those who come to tear down and destroy are warmly welcomed, loudly proclaimed, and constantly cheered. So it happened that within a twelve month Parker was firmly established as a religious teacher.

He preached in the Melodeon, and became the minister of what he always called “The Twenty-eighth Congregational Society of Boston.” In there and then presented the extraordinary spectacle of a man who vigorously and emphatically repudiated all the fundamentals of Christianity, and who denied that there was “any great moral or religious truth in the New Testament which had not been previously set forth by men, for whom no miraculous help was ever claimed,” still professing to be a Christian minister! There was no Church organization, and no sacraments were administered. The public services consisted simply of a single discourse every Sunday on some literary, philosophical, theological, or political topic, having more or less of a moral or religious bearing, with music and a certain kind of prayer. His congregation, which was large, as might be expected, was made up of men of diverse religious opinions, comparatively few of whom agreed with him, except in his thorough opposition to evangelical Christianity and his general philanthropic sentiments. The mass of his hearers were men of considerable thought, who had a taste for religious discussion, but who had reasoned themselves away from the Bible — had become dissatisfied with the churches, and had passed into various phases of unbelief. There were atheists, deists physical and spiritual pantheists, fatalists, spiritualists, come-outers, universal skeptics, and secularists. There were many persons of high culture, wealth, and social position. The more radical reformers, dissatisfied with the indifference of some of the churches to great public vices, and the complicity of others in them naturally gathered around a man who boldly attacked all public sins,  and delighted to pour forth his scorching invective upon those religious bodies who only rebuked unpopular wickedness. Thus a large element of his congregation consisted of those who, having no especial religious or irreligious principles, were attracted by the fascinating manner, the novel matter, the trenchant wit, and other high intellectual qualities, of his discourses. He was not what is popularly termed an eloquent speaker — though he was something far better. Neither his person, attitude, gesture, nor elocution indicated the great orator. There was no splendid declamation, no soaring flight, no electrifying of the audience as by some rhetorical machinery. He had learned, what so few of our scholars ever know, how to convey great thoughts in common language. Not that his vocabulary was meager or vulgar — though there was sometimes an approach to coarseness in his expressions. On the contrary, his range of language was remarkably extensive, and his command of appropriate terms almost unlimited. He was thus able to popularize the most abstruse thought, and convey it in the most familiar words. His fertility of illustration was unbounded, and his brief similes and metaphors sometimes gave possession of a valuable idea which whole pages of writing might otherwise have failed to bring out. In reading as well as in hearing him, all felt that an ordinary man was placing before them extraordinary thoughts. It is true that sometimes when discoursing on some popular sin before which the Church and the political parties had been awed into silence, his soul would become mightily stirred, and then the momentum was almost terrible. A natural rhetoric would marshal his phrases in wonderful order; his fiery words would tingle in the ears of those who heard them; there was then an eloquence which inspired whole multitudes after the sublimest manner. Ordinarily, however, he spoke in a plain, easy, conversational way, using familiar but striking illustrations, garnishing, and yet helping the argument with strokes of irresistible humor, not sparing the terrible sarcasm in which he was an adept, often palpably extravagant in his statements, now and then violating the conventional canons of good taste, but always making his point tell, at whatever sacrifice. Besides preaching on Sunday, Theodore Parker is said to have engaged largely in parochial duties, attending to the wants of the poor, and the afflicted. Of these, we find no definite account; but from the benevolent character of the man we have no doubt that he devoted some time to these, genial employments. In addition to the duties of his parish, his public labors were very numerous. He lectured before lyceums all through New England and many other Northern states, to the amount of eighty or one hundred times in a year;  was present at and addressed many kinds of meetings for the promotion of temperance, antislavery, education, the rights of women, etc.

Though often in feeble health, Theodore Parker seldom allowed physical languor to intermit his work. He knew nothing of the necessity of sleep, exercise, or recreation. He grew up thoughtless of the simplest conditions of physical health. For more than ten years before his death he manifested symptoms that caused great anxiety to every one but himself. But it was not till the beginning of 1859 that he was compelled to relinquish his pulpit, and seek for the improvement of his health in another climate. On February 3 he sailed for Santa Cruz, where he remained until the middle of May, when he took passage from St. Thomas for Southampton. His stay in Switzerland and Italy was to no purpose. The fatal moment did not long delay to strike. After suffering intensely from the capricious climate, and still more from the spiritual atmosphere of Rome, he found a welcome resting-place in the beautiful Florence, where in the midst of flowers, which he loved so well, he died May 10, 1860. He had often expressed a desire in earlier life that, like Goethe and Channing, he might not be deterred from labor by the prospect of immediate death. Shortly before his decease he addressed to his congregation in Boston a letter containing his experience of the fourteen years' pastorate at the Melodeon. He now rests in the little cemetery outside the walls of Florence; his tombstone, at his own request, simply recording his name and the dates of his birth and death.

See, besides the preface to his works, his Life by Weiss (lost. 1864, 2 vols. 8vo), and by Frothingham (1874); A Discourse occasioned by the Death of Theodore Parker, delivered by P.W. Perfitt in South Place Chapel, Finsbury, on Sunday evening, May 27, 1860 (1860); The late Theodore Parker, a discourse delivered in South Place Chapel, Finsbury, on Sunday morning, June 3, 1860, by Henry N. Barnett, published by request (1860); Three Discourses delivered on the Occasion of the Death of Theodore Parker, by the Rev. Messrs. Warren, Newhall, and Haven (N. Y. 1860); Hurst, History of Rationalism, p. 564 sq.; Farrar, Critical History of Free Thought, p. 323 sq.; Methodist Qu. Rev. April-Oct. 1873; July, 1859, p. 433; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. Oct. 1857,- art. viii; Lond. Qu. Rev. vol. iii, art. i.

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

             a noted Puritan divine, was son of Robert Parker, and was born June 8, 1595. He studied some time at Oxford, and in Ireland under Dr. Usher,  receiving his degree of M.A. while at Leyden in 1617. He taught and preached for some time in Newbury, England. He came to New England in May, 1634; was co-pastor with Mr. Ward, of Ipswich, about a year; and then began the settlement of Newbury, Mass., and became the first minister of the Church in that place. A bitter controversy on Church government, lasting for years, unhappily divided his Church. He died April 24, 1677. He was eminent for learning and piety. He published a Letter to a member of the Westminster Assembly on Church government (1644): — The Prophecies of Daniel Expounded (London, 1646, 4to): — Methodus Gratiae Divinae (1657): — and Theses de Traductione Peccatoris ad Vitam, with some works of Dr. Ames. See Brooks, Lives of the Puritans, vol. iii; Mather, Magnalia; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:41 sq.

## Parker, William D.D., F.R.S.[[@Headword:Parker, William D.D., F.R.S.]]

             an eminent English divine, was born near the opening of the 18th century. He was educated at Baliol College, Oxford (M.A. 1738; B.D. 1751; D.D. 1754). After entering the ministry he became rector of Little Ilford, Essex; vicar of St. Catharine Cree, London; and rector of St. James's, Westminster. He died in 1802. Dr. Parker published The Nature and Reasonableness of the Inward Call and Outward Mission to the holy Ministry considered (ordination sermon). and other sermons, of which a list is given by Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. ii; 22 sq.

## Parker, William H[[@Headword:Parker, William H]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Virginia in 1799. His parents, who were Presbyterians, removed to Ohio while he was still a boy. In that new and stirring population he developed into an active and industrious man. Many of his neighbors sent their produce every autumn to New Orleans in flat-boats. The love of excitement and a curiosity to see that semi-tropical region, and the hope of bettering his fortune, induced him to go frequently to that distant city, and he became so familiar with the river-bed that he was finally employed as a pilot; after a time he learned the trade of a cooper, and for many years, both in Ohio and Kentucky, carried on the business. He was fully grown to maturity before he became religious. But when he heard the Methodist doctrine of free grace he was drawn towards the cross. So anxious was he to know the plan of salvation, that even while engaged at his trade he always kept such books as Wesley's Notes and Clarke's Commentaries on his bench, that he  might glean some grains of knowledge while for a moment at any time he stopped to rest his body. After joining the Church he soon became class- leader, then local preacher; and as such he was ordained deacon at Maysville in 1854, and in 1859 recommended to the Kentucky Conference. He was admitted, and, having filled his probation, was admitted into full connection in 1860. As a preacher he was studious, faithful, and fill of zeal; as a pastor he was diligent. While on the New Columbus Circuit, where he labored assiduously, both in the pulpit and from house to house, he was stricken down. During his sickness he was patient in suffering, but grieved that he could not be at work. Though he suffered much in body, his soul seemed filled with the love of God. He died May 28, 1871. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the Meth. Epis. Church, South, 1871, p. 592.

## Parkhurst, John (1), D.D.[[@Headword:Parkhurst, John (1), D.D.]]

             an English prelate of some note, was born in 1511 at Guildford, in Surrey. He received his preparatory training at the grammar school of his native place, and then proceeded to Merton College, Oxford. After graduation he was tutor at his alma mater, and one of his pupils was the learned English prelate Jewell (q.v.). In 1548 Parkhurst was presented with the living of Bishop's Cleve in Gloucestershire, but on the death of Edward VI Parkhurst retired to Switzerland, and there imbibed Calvinistic views. On the accession of queen Elizabeth he returned to his native country. He now advocated Puritanic notions, yet, notwithstanding his difference of opinion, he was highly esteemed by archbishop Parker. This primate in 1560 caused Parkhurst to be elevated to the bishopric of Norwich. As Parkhurst after this favored the most liberal concessions to the Dissenters, he fell under displeasure with the archbishop and the queen, and his last years were embittered by much reviling and slander from the High-Church party. He was accused of inability for the bishopric, was declared in his dotage, and was reported very superstitious, when the truth is that he simply had faith in ecclesiastical miracles, and put a favorable construction on the failings of his fellow beings of whatever class. He was certainly a learned and pious man. He died Feb. 2, 1574. Bishop Parkhurst was one of the translators of the “Bishops' Bible,” of which his share was the Apocrypha, from the book of Wisdom to the end. Some of his letters were published by Strype, and others are still in MS. in the British Museum. His publications are, Epigrammata in Mortem duorum Fratrum, etc. (Lond. 1552, 4to): — Epigrammata Seria (1560, 4to): — Ludicra; sive Epigrammata Juveniliac (1573, 4to): —Vita Christi, carm. Lat. in lib. precum privat. (1578, 4to). See Strype, Annals; Wood, Athenae Oxon.; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans; Soames, Elizabethan History, p. 203; Macaulay, Hist. of England, 1:50; Froude, Hist. of England (see Index in vol. xii); Hook, Eccles. Biog. 7:548 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v.

## Parkhurst, John (2)[[@Headword:Parkhurst, John (2)]]

             a noted English Biblical scholar, was born of honorable parentage in June, 1728. He was educated at ugly Grammar School, and afterwards at Clare Hall, Cambridge, where he took the degree of B.A. in 1748, and that of M.A. in 1752. He was for some years a fellow of his college; then took orders in the Church of England, but never obtained any preferment,  having succeeded to a considerable estate, which rendered him independent. He acted, without receiving any salary, as curate of the church at Catesby, the preferment of which Was in his own gift. He died at Epsom March 21, 1797. Parkhurst was a man of great integrity and firmness of character. He always lived in retirement, though he possessed qualities which fitted him to shine in society. In spite of a weak constitution he was a most laborious student. His first work was A Serious and Friendly Address to the Rev. John Wesley (1753), remonstrating against the doctrine of the faith of assurance as held by Mr. Wesley (see Wesley's Works). Parkhurst, however, devoted himself chiefly to Biblical studies. In 1762 he published the first edition of his Hebrew and English Lexicon, without Points, with a Hebrew Grammar, which has passed through several editions. His Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament, with a Greek Grammar, appeared in 1769. Of this work there are several editions, both in quarto and octavo; the first of the octavo editions was prepared by his daughter, Mrs. Thomas. A new edition, by the Rev. Hugh James Rose, B.D., was published in 1829. The only other work published by Mr. Parkhurst was The Divinity and Pre-existence of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ demonstrated from Scripture, in Answer to the First Section of Dr. Priestley's Introduction to the History of Early Opinions concerning Jesus Christ (Lond. 1787, 8vo). Dr. Priestley replied to this work in “A Letter to Dr. Horne.” Parkhurst's lexicons, though now superseded, enjoyed a considerable reputation at the time of their first appearance, and certainly were very useful in their day. Their great blemish is their many fanciful and ridiculous etymologies bearing traces of the Hutchinsonian opinions of their author. See English Cyclop. s.v; Kitto, Biblical Cyclop . s; v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; — Horne, Biblioteca-Biblia (1839), p. 208 sq.; Bickersteth, Christian Student, p. 388; Orme, B. Bib. sib. v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. 24:130; Lond. Gent. Mag. vol. 67 and 70; North Amer. Review, 44. 282; 72. 269.

## Parkinson, Richard D.D.[[@Headword:Parkinson, Richard D.D.]]

             an English divine, was born near the opening of this century, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. After taking holy orders he was successively canon of Mallchester, rural dean, and the principal of St. Bee's College. He died in 1858. He published Sermons on Points of Doctrine and Rules of Duty (1820,2 vols. 12mo): — Rationalism and Revelation (Hulsean Lectures for 1837): — The Constitution of the Visible Church of Christ considered (Hulsean Lectures for 1838): — Sermons on  Transubstantiation and Invocation (1841, 12mo); and miscellaneous works. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

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

             D.D., an English divine, was born in 1745, and was educated at Christ Church, Cambridge, of which he became a fellow and tutor. In 1790 he was given the rectorate of Kegworth, and in 1794 was made archdeacon of Huntingdon. He died in 1830. Dr. Parkinson was a devoted student of higher mathematics, and his publications in that branch of science are greatly esteemed. He also published several of his Sermons (Chester, 1802, 4to; 1816, 8vo).

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

             a Baptist minister, was born in Frederick Co., Md., Nov. 8, 1774; his early education was limited. After following commercial pursuits for a while. he opened a school in 1794 or 1795 at Carroll's Manor, Frederick Co., and was there ordained April 1, 1798. In 1801 he was chosen chaplain to Congress, and was re-elected for two successive years. In April, 1805, he became pastor of the First Baptist Church of New York, where he continued until his health having become too much impaired to permit of his remaining in charge of so large a congregation, he took the pastorate of the Bethesda Baptist Church in 1841. He died March 10,1848. — Mr. Parkinson published A Treatise on the Public Ministry of the Word (1818); and A Series of Sermons on the Thirty-third Chapter of Deuteronomy (1831, 2.vols. 8to). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pupit, 6:362.

## Parkison, Christopher[[@Headword:Parkison, Christopher]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born Oct. 18, 1797, in Cecil County, Maryland. The only information we have of his early religious life is that he was converted to God and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church at the “Old Bethel Church,” within the bounds of what is now the Wilmington Conference. In 1829 he was received on trial in the Baltimore Conference, and appointed to Lancaster Circuit. Thereafter the following were his successive fields of labor, viz. 1830, Clearspring; 1831, Springfield; 1832, Christiansbturg;. — 1333, Monroe; 1834, Fairfax; 1835, Westmoreland; 1836, Ebenezezr; 1837-38, Cumberland; 1839, superannuated; 1840, Mission to colored people in Anne: Arundel Co., Md:.; 1841. West River; 1842, Woodstock; 1843,  Augusta: 1844-45, Springfield; 1846-47, South Branch; 1848, Havre de Grace; 1849, Patapsco; 1850-51, Bath; 1852, Wardensville; 1853-54, Woodberry; 1855, Hancock; 1856, Boonsborough; 1857, supernumerary; 1858-59, Lost River; 1860-61, Charles; 1862, Bladensburg; 1863, Baltimore Circuit; 1864, St. Mary's. In 1865 he took a superannuated relation. He died April 10, 1867. Christopher Parkison was appreciated most by those who knew him best. His piety was earnest and consistent. “Intellectually he deserved to be ranked with the strong men of the Church. His mind, naturally clear and vigorous, was cultivated by habitual reading and much thought. He was a diligent student of the Scriptures, bringing out of the sacred treasury things new and old. His sermons were able expositions of the Gospel of Christ; less ornate than convincing, commending him as the messenger of truth to every man's conscience in the sight of God.”' See Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1869.

## Parkman, Ebenezer[[@Headword:Parkman, Ebenezer]]

             an American Congregational minister, was born in 1703, and. was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1721. He entered the ministry that year as pastor of the Church at Westborough, Mass. He died in 1782. He published Reformers and Intercessors sought by God, a sermon (Boston, 1752, 8vo): — Convention Sermon (1761, 8vo) A short account of Westborough written by him is preserved in the Mass. Hist. Soc. Collections.

## Parkman, Francis D.D.[[@Headword:Parkman, Francis D.D.]]

             a Unitarian minister was born in the city of Boston June 4,1788. He was educated at Harvard University, class of 1807. He studied theology under Dr. William E. Channing, and at the University of Edinburgh. He. was ordained Dec. 8 1813. From 1813 to 1849 he was pastor of the New North Church in Boston. He died at Boston Nov. 12, 1852. Dr. Parkman published The Offering of Sympathy (1829) and some occasional sermons and addresses. The Parkman professorship of pulpit eloquence and pastoral care in the Cambridge Theological School was founded by his munificence; and he took an active part in nearly all the most important charitable institutions of his native city. See Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8:449: Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Parks, Isaac D.D[[@Headword:Parks, Isaac D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Granville, N.Y., Sept. 6, 1803. He was converted when about twenty-two years of age, and licensed to preach in 1829 by Rev. Tobias Spicer. In 1834 he was admitted into the Oneida Conference, and appointed to East Cayuga Circuit; in 1835, to Carbondale; 1836, to Brooklyn; 1837, Nichols, and subsequently to Groton, Fleming, Newfield, Morrisvilie, and Skaneateles. In 1848 he was stationed in Stockbridge; in 1849 he was called to supply the place of the presiding elder on the district. From 1850 to 1854 he was presiding elder of Otsego District, and from 1854 to 1858 of the Oneida. In 1858-59 he was stationed in Canastota in 1860-61 in Fort Plain. The General Conference of 1860' transferred Fort Plain to the Troy Conference. In 1862-63 he labored in Gloversville; 1864-65 in Cambridge; and in 1866-67 in Whitehall In 1868 he was appointed presiding elder of Poultney District., He died April 15, 1869. He was a laborious and faithful minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. He took a deep interest in the cause of education, and was elected regent of the University of New York in 1857. His social qualities were very striking. He was always cheerful, and always striving to make others happy. Sullenness and gloom could not live in his presence. All who knew him loved him. See Minutes of Conferences, 1870, p. 140, 141.

## Parks, Martin P[[@Headword:Parks, Martin P]]

             an American minister of the Gospel, who distinguished himself by a most consistent life and great devotion to the Christian cause, was born in North Carolina in 1804 of pious Methodist parents. He chose a military career, and was educated at West Point. While at the academy he was converted under the preaching of Mcllvaine, and after having been over a year and a half in the United States service, felt obliged to enter the ministry of the Gospel by the call he experienced to this holy work. He joined the Virginia Conference, and preached for years with great success. “The force and beauty of his language the fervor of his appeals, and the rapture that kindled in his heart while he preached, were at times almost irresistible; his hearers were borne along on the rapid, sparkling current of his eloquence.” He was at the opening of Randolph Macon College appointed professor of mathematics in that institution. But after a time he determined to change his Church relations, and he finally became a clergyman in the Protestant Episcopal Church. In this new relation he was equally successful until  disease closed his labors. He died on the ocean while on his way from Europe, whither he had gone to regain his health, in the year 1854. See Bennett, Memorials of Methodism in Virginia, p. 729-731. (J. H. W.)

## Parliamentary Church[[@Headword:Parliamentary Church]]

             is a church erected under the authority of an act of Parliament. In England such a church is generally called a district church; and the acts of Parliament authorizing such churches are known as the Church Building Acts. In Scotland similar churches are called Quoad Sacra churches. SEE PARISH.

## Parlor[[@Headword:Parlor]]

             is the rendering occasionally of three Heb. words: חֶדֶר, cheder, an enclosed place (1Ch 28:11; Sept. ἀποθήκη, Vulg. cubiculum), especially an inner room or “chamber” (as elsewhere almost invariably rendered); 2, לַשְׁכָּה, lishkah, a bedroom (1Sa 9:22; Sept. κατάλυμα, Vulg. triclinium), especially a corner cell or “chamber” (as elsewhere nearly constantly rendered) in a courtyard; 3, עֲלַיָּה, aliydh, an upper room (Jdg 3:20; Jdg 3:23-25; Sept. ὑπέρῳον, Vulg. ocenaculum), especially “the chamber” (as elsewhere usually rendered) over the gate or on the roof. SEE CHAMBER. In Jdg 3:20-28 the words in the original imply an upper chamber of coolness, no doubt such as are still found in the mansions and gardens of the East, to which the owner retires to enjoy a purer air and more extensive prospect than any other part of his dwelling commands, and where he usually takes his siesta during the heat of the day. It is kept as a strictly private apartment, no one entering it but, such as are specially invited. SEE HOUSE. Kitto observes (note in Pict. Bible, ad loc.) that “it appears to have been an apartment detached from the main building, but having a communication with it, and also with the exterior. It also probably enjoyed a free circulation of the air, which rendered it particularly agreeable in the heat of summer, especially in so very warm a district as the plain of Jericho.” SEE UPPER ROOM.

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

             (Locutorium, spekehouse) designates in ecclesiastical language the room in which monastics communicated with tradespeople and visitors at the convent; also with the obedientaries during reading or cloister time.

## Parma[[@Headword:Parma]]

             a former duchy of Upper Italy, but now a part of the Italian kingdom, is bounded on the north by Lombardy and Venice, east by Modena, south by Genoa and Tuscany, and west by Piedmont, and contains in all 1278 English square miles, with a population (1889) of 285,790. The Apennines, which cross the southern division of the duchies, send off spurs northwards, and give to the northern part of the country the character of a plain, gently undulating, but sloping uniformly to the Po, which is the recipient of all the rivers of the country. The plain, which is very fertile, produces rich crops of grain (including rice), leguminous plants, fruits of all kinds, olives, and grapes; while marble, alabaster, salt, and petroleum are the chief mineral products. Next to agriculture, the production and manufacture of silk, the rearing of cattle and poultry, cheese-making, and the extraction of the mineral products afford the chief employment. Silk and cheese are the chief exports. The Roman Catholic religion was until its recent union with the kingdom the only one tolerated, though a few Jews are found here and there through the country. The condition of educations much improved of late, is still very defective.

History. — Parma and Piacenza, which was a part of the recent duchy, belonged in the time of the Roman empire to Cisalpine Gaul, and after its fall came under the rule of the Lombards, to whose rule succeeded that of the kings of Italy and the German emperors. In the 12th and following centuries they joined the other territories of Northern Italy which were struggling for liberty and independence, and consequently became involved in the Guelph and Ghibelline contests. Weakened by these strifes, they fell under the domination of the powerful houses of Este, Visconti, and Sforza; but in 1499 they passed under the yoke of the French monarch, Louis XII, from' whom they were soon recovered by the emperor Maximilian, and handed over to pope Leo X in 1513. They continued under the sovereignty of the popes till 1543, when they were alienated by pope Paul III, and with the surrounding territory were erected into a duchy for his natural son Pier- Luigi Farnese, the grandfather of Alessandro Farnese, the celebrated regent of the Low Countries. On the extinction of the male line of Farnese in 1731, by the death of the eighth duke, Antonio, his niece Elizabeth, the queen of Philip V of Spain, obtained the duchies for her son Don Carlos, who, however, exchanged them in 1735 with Austria for the throne of the Two Sicilies. In 1748 they were restored, along with Guastalla. to Spain, and became a duchy for the infante Don Philip, with a reversion to Austria  in. case of the failure of his male descendants, or of any of them ascending the Spanish or Neapolitan throne.

Philip was succeeded in 1765 by his son Ferdinand, who was an able and enlightened ruler, and expelled the Jesuits in 1768. He died in 1802, and his dominions were immediately taken possession of by the French, and were incorporated with France, under the designation of the department of Taro, in 1805. In 1814, by the treaty of Paris, Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla were presented as a sovereign duchy to the ex-empress Maria Louisa, a proceeding strongly opposed by the king of Spain, who demanded them for his sister, Maria Louisa, the widow of Louis, king of Etruria, the' son of duke Ferdinand. However, in 1817, it was settled that Maria Louisa of Austria should possess the duchies, and that on her death they should descend to Ferdinand Charles. duke of Lucca, the son of Maria Louisa of Spain, and the rightful heir and on failure of his heirs Parma should revert to Austria, and Piacenza to Sardinia. The empress governed very much after the Austrian fashion, but with gentleness, though liberal sentiments were looked upon by her with little favor. On her death in 1847 the duke of Lucca succeeded as Charles II, and certain exchanges of territory, previously settled by the great powers, took place with Tuscany and Modena — the chief of which being the transfer of Guastalla to Modena in exchange for the districts of Villa Franca, Treschietto, Castevoli, and Melazzo, all in Massa-Carrara, resulting in a loss to Parma of about 77 English square miles of territory, and a gain of 193 English square miles. This transfer was not made without great discontent on the part of the inhabitants. The duke's rule was severe and tyrannical, and on an address being presented to him with a view of obtaining a reform of certain abuses, and a more liberal political constitution, similar to what Tuscany had obtained (February, 1848) from its grand-duke, he threw himself into the arms of Austria, and consented to the occupation of his territory by Austrian troops. In March, 1848, a revolution broke out, and the duke was compelled to grant the popular demands, but he almost immediately retired from the country. Parma joined with Sardinia in the war of 1848-1849 against Austria, but on the triumph of the latter power was compelled to receive Charles III (his father, Charles II, having resigned his throne, March 1849) as its ruler.

The new duke recalled the constitution which his father had been compelled to grant, and punished with great severity the active agents of the revolutionary movements in his dominions. His arbitrary measures were effectively seconded by his chief minister, an Englishman named Ward, who shared the public obloquy with his master, After Charles III's  assassination in March 1854, his widow, Louise-Marie-Therese de Bourbon, daughter of the last duke of Berry, assumed the government for the behoof of her son Robert I, and made some attempts at political reform; but owing to the excited state of the people they were little effective, and she and her son were compelled to leave the country in 1859, on the outbreak of a new war between Sardinia and Austria. On March 18 of the following year the country was annexed to Sardinia, and now forms a part of the kingdom of Italy, constituting the two provinces of Parma (area 1251 English square miles, population 258,502) and Piacenza (area 965 English square miles, population 210,933), a few of the outlying districts, amounting to about 150 square miles, being incorporated with other provinces.

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

             the chief town of the province of the same name in Italy, and formerly the capital of the duchy of Parma, is situated on both sides of the river Parma, twelve miles south from the Po, seventy-five miles south-east from Milan, and about the same distance east-north-east from Genoa. It is reported to have been the seat of a Church council in 1187, presided over by pope Gregory VIII, but nothing is known of the synodal decisions. See Hefele, Conciliengesch. v. 649; also 4:791.

## Parmashta[[@Headword:Parmashta]]

             (Heb. Parmashtah', פִּרְמִשְׁתּ, prob. from the old Pers. fra, very, and mathista, the greatest = pernzaynus; Sept. Μαρμασυμνά v. r. Μαρμασιμά), the seventh named of the sons of Haman slain by the Jews in Shushan (Est 9:9). B.C. 473.

## Parmelee, Ashbel D.D.[[@Headword:Parmelee, Ashbel D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in West Stockbridge, Mass., Oct. 18, 1784. He received an early pious training, and during a revival in 1802 he was converted, and soon after entered upon a course of study, intending to obtain a liberal education and enter the ministry; but his health became impaired, and he was compelled to desist from study. In 1806, having given up the hope of a collegiate education, he began the study of theology with the Rev. Lemuel Haynes, of Rutland, Vt., where he remained for more than a year, and then completed his course with the Rev. Holland Weeks, of Pittsford, Vt. He was licensed Sept. 27, 1808; entered upon his  work in Cambridge, Vt., where he labored six months, and the next six months at Hinesville, Vt.; in October, 1809; he commenced preaching in Malone, N. Y., and was ordained pastor of the Congregational Church in that place Feb. 10, 1810. After a pastorate of more than thirty-five years he resigned. In April, 1845, he became pastor at Bangor, N.Y.; in 1848, chaplain in the state prison at Clinton, N. Y.; in 1851, pastor at Champlain, N. Y.; in 1854, at Constable, N. Y.; and in 1857 he returned to Malone, and preached in his old pulpit till his death, May 24, 1862. Dr. Parmelee loved the work of the ministry with all his heart. He was an excellent minister, and naturally gifted as a speaker. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 306; Congregational Quar. 1862, p. 392. (J. L. S.)

## Parmelee, David Lewis[[@Headword:Parmelee, David Lewis]]

             a somewhat noted Congregational minister, was born in Litchfield, Conn., Nov. 11, 1795; received his preparatory training at the school of his native town, and then entered upon mercantile employment. He was all this time a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but the frequent appeals from Dr. Lyman Beecher, which he heard, for a devoted and active Christian life, influenced Parmelee finally to change his Church relations, and he became while at Goshen, whither he had removed, a member of the Congregational Church. Having amassed a tolerable competency, and feeling called of God to preach, he forsook the counting-desk, and entered upon the study of theology under the direction of his pastor, Dr. Harvey. When Parmelee finally offered himself before the Middlesex (Conn.) Association, he was by that body approved and licensed to preach. After laboring for a season in several parishes as a temporary supply, he was, at the age of thirty-five, ordained and installed as pastor of the Congregational Church and society in Bristol, Conn. Although entering on the public ministry thus, compared with many, late in life, it was evident that God had ordered his previous course of training, even in things secular as well as religious, that he might the better know how to “take care of the Church of God.” His ministry of ten years in Bristol was eminently useful and successful. The congregation was largely increased. Special revivals were enjoyed, and the Church greatly strengthened and prospered. At the end of ten years' constant labor, “instant in season, out of season,” he felt the need of temporary rest. He was not, however, allowed to remain long unemployed The Church and society in Litchfield, South Farms (now Morris), soon sought his labors, and he was shortly after installed as their pastor. The Church had been feeble and divided, but his labors were  blessed, promoting their union and strength; and his ministry of twenty years as their sole pastor was one of great spiritual benefit to them and to their children. As a watchman on the walls of Zion, he was ever vigilant against the incursions of error. As a shepherd, entrusted by the great Head of the Church with the care of the flock, like his namesake of old, So he fed them according to the integrity of his heart, and guided them by the skillfulness of his hands. In consequence of waning bodily health and strength, Parmelee gave up the responsible charge of his Church, and removed to Litchfield in 1861; and there he died, June 29,1865. “His end was peace; he rests from his labors, and his works do follow him.” He was deeply interested in all benevolent and religious enterprises; and, after having made ample provision for the earthly comfort of his wife, he gave by his will valuable legacies to several of them. See Congreg. Quar, April, 1866, p. 211 sq.

## Parmelee, Simeon, D.D[[@Headword:Parmelee, Simeon, D.D]]

             a centenarian Congregational minister, was born at West Stockbridge, Massachusetts, January 16, 1782. He was a student of Middlebury College for a few months; then studied theology with Reverend Lemuel Havnes, of West Rutland, Vermont. He was ordained pastor of the Church at Westford, August 31, 1808, and was dismissed, August 8, 1837. From November 9 of that year to April 26, 1843, he was pastor in Williston. He served for a time as acting-pastor at Underhill, and was installed there September 11, 1844, and dismissed November 9, 1854. From 1852 to  1854 he was acting pastor at Milton; from 1854 to 1857 at Tinmouth; from 1857 to 1863 at Underhill; from 1863 to 1866 at Swanton. With the exception of a short time, during 1868 and 1869, when he again supplied Westford, he resided after 1866, without charge, at Oswego, N.Y. He died there, February 10, 1882. See Cong. Year-book, 1883, page 27.

## Parmenas[[@Headword:Parmenas]]

             (Παρμενᾶς, probably a contraction for παρμενίδης, constant), the sixth named of the seven first deacons (q.v.) of the Church formed at Jerusalem (Act 6:5). A.D. 29. Nothing more is known of him.; but the Roman martyrologies allege that he suffered martyrdom at Philippi under Trajan (Baron. Ann. 2:55). Hippolytus asserts that he was at one time bishop of Soli. In the Calendar of the Byzantine Church he and Prochorus are commemorated on July 28th.

## Parmenianists [[@Headword:Parmenianists ]]

             SEE PARMENIANUS.

## Parmenianus[[@Headword:Parmenianus]]

             a Donatist prelate, flourished in the second half of the 4th century. Upon the decease of Donatus the Great in A.D. 360 Parmenianus was chosen his successor as and bishop of Carthage. He was, however, soon driven from this episcopal seat, and only reinstated under Julian the Apostate. He was at the head of the Donatist party until the close of the 4th century. Two of his writings are lost, but they are noteworthy, as one of them was replied to by Optatus of Milevi in his De Schismate Donatistarnum adv. Parmen., and the other occasioned a reply from St. Augustine (Contra Epistolamn Parneniani, lib. iii). The strict adherents of Parmenianus are called Parmenianists. SEE DONATISTS.

## Parmenides[[@Headword:Parmenides]]

             (Παρμενίδης), a noted Greek philosopher of ancient times, who belonged to the school known as the Eleatic philosophers, was a. native of Elea, in Italy. He was descended from a noble family, and is said to have been induced to study philosophy by Aminias (Diog. Laert. ix, 21). He is also stated to have received instruction from Diocheetes the Pythagorean. Later writers inform us that he heard Xenophanes, the founder of the Eleatic school; but Aristotle (Met. 1:5) speaks of it with some doubt. We read that Parmenides gave a code of laws to his native city, which was so highly esteemed that at first the citizens took an oath every year to observe it (Diog. Laert. 9:23; Plutarch, Adv. Colot. 32; Strabo, 6:252, ed. Casaub.). The time when Parmenides lived has been much disputed. According to Plato (Parmenid. p. 127), Parmenides, at the age of sixty-five, accompanied by Zeno, at the age of forty, visited Athens during the great Panathenaea, and stopped at the house of Pythodorus. As this visit to Athens probably occurred about B.C. 454 (Clinton, Fast. Hell. p. 364), Parmenides would have been born about B.C. 519. But to this date two objections are urged: first, that Diogenes Laertius (9:23) says that Parmenides flourished in the 69th Olympiad, that is, about B.C. 503; and consequently, if he was born B.C. 519, he would only have been about sixteen in the 69th Olympiad; and, secondly, that Socrates is stated by Plato, if his dialogue entitled Parmenides to have conversed with Parmenides and Zeno on the doctrine of ideas, which we can hardly suppose to have been the case, as Socrates at that time was only thirteen or fourteen. Atheneus (11, p. 505) accordingly has censured Plato for saying that such a dialogue ever took place. But in reply to these objections it may be remarked, first, that little reliance can be placed upon the vague statement of such a careless writer as Diogenes; and, secondly, that though the dialogue which Plato represents Socrates to have had with Parmenides and Zeno is doubtless fictitious, yet it was founded on a fact that Socrates when a boy had heard Parmenides at Athens. Plato mentions, both in the Theoetetus (p. 183) and in the Sophistes (p. 127), that Socrates was very young when he heard Parmenides. We have no other particulars respecting the life of Parmenides. He taught Empedocles and Zeno, and with the latter he lived on the most intimate terms (Plato, Parne. p. 127). He is always spoken of by the ancient writers with the greatest respect. In the Theoetetus (p. 183) Plato compares him with Homer, and in the Sophistes (p. 237) he calls him “the Great” (comp. Aristot. Met. 1:5).

Parmenides  wrote a poem, which is usually cited by the title Of Nature Περὶ φύσεως (Sext.' Empir. Adv. Mathem. vii, 11; Theophrastus, Ap. Diog. Laert. 8:55), but which also bore other titles. Suidas (s.v.) calls it Φυσιολογία; and adds, on the authority of Plato, that he also wrote works in prose. The passage of Plato (Soph. p. 237) however, to which Suidas refers, perhaps only means an oral exposition of his system, which interpretation is rendered more probable by the fact that Sextus Empiricus (Adv. Mathen. vii, l111) and Diogenes Laertius (1:16) expressly state that Parmenides only wrote one work. .everal fragments of this work (On Nature) have come down to us, principally in the writings of Sextus Empiricus and Simplicius. They were first published by Stephanus in his Poesis Philosophica (Par. 1573), and next by Fulleborn, with a translation in verse (Zuillichau, 1795). Brandis, in his Commentationes Eleatcae (Altona, 1815), also published the fragments of Parmenides, together with those of Xenophanes and Melissus; but the most recent and most complete edition is by Karsten, in the second volume of his Philosophorum Graecorum veterum, praesertim qui ante Patonem floruerunt, Operum Reliquice (Brux. 1835). The fragments of his work which have come down to us are sufficient to enable us to judge of its general method and subject. It opened with an allegory, which was intended to exhibit the soul's longing after truth. The soul is represented as drawn by steeds along an untrodden road to the residence of Justice (Δίκη), who promises to reveal everything to it. After this introduction the work is divided into two parts: the first part treats of the knowledge of truth, and the second explains the physiological system of the Eleatic school. That great search concerning the substance of things occupied Parmenides; but, instead of finding unity in nature, he discovered it in mind alone. It is the reason which conceives and bestows unity on plurality; so that true reality is subjective. The scheme of Parmenides is pure idealism, and open to all the objections to which one- sided schemes are' liable. He exercised much influence on the speculations of Plato. See Riaux, Essai sur Parmenide d'Ele .(1840); Ritter, Hist. of Philos.; Lewis, Hist. of Philos.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1:40, 49, 54 sq., 247; Cocker, Christianity and Greek Philosophy, p. 307-309; Cudworth, Intellectual System (see Index in vol. iii); Butler, Ancient History, vol. ii; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v.; Journal of Spec. Philos. Jan. 1870, art. 1. SEE ELEATICS, and the literature there appended.

## Parmigiano, Francesco Mazzuoli[[@Headword:Parmigiano, Francesco Mazzuoli]]

             familiarly known as Parmigianino, a noted Italian painter, who devoted himself to the study of sacred art, was born at Parma Jan. 11,1503. He studied under his uncles, who were artists of celebrity, and in his sixteenth year finished a picture of the Baptism of Christ. ‘In 1521 Correggio's visit, to Parma afforded Parmigiano the opportunity to study the style of that great artist, and thereafter the efforts of Parmigiano betray that influence. In 1522 he painted, among other works, a Madonna with the Child, and St. Jerome, and St. Bernardin. In 1523 he went to Rome, and there studied the works of Raffaelle. Parmigiano now aimed to combine with the grace of Raffaelle the contrasts of Michael Angelo and the grace and harmony of Correggio. By Parmigiano's admirers it was said at this time that “the spirit of Raffaelle had passed into him.” In 1727 he removed to Bologna, where, among other works, he painted for the church of St. Petronius the Madonna della Rosa, now in the Dresden Gallery. He returned to Parma in 1531. Having engaged to execute several extensive fiescos in the church of S. Maria Steccata, after repeated delays, he was thrown into prison for breach of contract, and on being released, instead of carrying out his undertaking, he fled to Casal Maggiore, in the territory of Cremona, where he died in 1540. Vasari, in his notice of Parmigiano, attributes his misfortunes and premature death to a passion for alchemy; but this oft- repeated story has been disproved by the researches of late biographers. Parmigiano executed several etchings, and some woodcuts are attributed to him. His works, especially his easel-pieces, are very scarce. The prominent features of his style are elegance of form, grace of countenance, contrast in the attitudes, perfect knowledge of the chiaroscuro, and the charm of color. But his figures are often characterized by excessive slenderness rather than real elegance of form, and his grace sometimes degenerates into affectation, and his contrasts into extravagance. Pariigiano was celebrated for the ease and freedom with which he designed, and for those bold strokes of the pencil which Albano calls divine. There are a few altar-pieces by Parmigiano; the most valued is that of St. Margaret in Bologna, a composition rich in figures. Guido preferred it to the St. Cecilia of Raffaelle. See Affo, Vita di F. Mazzola (1784); Bellini, Cenni intomo alla Vita ed alle Opere di Mazzuoli (1844); Mortara, Memoria della Vita di Mazzuoli (1846); Mrs. Jameson, Memoirs of Early Italian Painters; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, vol. ii, s.v.; English Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Parnach[[@Headword:Parnach]]

             (Heb. Parnak', פִּרְנָךְ, perhaps swift; Sept Φαρνάχ), the father of Elizaphan, which latter was prince of the tribe of Zebulun at the close of the Exodus (Num 34:25). B.C. ante 1618.

## Parnasim[[@Headword:Parnasim]]

             (פרנסים= ποιμένες, shepherds) is a name by which the rulers of the synagogue in the time of Christ were called. A place that had at least “ten men of leisure” (batlanim), as they were technically called, i.e. men who could devote the whole of their time to the requirements of the synagogue, enjoyed the privilege of erecting a synagogue. These men filled the different offices required for the administration of the affairs of the synagogue, and were called presbyters or elders = πρεσβύτεροι (because old men were generally selected for those offices), or parnasim or shepherds (because they had both the ecclesiastical and civil affairs of their respective communities in charge). The term parnas, of which parnasim is the plural, is Aramaic, and is used in the Chaldee paraphrase for the Hebrew roeh (רעה), ‘‘shepherd” (comp. Eze 34:5; Eze 34:8; Eze 34:23; Zec 11:15-16, etc.). This appellation was in the Old Testament already given to God, who performs the office of tending and caring for his people in the highest sense (Psa 23:1; Psa 80:1 [2]), and then to his representatives, who exercised religious and civil care over the community (e.g. Jer 3:15). As these rulers had to feed the poor with bread, and their respective congregations with knowledge and understanding, the title “shepherd” was appropriated to them. The Talmud declares that every shepherd (פרנס) who leads his congregation in gentleness; has the merit of leading them in the path for the world to come” (Sanhedr. 92 a); and that “the Holy One, blessed be he, mourns over the congregation, which, has a shepherd who conducts himself haughtily towards his flock” Chagiga, 5 b). From this custom of calling the administrators of the synagogue “shepherds” came the application of the name to those who bear office in the Church. SEE PASTOR. (B. P.)

## Parnassides[[@Headword:Parnassides]]

             a name given to the Muses (q.v.), from Mount Parnassus (q.v.).

## Parnassus[[@Headword:Parnassus]]

             a mountain greatly celebrated among the ancients, and regarded by the Greeks as the central point of their country. It was in Phocis. It has three steep peaks, almost always covered with snow, and seen from a great distance, the highest being fully 8000 feet above the level of the sea; but as only two of them are visible from Delphi, it was customary among the Greeks to speak of the two-peaked Parnassus. On its southern slope lay Delphi, the seat of the famous oracle, and the fountain of Castalia. The highest peak of Mount Parnassus was the scene of the orgies of the worship of Dionysus (Bacchus); all the rest of the mountain was sacred to Apollo and the Muses, whence poets were said to “climb Parnassus,” a phrase still thus employed.

## Parnell, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Parnell, Thomas, D.D]]

             an English divine, noted however rather in the field of belles-lettres than in theology, was born at Dublin in 1679. He was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, where he was passed as master in 1700. In the same year, though under canonical age, he was ordained deacon by dispensation from the bishop of Derry. About three years later he took orders and became archdeacon of Clogher. He received also other preferments through the interest of Swift, when he deserted the Whig party on their fall in the latter part of the reign of queen Anne. Parnell was a contributor to the Spectator and Guardian, and, after flying to London from his Irish parsonage, became irate with the leading men of letters. His poetry comes nearer to Pope's, in sweetness of verification, than do any other verses of the time; and he has not only much felicity of diction, but also a very pleasing seriousness of sentiment, shown in such pieces as his popular allegory, The Hermit. His death, which occurred in 1718, is said to have been hastened by intemperate habits, and these his friends have attributed to the grief he felt for the loss of his wife. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, ii, s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v., for further details and references.

## Parnethius[[@Headword:Parnethius]]

             a surname of Zeus (Jupiter), derived from Mount Parnes in Attica.

## Parnopius[[@Headword:Parnopius]]

             a surname of Apollo, under which he was worshipped at Athens. The word signifies an expeller of locusts.

## Parny, Evariste-Desire-Desforges[[@Headword:Parny, Evariste-Desire-Desforges]]

             Chevalier, and afterwards Vicomte de Parny, a French writer, needs mention here for his profanity, immoral tendency, and vile blasphemy of the Bible and its teachings. He was born in the Isle of Bourbon Feb. 6, 1753. At the age of nine he was sent to France and placed at the College of Rennes; but he appears to have shown considerable indifference to the course of studies which was followed there. His imagination, which even at an early age had taken the almost entire guidance of his conduct, impressed him as he grew up with the belief that he was called upon to embrace the ecclesiastical profession, and it is said that he attempted to join the brotherhood of La Trappe. An effort of imprudent zeal, however, on the part of the confessor whom he had chosen as his spiritual guide, produced a rapid change in the mind of the young convert, and he is related to have fallen into an opposite extreme of conduct, and soon after, entering into all the dissipations of youth, finally to have enrolled himself in the military profession. He returned to his native island at the age of twenty, where he became acquainted with a young creole lady, the Eleonore of his verse, which acquaintance his fervent imagination soon converted into the most ardent attachment. Their mutual love inspired his first poetical effusions, which paint with grace and freshness, though perhaps in too vivid colors, the all absorbing passion of his soul.

The affections, however of the lady were of an evanescent nature; a marriage of interest, which she contracted at the desire of her parents, induced Parny to return to France. Distance and time were unable to efface his sad reminiscences, and he there continued to translate into the language of poetry the feelings which appear to have taken a lasting possession of his mind. In 1775 was published his first collection of elegiac poems, which have been so much admired by his countrymen that they have earned for him the title of the French Tibullus. On the breaking, out of the French Revolution he became deprived of the property which he had inherited from his father, and he was compelled to obtain a livelihood by the cultivation of his talents. A painful and striking change now appears in his writings, which he had the weakness to adapt to the prevalent taste of a corrupt age. The rival of Tibullus became the feeble copyist of Voltaire, and his Paradis perdu, Galanteries de la Bible, and  Guerre des Dieux, by their disgusting profaneness and absence of genuine poetical feeling, will only be remembered by posterity as indications of the state of society at a period when “everything evil was rank and luxuriant.” So strong indeed was the feeling excited against Parny even in France on account of the last mentioned of these three poems that his name was repeatedly passed over among the candidates for the honors of the Institute. However, he was admitted into it in 1803, in the place of Devaines. Most of his other poems are, with few exceptions, inferior to his early productions. He died in Paris Dec. 5, 1814. His works have been published in 5. vols. 18mo by. Didot, Paris, 1808, and at Brussels, in 2- vols. 8vo. The best edition, however, is that by M. Boissonnade in the Collection de Classiques Francais (Lefevre, Paris, 1827). A. volume was published, in 1826, entitled Les Poesies inedites de Parny, with a notice of his life and writings by M. Tissot. See English Cyclop. s.v.; St. Beuve, Causeries du Lundi, 15:285 sq.; Tissot, Notice sur la Vie et les Ouvrages de M. de Parny (1826).

## Parochial Board[[@Headword:Parochial Board]]

             in Scotland, is the board in each parish which manages the relief of the poor. In England the same duty is performed by overseers, and in some cases by guardians of the poor. SEE PARISH.

## Parochial Schools[[@Headword:Parochial Schools]]

             SEE PARISH SCHOOLS.

## Parochial relief[[@Headword:Parochial relief]]

             is the relief given to paupers by the parish authorities. SEE PAUPERISM.

## Parolini, Giacomo[[@Headword:Parolini, Giacomo]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Ferrara. According to Baruffaldi, who wrote his life, his father died when he was five years old, and his maternal uncle took him under his protection, and, perceiving in him a genius for painting, placed him with the cavalier Peruzzini at Turin, with whom he remained until he was eighteen, when he entered the school of Carlo Cignani. On his return to Ferrara Parolini finished some pictures left incomplete at the death of Maurelio Scannavini; who had been his fellow-student under Cignani. He did this out of regard to his friend, for the relief of his orphaned family. He executed many works for the churches, and a  multitude for the collections. Though inferior to Cignani in the grandeur of his conceptions and the masterly style of his chiaroscuro, he yet sustained the credit of his school by the elegance of his design and the suavity of his coloring, particularly in his flesh tints, in which he excelled, and for which reason he was fond of introducing into his compositions the naked figure. He was unusually successful in the design of his female figures, children, and cherubs. Lanzi says his pictures of Bacchanals, festive dances, and Capricci partake much of the playful and elegant style of Albano, and are found in almost every collection at Ferrara. His principal works for the churches are three altar-pieces in the cathedral, and a grand fresco, representing St. Sebastian mounting into glory amid a group of angels, in the church of that saint at Verona. Lanzi pronounces this work a grand production, well executed which greatly raised his reputation. He died in 1733, and “with him,” says Lanzi “was buried for a season the reputation of the Ferrarese school in Italy.” Zani, differing from all others, calls him Giacomo Filippo, and says he was born in 1667 and died in 1737.

## Parolini, Pio[[@Headword:Parolini, Pio]]

             was an Italian painter of Udint. According to the abbe Titi, Parolini resided chiefly at Rome, and was admitted a member of the Academy of St. Luke in 1678. He painted the ceiling of one of the chapels of St. Carlo at Carso, representing an allegorical subject, which was ingeniously composed and well colored. — Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:665.

## Parone, Francesco[[@Headword:Parone, Francesco]]

             an Italian painter, was born about 1600 at Milan. According to Baglioni he was the son of an obscure artist, who taught him the rudiments of the art. At an early age he went to Rome, where he had the good fortune of being taken under the protection of the marquis Giustiniani, for whom he painted several pictures. He studied the works of the best masters with great assiduity, and had already begun to distinguish himself when he died, in 1634, in the flower of his life. His principal work is an altarpiece in the church of the monastery of St. Romualdo at Rome, representing the martyrdom of that saint — a grand composition of many figures, executed in the style of Caravaggio.

## Paros[[@Headword:Paros]]

             one of the larger islands of the Grecian Archipelago. SEE GREECE.

## Parosh[[@Headword:Parosh]]

             SEE FLEA.

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

             (Heb. Parosh', פִּרְעשׁ, flea; Sept. Φόρος, but Φαρές in Ezr 2:3; A.V. Pharosh,” in Ezr 8:3), a Jew whose retainers or descendants, in number 2172, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:3; Neh 7:8). Another detachment of 150 males, with Zechariah at their head, accompanied Ezra (Ezr 8:3). Seven of the family had married foreign wives (Ezr 10:25). They assisted in the building of the wall of Jerusalem (Neh 3:25), and signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:14), either individually, or perhaps representatively in the person of Parosh himself, if then surviving. B.C. ante 545-445.

## Parousia[[@Headword:Parousia]]

             SEE ESCHATOLOGY; SEE MILLENNIUM.

## Paroy, Jacques De[[@Headword:Paroy, Jacques De]]

             a French painter on glass, was born at St. Pourgain-sur-Allier, towards the close of the 16th century. After acquiring the elements of design and painting, he visited Rome for improvement, and studied under Domenichino. It is probable that he gained his knowledge of glass painting in his native country, as that art had already been practiced in the south of France in great perfection by Frere Guillaume, or Guglielmo de Marcilla. Paroy executed several fine works in Venice, and then returned to France. At Paris he painted the windows in the choir of St. Marie. and designed the Judgment of Susanna for the chapel of the same church, executed on glass by Jean Nogare. There are four beautiful paintings by Paroy in the parish church of St. Croix at Gannat, representing St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, and St. Gregory.

## Parr, Elnathan[[@Headword:Parr, Elnathan]]

             D.D., an eminent English divine, flourished in the reign of king James I. Parr was educated at King's College, Cambridge; after taking holy orders he became rector of Palgrave, Suffolk. His exposition of the Epistle to the Romans is a useful “work, “equally remarkable,” says Dr. Williams, “for soundness of sentiment, familiarity of illustration, and want of taste in style and composition.” His Works were repeatedly published (4th edit., corrected and enlarged. Lond. 1651, fol.). They contain, Exposition on the Epistlet to the Romans (on ch. i, on the first two verses of ch. ii, and on ch. viii-xvi): — The Grounds of Divinity expounded and applied (8th edit. Lond. 1636, 12mo): Abba, Father, or a plain and short Direction concerning the Framing of Private Prayer.

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

             (1), an English prelate, flourished in the first half of the 17th century. He was made bishop of Sodor and Man in 1635. He died in 1643. He published a Sermon preached at the burial of Sir Robert Spencer (Oxf. 1628, 4to), and Concio ad Clerum (1628, 8vo).

## Parr, Richard (2)[[@Headword:Parr, Richard (2)]]

             (2), D.D., an exemplary Irish divine of note, was born at Fermoy, Ireland, in 1617. He was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. After taking holy orders he held several minor appointments, and in 1653 became vicar of Camberwell. He remained in this position for thirty-eight years. He died in 1691. In doctrine he was a Calvinist. He wrote Life and Letters of Archbishop Usher: The Christian Reformation (Lond. 1660, 8vo); and published many Sermons.

## Parr, Samuel[[@Headword:Parr, Samuel]]

             LL.D., a learned English divine noted as a profound scholar, was born in 1747, at Harrow-on-the-Hill, Middlesex. He was educated at the grammar school of that place, and at Emannuel College, Cambridge. He accepted in 1767 the situation of usher at Harrow, under Dr. Sumner; at whose death in 1772 he offered himself as a candidate for the mastership, but without success. He first opened an academy at Stanmore, which began under very promising appearances; but which, ultimately failing, he gave up in 1776, and then became master of the grammar school at Colchester; whence, in 1778, he removed to that of Norwich. In 1780 he was presented to the rectory of Asterby, Lincolnshire. In 1783 he obtained the perpetual curacy of Hatton, in Warwickshire, and a prebend in St. Paul's Cathedral. In 1790 he exchanged Hatton for the rectory of Wadenhoe, in Northamptonshire, though he still continued to live at the former place, to which he was much attached, and the parish church of which he greatly ornamented. In 1802 Sir Francis Burdett gave him the rectory of Graffham. in the county of Huntingdon, and this completed the course of his Church preferment. He died in 1825. As an elegant classical scholar Dr. Parr stood pre-eminent among his contemporaries; his prodigious memory and extent of research rendered him astonishingly powerful in conversation; and it is to be regretted that the greater part of his labors as an author had reference to topics which were of a temporary nature, and therefore, though written with vigor, are fast sinking into oblivion. Dr. Parr has not left a single great work, nor will his name go down to posterity associated with any important principle or extensive literary undertaking. His fame rests upon a learning which, whatever may have been its accuracy and extent, has bequeathed to the world no memorable results. Parr was a man of great talents, of very extensive learning, and of pre-eminent conversational powers; but he was vain, arrogant, and overbearing.

His friends uniformly  represent him as possessing much benevolence and kindness of feeling; but he required the utmost submission, and exacted the most devoted attention from all who approached him. In his literary and political disputes he argued and declaimed with the fierceness of party feeling and the petulance of self-love, and forgot alike both the equities and the decencies of controversy. Though of unquestionable ability, he spoke and wrote with the fluency of ready knowledge, rather than with the profoundness of original thought or the compass of a philosophic spirit. He was determined and violent in his social views, as his opinions on the slave-trade and Test- Act questions fully testify. It must be stated, however, that on these subjects his mind underwent a change in the latter part of his life. Still his notions about civil and religious liberty were never the clearest or the most comprehensive; for while he could recommend conciliation to the Roman Catholics and the Unitarians, he did not hesitate to suggest persecution against the Methodists. Parr left a vast mass of papers behind him, consisting of his correspondence, and of historical, critical, and metaphysical disquisitions. His published writings, with a memoir by Dr. Johnstone (1828), fill eight thick octavo volumes. They relate to matters historical, critical, and metaphysical, and show a copious eruditions, a ready conception, and a vigorous and ample style. He republished Tracts by Warburton and a Warburtonian to annoy bishop Hurd, the editor of Warburton; and felt no compunction about. injuring the fame of Warburton, whom he pretended to admire and respect, if he could only annoy Hurd, who had given him no offense save what a morbid self-conceit might imagine. See Field, Memoir of Dr. Parr (1828); Parriana (1828); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Blackwood's Magazine, Jan., May, June, 1831.

## Parricide[[@Headword:Parricide]]

             (Lat. paricida) is rather a popular than a legal term. In the Roman law it comprehended every one who murdered a near relative; but in English the term is usually confined to the murderer of one's father or of one who is in loco parentis. The parricidex does not, in any respect, differ in British and American law from the murderer of a stranger; in both cases the punishment is death by hanging. In the Roman law a parricide was punished in a much more severe manner, being sewed up in a leather sack, along with a live cock, a viper, a dog, and an ape, and cast into the sea to take his fate with those companions.

## Parris, Samuel[[@Headword:Parris, Samuel]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in London in 1653. He studied at Harvard University, but did not graduate, and engaged in mercantile labors. He became a successful merchant in Boston, but finally felt it his duty to enter the ministry. He was the pastor. of the church at Danvers, Mass., from 1689 to 1696. The Salem witchcraft commenced in his family in 1692. His daughter, and his niece, Abigail Williams, aged eleven, accused Tituba (a South American slave), living as a servant in the family, of bewitching them. Mr. Parris beat her, and compelled her to confess herself a witch. John, Tituba's husband, for his own safety, turned accuser of others. Nineteen were hung, and Gyles Cory pressed to death. The delusion lasted sixteen months. As Mr. Parris had been a zealous prosecutor, his Church in April, 1693, brought charges against him. He acknowledged his error, and was dismissed. After preaching two or three years at Stow, he removed to Concord, and preached six months in Dunstable in 1711. He died at Sudbury, Mass., Feb. 27. 1720. See Life of Parris, by S. P. Fowler, read to Essex Institute (1857, 8vo).

## Parrish, Daniel H[[@Headword:Parrish, Daniel H]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born about 1835, of pious parentage. In 1855 he joined the Baltimore Conference as an itinerant preacher, and in the various stations that he was called upon' to serve he labored zealously for the cause of Christ. He commanded the attention which intelligence, piety, and warm and generous sympathies usually secure. He was uncommonly fervent in prayer and earnest in exhortation; and in none of the duties of his work did he appear to greater advantage than in the labors incident to revivals. A friend writes, “In these his soul took delight, and great success attended his efforts.” He died in February, 1871. See Minutes of Conferences of M. E. Church, South, 1871, p. 525, 526.

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

             M.D. a Quaker noted for his philanthropy, was born in Philadelphia Sept. 2, 1779. Even as a youth he distinguished himself by his pious life. In his twenty-second year he engaged in the study of medicine, and after entering the medical profession became noted for his skill. He was also an elder in the Society of Friends, and by a noble and consistent life gained the esteem of his fellows. Dr. Parrish especially interested himself in the welfare of the  American Indians. He watched with deep concern those measure which affected their rights, and frequently engaged in efforts to shield them from injury. He was also the friend of the colored people, and early advocated their emancipation. He died March 13, 1840. See Janney Hist. of Friends, 4:126, 127.

## Parrish, Nathan Cowrey[[@Headword:Parrish, Nathan Cowrey]]

             M.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in West Chester, Ohio, Aug. 17, 1834. When he was but thirteen years of age his father died; when about sixteen years of age he began to teach. In 1855, while a student in Brookville College (in the preparatory department of which he was at the same time a teacher), he was converted. In 1856 he received his degree in medicine. He soon after felt impressed that he was called to preach; but he hesitated long to abandon his life-plans. At last, however, his convictions became so settled and thorough that he applied for work in the Kentucky Conference, and was employed by the presiding elder on Vanceburgh Charge. In 1865 he joined the Cincinnati Conference, and was appointed to Venice Circuit. His subsequent appointments were as follows, viz. To Wayne Street, Piqua; Carr Street, Cincinnati; Venice Circuit, Miami Circuit. Morrow Station, where he remained three years. At the conference of 1873 failing health warned him to rest for a season, and he asked a superannuated relation. He died Feb. 15, 1875. Dr. Parrish was a man of sterling worth. Of him it could be faithfully said, he was “diligent, never unemployed, never triflingly employed.” During his entire ministry he was in the habit of spending from six to ten hours per day in study. As a preacher he was earnest, practical, and eloquent. As a pastor he was faithful. With: the irreligious he maintained a dignified familiarity that honored his office, made him hosts of friends, and gave him large audiences. He had also a happy faculty of interesting children, and he diligently instructed them. See Minutes of Conferences, 1875, p. 115.

## Parrocel, Etienne[[@Headword:Parrocel, Etienne]]

             a French painter, was born in Paris about 1720. He painted historical subjects, but. attained little reputation. He executed several scripthral works, among which was Christ on the Mount of Olives. There are several etchings by him, in a bold, free style, among which is The Triumph of Mordecai (after De Froy).

## Parrocel, Pierre[[@Headword:Parrocel, Pierre]]

             a French painter and engraver, was born at Avignon'inl. 1664. He received his first instruction in art from his uncle Joseph, also a noted painter, after which he went to Rome, and studied under Marotti. On his return home he traveled through Languedoc and the Provence, and left many valuable productions in sacred art in different churches; among them the Resurrection and the Acension of Christ, at the chapel of the White Penitents at Aviignon. He was invited to Paris, and there executed a number of magnificent ‘works. At Marseilles he painted. the Coronation of the Virgin, in the church: of St. Maria. His engravings are inferior.

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

             D.D., an English divine, was born about the beginning of the second quarter of last century. He was a student of Christ, Church, Oxford, and obtained the degree of M.A. March 31, 1747; B.D. May 25, 1754; and D.D. July 8,1757. After taking holy orders he was made rector of Wichampton, in Dorsetshire, and preacher at Market Harborough, in Leicestershire, for which latter county he was in the commission of the peace. Dr. Parry was a very learned, active, and able divine. He died miserably poor at Market Harborough, April 9, 1780, scarcely leaving sufficient to defray the charges of his funeral. His publications are: The Christian Sabbath as Old as the Creation (1753, 4to); he was then chaplain to lord Vere: — The Scripture Account of the Lord's Supper; the substance of three sermons preached at Market Harborough in 1755, 1756: — The Fig-tree dried up, or the Story of that remarkable Transaction as it is related by St. Mark considered in a new light (1758, 4to): — Defence of the Lord Bishop of London's Interpretation of Job's “I know that my Redeemer liveth” (against Warburton [1760, 8vo]): — A Dissertation on Daniel's Prophecy of the Seventy Weeks (Northampton, 1762, 8vo): — Remarks upon a Letter from the Rev. Dr. Kennicott to the Printer of the “General Evening. Post,” wherein the printed Hebrew Text in Psa 16:10 is vindicated, and the Doctor's Charge against the Jews of having wilfully corrupted the Prophecy is confuted ‘( Lond. 1763, 8vo ). Other works: harmony of the Four Gospels: — The Genealogy of Jesus Christ in Matthew and Luke explained (1771, 8vo).

## Parry, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Parry, Richard, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born at Ruthin, Flintshire. He was educated at Oxford, whence he was preferred dean of Bangor (1599), and finally bishop of St. Asaph (1604). He died September 26, 1623. He possessed eminent episcopal qualities. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), page 539.

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

             some time president and theological tutor at Wymondley Academy, Herts, was born in the year 1754 at Abergavenny, in Monmouthshire. He was the eldest of twelve children, most of whom died young. When he was about seven years of age he removed with his father to London, where he attended the ministry of Dr. Samuel Stennett. At the age of seventeen he publicly professed his attachment to Christianity by becoming a member of the Church at Stepney, then under the pastoral care of Mr. Brewer, by whom, at the age of twenty, he was introduced to the academy at Homerton. Under the instructions of Drs. Condor, Gibbons, and Fisher, Mr. Parry remained during six years, pursuing, with unremitting ardor and persevering industry, the studies to which he had devoted himself. He was ordained at Little Baddow, Essex, in the year 1780. To his suggestion and benevolent activity while resident at Baddow may be attributed the formation of “The Benevolent Society for the Relief of Necessitous Widows and Children of Protestant Dissenting Ministers in the Counties of Essex and Herts,” also “The Essex Union,” whose object is to promote the extension of the Gospel in the county. In the year 1791, when an opposition was made to an application of the' Dissenters for a repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, more especially by the noblemen, gentlemen, and clergy of the county of Warwick, he animadverted with great eloquence and force on their resolutions in three letters addressed to the earl of Alyesford. The pamphlet on the Inspiration of the New Testament appeared in the year 1797, and has obtained for its author an extensive reputation. Shortly after its publication proposals were made to Mr. Parry, by the trustees of W. Coward, Esq., to become theological tutor in the dissenting academy which had for some years been conducted at Northampton and Daventry by Drs. Doddridge and Ashworth. An earnest desire of extended usefulness led Mr. Parry to accept those proposals, and in the year 1799 he took an affectionate farewell of his beloved flock at Baddow, after having labored among them for twenty years with great acceptance and fidelity.

Mr. Parry entered on his new and important office at Wymondley (to which place the academy was removed) with all that intense application which naturally resulted from the high sense he entertained of its responsibility. As a lecturer Mr. Parry was distinguished by perspicuity and classical simplicity; and by a happy union of dignity and affection he secured the love and veneration of the students entrusted to his care. In undertaking the office of tutor, Mr. Parry did not resign that of a  minister of Christ. Immediately after his settlement at Wymondley a small chapel was erected. on the premises, where a congregation was raised and a Church formed, over which he presided as pastor till the time of his decease. With: the exception of a charge delivered at the ordination of one of his students, Mr. Parry appeared but once:in the. character of an author after his removal to Wymondley, which was in a work of a controversial kind with Dr. Williams, of Rotherham, On the Origin of Moral Evil. It had been his intention to write a history of the Dissenters, a work for which he was well qualified, and for which he had made considerable preparation; but a painful nervous affection coming on, his design was interrupted, and never afterwards resumed. He died in November, 1818. The death-bed of Mr. Parry was one of calm and. holy triumph; he rested' with unshaken confidence on the rock of ages, and entered with .a smile the gloomy valley which was to conduct him to the regions of everlasting;day. The writings of Mr. Parry are characterized by clearness of conception, with great accuracy and felicity of expression.

## Parseeism[[@Headword:Parseeism]]

             SEE PARSEES; SEE PERSIA.

## Parsees[[@Headword:Parsees]]

             (i.e. people of Pars, or Fars, the name of ancient Persia) are a remnant of the old inhabitants of Persia, who to this day continue faithful to the ancient Persian religion as reformed by Zoroaster (q.v.). They are also called Atesh Perest, or fire-worshippers; Majus, from their priests the Magi; and by themselves Beh-Din, “Those of the excellent belief;” or Mazdaasnan, worshippers of Ormuzd; by the Turks Ghiaur or Ghaur, which is commonly, but against all linguistic laws, derived from the Arabic Kafir (a word applied to all non-Mohammedans, and supposed to have been first bestowed upon this sect by their Arabic conquerors in the 7th century), but which is evidently nothing more than an ancient proper name taken from some pre-eminent tribe or locality, since the Talmud (Jebam. 63 b, Gitt. 17a, etc.) already knows them only by this name (Chebor); and Origen (Contra Cels. 6:291) speaks of Kabirs or Persians, asserting that Christianity has adopted nothing from them.

What the pre-Zoroastrian religion of Persia was is not yet determined, and in all likelihood will not soon be definitely settled. By philological research it has been made clear that in primeval or pre-historic times the religious  faith of the Persians and Hindûs was identical; in other words, that Parseeism is but an outgrowth of Brahminism (q.v.). It appears that in consequence of certain social and political conflicts between the Iranians and the Aryans, who afterwards peopled Hindostan proper, an undying feud arose, in the course of which the Iranians foreswore even the hithertocommon faith, and established a counter faith (Ahura). The ancient but now hostile gods were transformed into daemons, and the entire Deva religion was branded as the source of all mischief and wickedness. The founder and organizer of this new religion is reputed to be Zarathustra (Greek, Ζαραστράδης, Ζωροάστρης; Latin, Zoroaster; mod. Persian, Zerdosht, Zerdusht), and he is usually distinguished from his successors in the priesthood of like name to the addition of his family name, Spitama. (For a summary of what is known and speculated about the person and time of this great reformer, see the article ZOROASTER SEE ZOROASTER .

We shall here confine ourselves to the merest essentials of Parseeism.) Zoroastrianism, as the new religion is sometimes called, is of uncertain date. The Zend-Avesta, the Parsee Bible, is ascribed to Zoroaster, but its varieties in doctrine make it evident that it was composed in different ages. Thus the dualism, which is now a characteristic of Parseeism (see below), is not found in the most ancient sections of that book and there are very early chapters. that contain traces even of a polytheistic nature-worship, in which the gods have no personal existence, but are mere powers, such .as the sunshine, the wind, the:earth, and fire. Hardwick takes the ground that the modifications in the religion of Indo- Persian heathenism, that give it the shape in which we now encounter it, began in the 7th century B.C., and continued until the Sassanian revival in the time of Artaxerxes, or the 3d century of the Christian aera (A.D. 226). le also holds that the Avesta was not given its present shape any earlier than the last-named period (Christ and other Masters, 2:374).

Whatever the date of the origin of Parseeism, the principles of Zoroaster's theology are easily accessible, and we now turn to a consideration of these. In the article PERSIA SEE PERSIA we give the early religious history of its people. Taking for granted that such a prophet as Zoroaster flourished at some time in Persian history, we encounter him as the reformer of the Persian religion. From the too-sensuous Aryan system the Iranians had developed a distinct recognition of deities, who are real persons, possessed of self-consciousness and intelligence. But the attempt to subordinate one power to another, in order to establish the supremacy of one God, was first  conceived by the author of Zoroastrianism. Its especial glory it is to have established as the principle of its theology a monotheism as pure as ever the followers of the Jehovistic faith enjoined. The supposed Zoroaster first taught the existence of but one deity, the Ahura, who is called Mazda, SEE ORMUZD, the Creator of all things, to whom all good things, spiritual and worldly, belong. Zoroaster's conception of the Supreme Deity is sublime. All the highest attributes, except that of Fatherhood, are assigned to him. He is the Creator of all earthly and spiritual life. He is the Holy God, the Father of all truth, the “Best Being of all,” the Master of purity. He is supremely happy, possessing every blessing, health, wealth, virtue, immortality, wisdom, and abundance of every earthly good. All these he bestows on the good man who is pure in thought, word, and deed, while he punishes the wicked. All that is created, good or evil, fortune or misfortune, is his work.

He is to be served by purity, truth, and goodness in thought, word, and deed, by prayers and offerings. The works of agriculture are especially pleasing to him. No images of him were allowed. In spite of some mixtures of physical ideas, such as the ascription to him of health, and the conception of him as in some sense light, the notion of Ahura-Mazda is truly spiritual. Under the Supreme Being are the genii, who stand between God and man; Sraosha, the instructor of the prophet, the friend of God, and the protector of the faith; and Armaiti, the genius of the earth and the guardian of piety, and perhaps some others. The existence of evil was accounted for by the supposition of two primeval causes, which, though opposed to each other, were united in every existing being, even in Ahlura-Mazda himself, and by their union was produced the world of material things and of spiritual existence. The cause of good is VohuMano, the good mind, from which springs Gaya, or reality; to it ,all good, true, and perfect things belong. The evil cause is Akun-Mano, “naughty mind,” from which springs non-reality (Ajyaiti); to it all evil and delusive things belong. But, as united in Ahura-Mazda, the two principles are called Spento-Manyus, the dark. spirit. No personal existence is ascribed to these; they both exist in Ahura-Mazda. but they are opposed to one another as creators of light and darkness, of life and death, of sleep and waking. In the course of time, through the operation of the principle whereby attributes become personified, this primeval doctrine became corrupted into a systematic dualism.

Thus the two causes appear as distinct and opposed personal beings, Ahura-Mazda or Ormuzd, of whom Spento- Manyus is a title, and Angro-Manyus or Ahriman. These two existed separately and independently from all eternity, each ruling over a realm of  his own, and' constantly at war with and striving to overthrow the other. All the good and pure creations of Ormuzd are defiled and spoiled by those of Ahriman, who cannot create independently, but only brings evil into being to counterwork, ruin, and destroy the good works of Ormuzd. Under each principle is a hierarchy of ministers, personal beings created by these respective lords, whom they serve and obey in every way. The first created and chief of these to Ormuzd are his six councillors, in later times made seven by including Sraosha or Ormuzd himself. They are all called “immortal saints,” and each rules over a special province of creation. These are in their origin personifications of abstractions, representing the gifts of Ormuzd to his worshippers. Ahriman has also a council of six (later seven) evil beings, the counterparts of Ormuzd's councillors, who work evil in the spheres over which the latter preside. Under these, on each side, are hosts of other spirits. Those of Ormuzd are the “good spirits,” headed by Sraosha and the Fervers, invisible protectors of all created beings. Ahriman has the Devas or Divs, the exact contraries to these.

The two principles are considered as co-equal and co-eternal in the past; neither is absolutely victorious as yet. Their strife extends throughout all creations; every existing thing is ranged on one side or the other; nothing can be neutral. But at the last three prophets sprung from Zoroaster will appear, who will convert all mankind to Zoroastrianism; evil will be conquered and annihilated; Ahriman will vanish forever, and creation will be restored to, its primitive purity. A later development still was made to save the unity of the Supreme. It was therefore held that the two principles emanated from a being called Zarvan-Akarana, time without bounds, into whom they will again be in the end absorbed. This doctrine rests on a misinterpretation of texts in the Avesta (see Haug, Essay, p. 20 sq., 264). It is, however, still held by the Parsees in India as well as in Persia. Man is represented as created by Ormuzd in purity and holiness; but through the temptation of the Divs he fell, and became exposed to sin and evil, Every man is bound to choose whether he will serve Ormuzd by good deeds, industry, and piety, or Ahriman by the contrary vices. According as he chooses, so is he rewarded or punished in another world. For Zoroaster had taught the hope of a future life. According to him, there are two intellects, as there are two lives — one mental and the other bodily; and, again, there must be distinguished an earthly and a future life. There are two abodes for the departed — Heaven (Garo-Demana, the House of the Angels' Hymns, Yazna, 28:10; 34:2; comp. Isaiah 6, Revelat., etc.) and Hell (Draj- Demana, the residence of devils and the priests of the Deva religion).  Between the two there is the Bridge of the Gatherer or Judge, which the souls of the pious alone can pass. There will be a general resurrection, which is to precede the last judgment, to foretell which Sosiosh (Soskyans), the son of Zoroaster, spiritually begotten (by later priests divided into three persons), will be sent by Ahura-Mazda. The world, which by that time will be utterly steeped in wretchedness, darkness, and sin, will then be renewed; death, the archfiend of creation, will be slain, and-life will be everlasting and holy.

The Zoroastrian creed gradually became corrupted, until, in the time of Alexander Severus, Ardshir “Ariainos” (comp. Mirkhond, ap. de Sacy, Memoires surn div. Aut. de la Perse, etc., p. 59), the son of Babegan, called by the Greeks and Romans Artaxerxes or Artaxares, who founded the Sassanide dynasty, caused the complete restoration of the partly lost and partly forgotten books of Zoroaster, which he effected, it is related, chiefly through the inspiration of a Magian sage, chosen out of 40,000 Magians. The sacred volumes were then translated out of the original Zend into the vernacular, and disseminated among the people at large, and fire temples were reared throughout the length and the breadth of the land. The Magi -or priests were all-powerful, and their hatred was directed principally against the Greeks. “Far too long,” wrote Ardshir, the king, to all the provinces of the Persian empire, for more than five hundred years, has the poison of Aristotle spread.” The fanaticism of the priests often found vent also against Christians and Jews. The latter have left us some account of the tyranny and oppression to which they as unbelievers were exposed — such as the prohibition of fire and light in their houses on Persian fast-days, of the slaughter of animals, the baths of purification, and the burial of the dead according to the Jewish rites — prohibitions only to be bought off by heavy bribes. In return, the Magi were cordially hated by the Jews, and remain branded in their writings by the title of daemons of hell (Kidushin, 72 a). To accept the instruction of a Magian is pronounced by a Jewish sage to be an offense worthy of death (Shabb. 75 a, 156 b). This mutual animosity does not, however, appear to have long continued, since in subsequent times we frequently find Jewish sages (Samuel the Arian, etc.) on terms of friendship and confidence with the later Sassanide kings (comp. Moed Katon, 26 a, etc.).

From the period of its re-establishment, the Zoroastrian religion flourished uninterruptedly for about four hundred years, till, in A.D. 651, at the great battle of Nahavand (near Ecbatana), the Persian army, under Yezdezird,  was routed by the caliph Omar. Under Mohammedan rule, the great mass of the inhabitants were converted to the religion of Islam. A very small number, still clinging to the ancient religion, were for many centuries the victims of constant oppression. Malimmud the Ghiznevide, Shah Abbas, and others, were conspicuous by their untiring persecution of them; and the manner in which they were held up to general detestation is best shown by the position assigned them in most popular Mohammedan tales as sorcerers and criminals. They were hunted down with such ferocity that they became nearly exterminated, and after untold suffering for two hundred years a colony found its way to India. Those that remained in Persia, being permitted to reside only in one district and under the most mortifying restrictions, gradually sank into ignorance and degradation, and procured a precarious living by performing menial labor; but, notwithstanding all this oppression, they have always maintained the character of holest, chaste, and industrious citizens. At present there are, according to the very latest information, about eight thousand Guebres (as they are now called) scattered over the vast dominions of their ancestors, chiefly in Yezd and twenty-four surrounding villages. There are a few at Teheran, a few at Ispahan, at Shiraz, and some at Baku, near the great naphtha mountain.

During those fierce persecutions of the 7th century many of those who still cleaved to the religion of their forefathers found a refuge in the mountainous districts of Khorassan, where, for about a hundred years, they lived in the free and undisturbed exercise of their religion. At length, however, when the sword of the persecutor overtook them even in these remote districts, and they were again compelled to seek safety in flight, a considerable number emigrated to the. small island of Ormuz, at the mouth of the Persian Gulf. Here, however, they remained only a short time, when, finding that they were still within the reach of their Moslem persecutors, they went out to seek an asylum in Hindostan,” where, concealing the true nature of their religion, they partly conformed' to Hindû practices and ceremonies. At length, after a long series of hardships, which they endured with the most exemplary patience, they resolved to make an open profession of their ancient faith, and accordingly they built a fire-temple in Sanjan, the Hindû rajah of the district kindly aiding them in the work.

The temple was completed in A.D. 721, and the sacred fire was kindled on the altar. For three hundred years from the time of their landing in Sanjan the Parsees lived in comfort and tranquillity; and at the end of that period their numbers were much increased by the emigration of a large body of their  countrymen from Persia, who, with their families, located themselves in different parts of Western India, where they chiefly engaged in agricultural pursuits. Being a peaceable and industrious people, the Parsees lived in harmony with the Hindûs, though of different and even opposite faiths. Nothing of importance, indeed, occurred in their history until the beginning of the 16th century, when they were called upon to aid the rajahl under whom they lived in resisting the aggressions of a Mohammedan chief residing at Ahmedabad. On that occasion they distinguished themselves by their valor and intrepidity, contributing largely to the success which at first crowned the arms of the Hindûs. Ultimately, however, the Moslems were victorious, and the Hindû government was overthrown. The Parsees, carrying with them the sacred fire from Sanjan, now removed to the mountains of Baharut, where they remained for twelve years, of the end of which they directed their course, first to Bansda, and afterwards to Nowsaree, where they speedily rose to wealth and influence. Here, however, a quarrel arose among the priests, and the sacred fire was secretly conveyed to Oodwara, a place situated thirty-two miles south of Surat, where it still exists; and being the oldest fire-temple in India, it is held in the highest veneration by the Parsees. Nowsaree is the city of the priests, members of whom are every year sent to Bombay to act as spiritual instructors of their Zoroastrian fellow worshippers. It is difficult to ascertain the precise time at which the Parsees arrived in Bombay, but in all probability it was in the latter half of the 17th century, somewhere about the time that the island passed into the hands of the British, having been given by the king of Portugal as a dowry to his daughter Catharine when she became the wife of Charles II. Ever since this remarkable remnant of antiquity has maintained its footing in Hindostan. chiefly in Bombay, and in some of the cities of Gujerat, and a few are also to be found in Calcutta, and other large cities in India, in China, and other parts of Asia.

The Parsees of India, who, according to the latest census, form a population of 110,544, or twenty per cent. of the whole population, are recognised as the most respectable and thriving portion of the community, being for the most part merchants and landed proprietors. They bear, equally with their poorer brethren in Persia, with whom they have of late renewed some slight intercourse for religious and other purposes such as their rivayets or correspondences on important and obscure doctrinal points — the very highest character for honesty, industry, and peacefulness, — while their benevolence, intelligence, and magnificence  outvie those of most of their European fellow-subjects. Their general appearance is to a certain degree prepossessing, and many of their women are strikingly beautiful. In all civil matters they are subject to the laws of the country they inhabit; and its language is also theirs, except in the ritual of their religion, in which the holy language of Zend is used by the priests, although, as a rule, these have no more knowledge of it than the laity.

These are the leading fundamental doctrines as laid down by their prophet. Respecting the practical side of their religion, we cannot here enter into a detailed description of their very copious rituals, which have partly found their way into other creeds. Suffice it to mention the following points. They do not eat anything cooked by a person of another religion; they also object to beef, pork, especially to ham. Marriages can only be contracted with persons of their own caste and creed. Polygamy, except after nine years of sterility and divorce, is forbidden. Fornication and adultery are punishable with death. The Parsees stand alone in their treatment of the dead. At a certain stage of every funeral a dog is introduced to look at the corpse; and without this preliminary no spirit is presumed to rest in peace. But the dead are neither burned nor buried.

However well this fact is known, it is not equally well known that the motive which deters alike from cremation and from sepulture is a fear of doing dishonor to the elements of fire and earth. Their dead are exposed on an iron grating in the Dokhma, or Tower of Silence, to the fowls of the air, to the dew, and to the sun until the flesh has disappeared, and the bleaching bones fall through into a pit beneath, from which they are afterwards removed to a subterranean cavern. The Parsees having so long mingled with the Hindûs have naturally adopted many of their customs and practices, which for centuries they have continued to observe; and though the punchayet, or legal council of the Parsees, about twenty-five years ago endeavored to discourage, and even to root out all such ceremonies and practices as had crept into their religion since they first settled in Hindostan, their attempts were wholly unsuccessful. So recently, however, as 1852 steps have been taken for the accomplishment of the same desirable object which are more likely to bring about the restoration of the Zoroastrian religion to its pristine purity. In that year an association was formed at Bombay, called the “Rahnumai Mazdiasna,” or Religious Reform Association, composed of many wealthy and influential Parsees, along with a number of intelligent and well- educated young men. The labors of this society have been productive of considerable improvement in the social condition of the Parsees.

The state  of the priesthood calls for some change in that body. Many of them are so ignorant that they do not understand their liturgical works, though they regularly recite the required portions from memory. The office of the priesthood is hereditary, the son of a priest being also a priest, unless he chooses to follow some other profession; but a layman cannot be a priest. That the priests may be incited to study the sacred books, an institution has been established called the “Mulla Firoz Mudrissa,” in which they are taught the Zend, Pehivi, and Persian languages. On the whole, the Parsee community in India appears to be rapidly imbibing European customs and opinions, and rising steadily in influence and importance. Liberal as is the adoption by the Parsees of social improvements suggested by Englishmen, it is too recent in origin to be yet any thing like complete. The family is still essentially shut off from the outer world; and we must refer to those who have been behind the scenes if we would know the people thoroughly under their social or domestic aspect. Here, too, marks of the influence of the Hindûs meet us at almost every turn. Noticeably is this the case as concerns astrology. Whether it be a birth or a marriage, or anything else of critical moment, the stars are to be interrogated for their reading of its future. The notion of a baby without. a horoscope is quite foreign to all Parsee associations. In fact, the very naming of a child is looked upon as an impossibility without the intervention of a star-gazer. While alchemy has come to be discredited in India nearly as much as it is in Europe, astrology and palmistry are to this day gravely reckoned among Parsees in the category of rational sciences. At the early age of seven a child must be betrothed, and the wedding follows not long after. Its rites are in a large measure symbolical; but their original signification has been forgotten. Many of them are evident grafts from Hindûism; but one of them, at least, is foreign. When the bridegroom first reaches the abode of his father-in- law, some lady of the house waves over his head several times a metallic vessel containing rice and water, flings its contents at his feet, and also an egg, and finally admits him through the door, with his right foot forward. To a Hindû nothing — unless it be an onion — is more utterly impure than an egg. A priest is always employed to solemnize marriage. A Parsee, if true to the traditions of his race, can be only a monogamist. Nuptial festivities, even to the poorest Parsee, are very expensure, and often, besides exhausting his earnings of many past years, entail a heavy load of debt. But the long-established submission to this unremunerative folly is now gradually yielding to common-sense; and the Parsees, year by year, are coming more and more to conduct their espousals on a scale of outlay  soberly correspondent to the real requirements of the occasion. Towards bringing about this improvement, the counsel — and the example of Englishmen have doubtless been of important influence.

The traditions of the Parsees teach that the sacred fire which Zoroaster brought from heaven has been kept continually burning in the consecrated temples, and is fed with choice wood and spices. The Parsees claim to have brought that fire from the temple in Persia, and for ages to have kept it alive and burning. They are called Fire-worshippers, but they call themselves “Those of excellent belief.” Their, temples contain no idols, but are entirely plain, and contain nothing that they regard as sacred but the fire which is burning on the altar, and which they assert has not only been kept burning through all the ages, but will be kept burning to the end of the world. All intelligent Parsees, however, spurn the imputation that they worship the sun or fire. Ahura-Mazda being the origin of light, his symbol is the sun, with the moon and the planets, and in default of them the fire, and the believer is enjoined to face a luminous object during his prayers. Hence also the temples and altars must forever be fed with the holy fire brought down, according to tradition, from heaven, the sullying of whose, flame is punishable with death. The priests themselves approach it only with a half-mask (Penom) over the face, lest their breath should defile it, and never touch it with their hands, but with holy instruments. The fires are of five kinds; but however great the awe felt by Parsees with respect to fire and light (they are the only Eastern nation who abstain from smoking), yet they never consider these, as we said before, as anything but emblems-of Divinity. They assert that they worship the one true spiritual God alone, but revere the sun and fire as the highest manifestation of God. The ignorant Parsees, however, do not so discern in their worship, and pay adoration to the sun and fire as divinities; and the intelligent excuse them because, say they, if so ignorant as to be unable to comprehend the true God, they may as well be suffered to adore His brightest manifestations. The intelligent ones claim that when they look up to the sun, they look beyond to the great Author of all good, and worship only Him. “We see them,” says Graves (in a letter from India to the Northern Christian Advocate, 1875), “in the street, on the docks, or anywhere that they may happen to be at the time of the going down of the sun, apparently in adoration. We have seen them in their carriages stop on the terrace and put themselves in a position of worship. They gather on the shores of the sea as the sun goes down, and raise their hands and bow with the most profound  reverence. From their beautiful homes on Malabar Hill the ladies gather with their children to reverence and adore the setting sun as it sinks into the sparkling sea.”

The Parsees practice also five kinds of “sacrifice,” which term, however, is rather to be understood in the sense of a sacred action. These are, the slaughtering of animals for public or private solemnities; prayer; the Damns sacrament, which, with its consecrated bread and wine in honor of the primeval founder of the law, Hom or Heomoh (the Sanscr. Soma), and Dahman, the personified blessing, bears a striking outward resemblance to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; the sacrifice: Expiation, consisting therin flagellationor in gifts top the priest; and, lastly, the sacrifice for the souls of the dad. The purification of physical and moral impurities is effected, in the first place, by cleansing with holy water (Nirang), earth, etc.; next, by prayers (of which sixteen, at least, are to be recited every day) and the recitation of the divine word; but other self-casitigations, fasting, celibacy, etc., are considered hateful to the Divinity. The ethical code maybe summed up in the three words — purity of thought, of word, and of deed; a religion” that is for all, and not for any particular nation,” as the Zoroastrians say. It need hardly be added that superstitions of all kinds have, in the course of the tribulations of ages, and the intimacy with neighboring countries, greatly defiled the original purity of this creed, and that its forms now vary very much among the different communities of the present time.

There are two sects of Parsees in India, the Shensoys and the Kudinis, both of whom follow in all points the religion of Zoroaster, and differ merely as to the precise date for the computation of the aera of Yezdegird, the last king of the ancient Persian monarchy. The only practical disadvantage which arises from this chronological dispute is that there is a month's difference between them in the time at which they observe their festivals. The Kudmis are few in number, but several of the most wealthy and influential of the Parsees belong to this sect. About thirty years ago a keen discussion, known among the Parsees by the name of the Kubisa controversy, was carried on in Bombay, and though argued. with the greatest earnestness and acrimony on both sides, the contested point in regard to the sera of Yezdegird has not yet been satisfactorily settled. The difference was first observed about two hundred years ago, when a learned Zoroastrian, named Jamasp, came from Persia to Surat, and while engaged in instructing the Mobeds, or Parsee priests, discovered that there was a  difference of one full month in the calculation of time between the Zoroastrians of India and those of Persia. It was not, however, till 1746 that any great importance was attached to this chronological difference. In that year the Kudmi sect was formed, its distinguishing tenet being an adherence to the chronological view imported by Jamasp from Persia, while the great mass of the Parsees in India still retained their former mode of calculation. At first sight this might appear a matter of too small importance to give rise to a theological dispute, but it must be borne in mind that when a Parsee prays, he must repeat the year, month, and day on which he offers his petition, and this circumstance leads to an observable difference between the prayer of a Kudmi and that of a Shensoy, and the same difference of course exists in the celebration of the festivals which are common to both sects.

Something like a very serious schism has lately broken out in the Parsee communities, and the modern terms of Conservative and Liberal, or, rather, bigot and infidel, are almost as freely used with them as in Europe. The sum and substance of these innovations, stoutly advocated by one side and as stoutly resisted by the other, is the desire to stop early betrothal and marriage, to suppress the extravagance in funerals and weddings, to educate women, and to admit them into society, and especially to abolish the purification by the Nirang — a filthy substance in itself — as well as to reduce the large number of obligatory prayers. The task of the pious Parsee in prayer is certainly no small one. He has to repeat his devotions sixteen times at least every day. First on getting out of bed, then during the Nirang operation, again when he takes his bath, again when he cleanses his teeth, and when he has finished his morning ablutions. The same prayers are repeated whenever, during the day, a Parsee has to wash his hands. Every meal — and there are three — begins and ends with prayer, besides the grace, and before going to bed the work of the day is closed by prayer. Two counter alliances or societies — the “Guides of the Worshippers of God” and the “True Guides” respectively — are contending for the objects of their different parties.

The literature of the Parsees will be found noted under PERSIA SEE PERSIA and ZEND-AVESTA SEE ZEND-AVESTA . Besides the latter, which is written in ‘ancient Zend, and its' Gujarati translation and commentaries, there are to be mentioned, as works essentially treating of religious matters, the Zerdusht-Nameh, or Legendary History of Zoroaster; the Sadder, or Summary of Parsee Doctrines; the Dabistan, or School of  Manners; the Desatir, Sacred Writings, etc. All these have been translated into English and other European languages. The Guebres had lost all knowledge of the literature connected with their religion, and were altogether steeped in the grossest ignorance, until the recent efforts for their elevation. As we have said above, the Parsee merchants of India sent a member of their denomination to Persia, with the view of ameliorating the condition of their poor brethren residing in that kingdom.. The emissary of his people bore the name Manokji Limdji Sahab. This worthy man, being a British subject, enjoyed in his' mission all the privileges which that mother-country of liberty so bountifully confers. Manokji visited the several settlements of the poor Guebres, and acquainted himself with their wants and burdens. Backed by his constituents in India, he made himself responsible to the Persian government for the punctual discharge of the annual poll-tax that was to be levied on the Guebre subjects of the realm. By this measure he put himself in direct connection with all the communes of Persian Guebres, and, moreover, became the medium of their political complaints to government. He thus liberated them at once from the endless troubles to which they had hitherto been subjected. He at the same time took care to establish schools for religious and secular instruction. We are informed. that his success has been .so complete in this undertaking as to induce Mohammedan fathers to send their children to the excellent Guebre school at Teheran.

Of works treating on the subject of this article, we mention principally, Hyde, Veterum Rel. Pers. Historia (Oxon. 1760, 4to); Ousely, Travels in the East (Lond. 1819); Anquetil du Perron, Exposition des Usages des Parses; Haug, Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees (Bombay, 1862, 8vo), especially essay 4; Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies, 3:93-136; 4:328-347; Bunsen, God in History, bk. 3, ch. 6, and Appendix, notes D, E; Egypt, 3:474 sq.; Muller, Chips from a German Workshop, 1:158 sq.; also 79 sq., 115, 126 sq., 140 sq.; Narroji, Manners and Customs of the Parsees (Liverpool, 1861); id. The Parsee Religion (ibid. 1861); Framjee, The Parsees (Lond. 1858); Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 2:361 sq.; Clarke, Ten Great Religions, ch. 5; Theol. Rev. Jan. 1871, p. 96-110; Spiegel's art. “Parsismus,” in Herzog's Real-Eneyklopidie, 11:115 sq.

## Parshandatha[[@Headword:Parshandatha]]

             [some Parshanda'tha] (Heb. פִּרְשִׁנְדָּתָא, Parshandathac', prob. Persian, given to Persia [comp. Παρσώνδης, Diod. 2:33]; Sept. Φαρσαννεστάν v.r. Φαρσαννές), the first named of the ten sons of Haman slain by the Jews at Shushan (Est 9:7). B. 473.

## Parsimony[[@Headword:Parsimony]]

             SEE COVETOUSNESS.

Parson in English ecclesiastical law means the incumbent of a benefice in a parish. He is called parson (Lat. persona ecclesiae) because he represents the Church for several purposes. He must be a member of the Established Church of England, and duly admitted to holy orders, presented, instituted, and inducted; and at least twenty-three years of age. When he is inducted, and not before, he is said to be in full and complete possession of the incumbency, and is called in law persona impersonata, or “parson imparsonee.” The theory is that the freehold of the parish church is vested in him, i.e. he represents the church, and in the eve of the law sustains the person thereof, as well in suing as in being sued in any action touching the same. As the legal owner, the parson has various rights of control over the chancel. He is also the owner of the churchyard, and as such is entitled to the grass. As owner of the body of the church, he has a right to the control of the church bells, and is entitled to prevent the churchwardens from ringing them against his will The distinction between a parson and a vicar is, that the parson has generally the whole right to the ecclesiastical dues in the parish, whereas the vicar has an appropriator over him, who is the real owner of the dues and tithes, and the vicar has only an inferior portion. The duty of the parson is to perform divine service in the parish church under the control of the bishop, to administer the sacraments to parishioners, to read the burial-service on request of the parishioners, and to marry them in the parish church when they tender themselves. He is bound to reside in the parish, and is subject to penalties and forfeiture if he without cause absent himself from the parish. He is subject to the Clergy Discipline Act, in case of misconduct. One may cease to be a parson, by death, cession in taking another benefice, consecration, promotion to a bishopric, resignation, or, lastly, deprivation, either by sentence of the ecclesiastical court, or in pursuance of divers penal statutes, which declare the benefice void for  some neglect or crime. See Walcott, Sac. Archaeol s.v.; Hook, Church Dict. s.v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v. SEE PARISH.

## Parsonage[[@Headword:Parsonage]]

             a common term for the residence of a parson or minister in many churches.

## Parsons, Charles Booth[[@Headword:Parsons, Charles Booth]]

             D.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Enfield, Conn., July 23,1805. In early life he was an actor, but having become convinced finally that he could not serve God as he should in that employment, he forsook the stage and all its associations in 1837, and joined the Church, to become a preacher of the good tidings, in 1840, as a member of the Kentucky Conference. At the time of the separation of the Southern branch of Methodism, Parsons joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. but at the outbreak of the war he went back to the mother Church, and gave his influence to the support of the Northern, or, rather, Union cause, and became also a most devoted friend of the freedmen, especially in the state of Kentucky, where he was then preaching. Parsons's early training as a dramatist always attracted to him large audiences, and somewhat tinctured his style as a preacher. Those who bad the pleasure of hearing him in his best days bear testimony to his ability, and-the scores who have been converted under his ministry are the living witnesses of his success. His favorite pulpit themes were the cardinal doctrines of the New Testament, as taught by his Church. He seemed to have a clear conception of these truths, and before large congregations he defended them with ability, and urged them with singular pathos and power. He happily united the. qualities of the able debater and the attractive orator. His propositions were clearly stated, and sustained by the conclusive reasoning of the one, and sufficiently adorned by the embellishments of the other. His sermons were remarkable for the uniformity of their excellence. Nearly every effort was a success. “We shall never forget,” writes one who is competent to criticise pulpit oratory, ‘his grim picture of that hardened wretch who stood at Calvary, clanking the spikes that were so soon to be driven through the hands and feet of the blessed Redeemer.”' This is a good sample of the dramatic pervading his discourses. Nor was he distinguished alone for the ability and success of his pulpit ministrations, but also for his wisdom in council and his administrative capacity In the meridian of life he was removed from the itinerant's extensive field to the invalid's limited  sphere — from the pulpit to the sick-room. In his affliction and death; which occurred in Louisville, Ky., Dec. 8, 1871, he exemplified the truth of what he had preached in life. He was a good man, a kind friend, a popular minister, and his name will long survive. He was the author of quite an interesting volume, entitled The Stage and the Pulpit, now out of print. He served as one of the commissioners of the Church South to settle the claims of that Church with the Methodist Episcopal Church; but, as is well known, that settlement failed to give satisfaction, and a final arrangement was not made until 1876.

## Parsons, David[[@Headword:Parsons, David]]

             D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Jan. 28, 1749, at Amhersta Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1771, entered the ministry in 1775, and was ordained pastor in Amherst, Oct. 2 1782, and resigned Sept. 1,1819. He felt much interest in the cause of education, and gave land for the site of an academy which has since become Amherst College. Parsons died May 18, 1823. He published several of his Sermons (1788,1795, et al.). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:120.

## Parsons, Henry M[[@Headword:Parsons, Henry M]]

             an American Presbyterian minister, was born at Glen's Falls, N. Y., July 27, 1813. He received a careful training from his parents; graduated at Williams College, Mass., in 1835; studied theology under Hugh N. Wilson, D.D., at Southampton, N.Y.; was licensed and ordained Oct. 8, 1847, pastor over the Moriches Church, Long Island. Soon his health began to fail him, and at the earnest solicitation of his people he tried a southern climate; he spent a winter in Cuba, where he served as a chaplain for the seamen at Havana; but after two years' absence he returned and labored another year with his people on Long Island. His health was still poor. and thinking that an inland climate would help him, in 1852 he accepted a call from Warrior Run Church, Pa., where he continued to labor for two years. At length he gave up preaching and traveled for his health, but died Aug. 10, 1859. Mr. Parsons was the author of Christ in the Desert. His mind was well-balanced, his descriptive powers excellent; and his letters from abroad bear evidence of nice discrimination and clearness of perception. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 104. (J. L. S.)

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

             an English prelate, was born at Oxford, July 6, 1761. He graduated from Wadham College; was chosen a fellow of Balliol; and appointed to the college livings of All-Saints' and St. Leonard's, in Colchester. He was recalled to Oxford by his election to the-mastership of Balliol, November 14, 1798; received the office of vice-chancellor in 1807; was promoted to the deanery of Bristol in 1810; instituted to the vicarage of Weare, Somersetshire, in 1812; and consecrated bishop of Peterborough in 1813. He died March 12, 1819. Bishop Parsons was an humble Christian, a ripe scholar, an able preacher, and a wise administrator. See The (Lond.) Christian Remembrancer, June 1819, pge 384; November, page 669.

## Parsons, Jonathan[[@Headword:Parsons, Jonathan]]

             an American Presbyterian minister, was born at West Springfield, Mass., Nov. 30, 1705. He was educated at Yale College, class of 1729. As a student at New Haven he gave many indications of uncommon genius. Soon after graduation Parsons began to preach. He was ordained minister in 1731 of Lyme, Conn., where he continued until 1745. The last thirty years of his life were spent at Newburyport, in one of the largest congregations in America. His labors were incessant, and he sometimes sank under his exertions. During his last sickness he enjoyed the peace of a Christian. He expressed his unwavering assurance of an interest in the favor of God through the Redeemer. He died July 19, 1776, at Newburyport. As a preacher he was eminently useful. During some of the first years of his ministry his style was remarkably correct and elegant; but after a course of years, when his attention was occupied by things of greater importance, his manner of writing was less polished, though perhaps it lost nothing of its pathos and energy. In his preaching he dwelt much and with earnestness upon the doctrines of grace knowing it-to be the design of the Christian religion to humble the pride of man and to exalt the grace of God. His invention was fruitful, his imagination rich, his voice clear and commanding, varying with every varying passion, now forcible, majestic, terrifying. and now soft and persuasive and melting. He was eminent as a scholar, for he was familiar with the classics, and he was skilled in the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages.. He was accounted a dexterous and masterly reasoner. He published at Boston, Letters in the Christian History (1741): — a Lecture (1742): — Lectures on Justification (1748): Good News from a Far Country, in seven Discourses (1756): — Observations, etc. (1757i): — Manna Gathered in the Morning (1761) — Infant Baptism from heaven, in two Discourses (1765): — A Sermon on the Death of G. Whitfield (1770): — Letters of Baptismn (1770): — Freedom firom Civil and Ecclesiastical Tyranny the Purchase of Christ (17:74); — Sixty Sermons on various Subjects (1780,2 vols. 8vo), See Searls Sermon preached at the funeral obsequies; Allen, Amer. Biogr. Dictionary, s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:47-52 Amer. Qu. Rev. 14:109.

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

             (1), a Congregational minister, flourished in the early part of last century. He was born about 1671, and was educated at Harvard College, where he  graduated in 1697. He then studied theology, and became minister of Lebanon, Conn., in 1700. In 1708 he accepted a call to Salisbury, and there died in 1740. He published an Ordiniation Sermon (1733).

## Parsons, Joseph (2)[[@Headword:Parsons, Joseph (2)]]

             (2), also a Congregational minister, was born about 1703, and was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1720. He studied theology, and became pastor at Bradford, Mass., where he died in 1765, in the thirty-ninth year of his ministry. He published three occasional Sermons (1741, 1744, and 1759).

## Parsons, Joseph (3)[[@Headword:Parsons, Joseph (3)]]

             (3), a divine of the Church of England, flourished near the middle of last century as minister of Stanton Harcourt and South Leigh, Oxford. He published. Fast Sermon (1760, 4to): — Thirty Lectures on the Principles of the Christian Religion (1761, 8vo): — Apology for the Church of England (1767, 4to).

## Parsons, Justin Wright, D.D[[@Headword:Parsons, Justin Wright, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Westhampton, Massachusetts, in 1824. He graduated from Williams College in 1845, and from Union Theological Seminary in 1848; was ordained by the New York Presbytery, December 26, 1849, and immediately thereafter sailed for Thessalonica, Greece. After laboring at this post until 1854, he was transferred to Smyrna, Asia Minor, and in 1857 to Baghchijeh, Turkey, thence again in 1861 to Nicomedia, and then, after an absence in the foreign field for twenty years, he returned to his native land on a short visit for the benefit of his health. Having again entered upon his work, in July, 1880, he was making a missionary tour on the mountains east of the sea of Marmora, accompanied by his servant, when they encamped foirthe night; the next morning they were found by the: roadside murdered by a band of Zureks. See N.Y. Observer, August 12, 1880. (W.P.S.)

## Parsons, Levi[[@Headword:Parsons, Levi]]

             a Congregational minister, who was employed also in-missionary labors, was born July 18, 1792, in Goshen, Mass. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1814; was ordained Sept. 3, 1817, and labored under the Vermont Missionary Society a year, when he was sent on an agency into Palestine by the American Board. He sailed with Rev. P. Fisk for Smyrna Nov. 3, 1819, and arrived Jan. 15, 1820, whence they went to the island of Scio, and in November Mr. Parsons started for Palestine, reaching Jerusalem Feb. 12, 1821, where he remained until May 8. After suffering severe illness on the island of Syra, he reached Smyrna Dec. 3, and sailed to Alexandria, where he died, Feb. 11, 1822. Mr. Parsons was a good scholar, and very amiable and interesting in his manners. His life was thoroughly devoted to benevolent work. His biography was written by his brother-in-law, D. V. Morton (1824). See also Amer. Miss. Mem. p. 263; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:644; Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 221; Christian Monthly Spectator, 7:316.

## Parsons, Levi, D.D[[@Headword:Parsons, Levi, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Northampton, Massachusetts, August 20, 1779; graduated from Williams College in 1801; subsequently spent two years as tutor, and trained for the ministry under Dr. Hyde of Massachusetts. He was licensed in 1807, and the same year became pastor  of the Church in Marcellus, N.Y., where he remained twenty-six years. He then supplied Tully for one year, and Otisco for another; next went to his former charge in Marcellus, held it six years longer, and then spent the remainder of his ministry with the Third Church in Marcellus, and at Borodino. He died November 20, 1864. See Mears, Presbyterianism in Central New York, page 628.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born at Gloucester, Mass., in 1716. He graduated at Harvard College in 1736; taught school at Manchester, and  subsequently at Gloucester; was ordained at Bvfield, Mass., in 1744, and continued pastor of that Church until his death in 1783. He published several Sermons (1765, 1772, 1773). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:448 sq.; Memoirs of Chief Justice Parsons (his son), ch, 2, 3, 7.

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

             a noted English divine, was born at Dedham, Essex, in 1729. He was educated at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. Having taken orders, he was appointed to the Free School of Oakham, Rutlandshire. In 1761 he was presented to the school and curacy of Wye, became rector of Eastwell in 1767, and of Snave in 1776. He died in 1812. Parsons published Dialogues of the Dead with the Living (Anon.) (Lond. 1779, 8vo): — Six Letters to a Friend on the Establishment of Sunday-schools (ibid. 1786, 12mo). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. ii, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2, s.v.; (Lond,) Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 82.

## Parsons, Robert[[@Headword:Parsons, Robert]]

             better known as Father Parsons, a noted English divine, originally a Protestant, but finally an ardent adherent of the Romish faith, and a most influential member of the Society of Jesus, was born of very humble parentage at Netherstowey, near Bridgewater, in Somersetshire, in 1546. He was as a boy remarkable for his native endowments and his devotion to study. The vicar of the town, interested in the promising youth, gave him instruction in Latin and Greek, and when he had been properly prepared for college contributed liberally towards Robert's support at Oxford, where he was admitted to Baliol College in 1563. In the university Parsons was remarkable as a clever disputant in scholastic exercise, then much in vogue; so that, having taken his first degree in arts in 1568, he was the same year made probationer-fellow of his college; and, taking pupils, was presently the most noted tutor in it. He entered into orders soon after, and was made socius sacerdos, or chaplain-fellow. In 172 he proceeded M.A., was busar that year, and the next dean of the college; — but being charged by the society with incontinency and embezzling the college money, to avoid the shame of a formal expulsion he was permitted, out of respect for his learning, to send in his resignation, Feb. 1573-4.

After quitting Oxford he went first to London. and thence, June, 1574, through Antwerp to Louvain, where, meeting with the Jesuit father, William Good, his countryman, he spent a week in the spiritual exercises at the college of the  Jesuits. He next proceeded to Padua, there to study medicine, in order to practice it for a support; but he had not been long at Padua before the unsettled state of his mind and of his affairs excited in him a curiosity to visit Rome. This visit fixed him heartily as a Jesuit; for here meeting with some Englishmen of the order, he became so impatient to be among them that he went back to Padua, settled his affairs there, and returning to Rome, May, 1575, was chosen a member of the Society of Jesus, and admitted into the English college. He was indeed framed by nature, as well as bent by inclination, to this society — being fierce, turbulent, and bold, and he soon made a distinguished figure in it. Having completed the course of his studies, he became one of the principal penitentiaries; and was in such credit with the pope in 1579 that he obtained a grant from his highness to raise a hospital at Rome, founded in queen Mary's time, and to establish it as a college or seminary for the English. Later he was sent, together with Campian, to England to influence the Anglican clergy towards a return to the Romish Church, and in this mission proved himself a most dexterous and wily messenger. As the law at the time forbade the admission of popish emissaries, Parsons carefully concealed his purpose; and made himself known only to those he knew he could safely trust. He at one time prided himself in having so far succeeded in his purpose, that the overture of the Anglican Church to the Romish fold was very imminent. But at this very time, so auspicious to him as he believed, his co-laborer was discovered by the watchful agents of lord Burleigh and imprisoned. Parsons thereupon hastily passed over into France, and stopped at Rouen.

While in England he had found means to privately print and put in circulation books advocating the re-establishment of the papal Church in England, and on kindred subjects; and now, not being otherwise employed, he printed others, which he likewise caused to be dispersed there. In 1583 he returned to Rome, being succeeded in his office of superior to the English mission by one Heyward. However, the management of that mission was left to him by Aquavivai, the general of the order, and he was appointed prefect of it in 1592. In the interim having procured for the English seminary before mentioned at Rome a power of choosing an English rector in 1586, he was himself elected into that office the following year. Upon the prodigious preparations in Spain to invade England, father Parsons was despatched to Madrid, to turn the opportunity of the present temper of its monarch to the best advantage of the Jesuits, whose enormities had nearly brought them into the Inquisition. Parsons found means to elude the severity of that tribunal; obtained of the king that his  majesty should appoint one of the judges, and himself another, for this Inquisition, and then set about the main business of the voyage.

He caused seminaries to be erected for the purpose of supplying England from time to time with priests, who should keep alive the spirit of Romanism that he had enkindled, as well as opposition to the Protestant crown, and to prepare the papists there to join with any invasion which those abroad might procure. Thus, for instance, he dealt with the duke of Guise to erect a seminary for. such a purpose in Normandy; and now he prevailed with Philip II to erect such in Spain; so that in a short time they could not only boast of their seminaries at Rome and Rheims, but of those at Valladolid, Seville, and St. Lucar in Spain, at Lisbon in Portugal, and at Douai and St. Omer in Flanders. In all these the English Roman Catholic youth who were sent to them were educated in violent prejudices against their native country, and their minds formed to all the purposes that father Parsons had in his head; one of these was obliging them to subscribe to the title of the infanta of Spain to the crown of England. In support of this scheme he published his. Conference about the next Succession to that Crown, advocating as lawful the intended deposition of queen Elizabeth. After the defeat of the Spanish Armada in 1588, Parsons left no means in his power untried to invite the duke of Guise, at that time all-powerful in France, to a second invasion; and when nothing effectual could be obtained that way, he endeavored to raise a rebellion in England. He tampered with the earl of Derby to appear at the head of it, and when that nobleman refused to be led into disloyal schemes he was poisoned, it is charged, by Parsons' procurement.

Nor is this the only charge brought against Parsons. We find Sir Ralph Winwood informing secretary Cecil from Paris, in 1602, of an attempt to assassinate the queen that year by another English Jesuit, at the. instigation of father Parsons (Winwood, Memorials, vol. 1). Finding all his projects against queen Elizabeth blasted, he plotted the exclusion of king James by several means; one of which was exciting the people to set up a popular form of government, for which he had furnished them with principles in several of his books. Another was to engage the pope in a design of making his kinsman the duke of Parma king of England, and securing the assistance of lady Arabella by marrying her to the duke's brother, cardinal Farnese. Cardinal d'Ossat gives the king of France a large account of both these projects in one of his letters, and in another mentions a third, wherein he himself had been dealt with by Parsons, which was that the pope, the king of France, and the king of Spain should agree among themselves for a successor for England who should be a Catholic, and that  they should join their forces to establish him on the throne (Ossat, Letters, pt. 2, lib. 3). However, the death of his friend, cardinal Allen, in 1594, drew Parsons's attention for a while off these weighty public affairs upon his own private concerns. It was chiefly by his interest that the cardinal had obtained the purple, and he conceived great hopes of succeeding him in it.

The dignity was worth his utmost endeavors, and he turned every stone to compass it. For that purpose he employed some Jesuits to set about in Flanders a petition to the king of Spain, subscribed by great numbers of the lowest of the people as well as those of better rank and quality. He applied also to. that monarch by John Piragues, one of his prime confidants, but received no answer; and then repaired himself to Rome in 1596, under pretense of settling some quarrels that had arisen in the English college there during his absence. He had the year before been complimented, in a letter from some of the principal persons of his order there, on the assured prospect he had of succeeding; and upon his arrival was visited, among others of the highest rank, particularly by cardinal Bellarmine, who encouraged him to wait upon the pope, as he did, with an account of the reports that were spread all over Flanders, and even at Rome, of his holiness's design to confer the purple upon him, and that the king of Spain had written to his holiness regarding this promotion. But in a personal interview with the pontiff, Parsons learned that there had been sent to his holiness so many complaints of him from the secular clergy, that, instead of bringing him into the sacred college, he had some thoughts of stripping him of the posts he was already possessed of. To avert this disgrace, Parsons withdrew on pretense of health to Naples, and did not return to Rome till after the death of the pope (Clement VIII) in 1606. Parsons now continued to devote his attention mainly to the successful termination of the English work; and under the next pontiff, Paul IV, enjoyed greater favor at Rome. When suddenly brought to a sick-bed, and his recovery was regarded as extremely doubtful. the pope indulged Parsons in all the ceremonies usually granted to cardinals at the point of death. Upon his decease at Rome in 1610 his body was embalmed, and interred, pursuant to his own request, in the chapel of his college, close to that of cardinal Allen.

The Jesuits all abound in praise of father Parsons but there are many Romanists who impeach the integrity of his character. Thus cardinal D'Ossat, in a letter to the king of France, giving an account of Parsons's Conference, declares that he was a man who regarded neither truth nor reason. Pasquin also at Rome thus exposed Parsons's factious and plotting  humor: “If there be any man that will buy the kingdom of England, let him repair to a merchant in a black square cap in the city, and he shall have a very good penny worth thereof.” To conclude, the imputation laid upon him by the English secular Romish priests, as well as the Protestants, that Parsons was a person of a turbulent and seditious nature, is sufficiently supported by his numerous writings, the titles of which are as follows: A brief Discourse, containing the Reasons why Catholics refuse to go Church, with a Dedication to Queen Elizabeth, under the fictitious name of John Howlet, Dec. 15, 1580: — Reasons for his coming into the Mission of England, etc.; by some ascribed to Campian: — A brief Censure upon two Books written against the Reasons and Proofs: — A Discovery of John Nichols, unreported a Jesuit, all written and printed while our author was in England: — A Defence of the Censure given upon his two Books, etc. (1583): — De persecutione Ancylicana epistola (Rome and Ingolstadt, 1582): — A Christian Directory (1583): — A second Part of a Christian Directory, etc. (1591); these two parts being printed erroneously at London, our author published an edition of them under this title; A Christian Directory, guiding Men to their Salvation, etc., with many Corrections and Additions by the Author himself; this book is really an excellent one, and was afterwards put into modern English by Dr. Stanhope, dean of Canterbury, and has gone through eight editions, the last in 1782: — Responsio ad Eliz. Reginae edictum contra Catholicos (Romae, 1593), under the name of And. Philopater: — A Conference about the next Succession to the Crown of England, etc. (1594), under the feigned name of Doleman: — A temperat Wardword to the turbulent and seditious Watchword of Sir F. Hastings, Knight, etc. (1599), under the same name: — A Copy of a Letter written by a Master of Arts at Cambridge, etc. (written in 1584, and printed about 1600); this piece was commonly called “Father Parsons's Green Coat,” being sent from abroad with the binding and leaves in that livery: — Apologetical Epistle to the Lords of her Majesty's Privy Council, etc. (1601): — Brief Apology, or Defence of the Catholic Ecclesiastical Hierarchy erected by Pope Clement VIII, etc. (St, Omer, 1601): — A Manifestation of the Folly and bad Spirit of secular Priests (1602): — A Decachordon often quodlibetical Questions (1602): — De Peregrinatione: — An Answer to O. E. whether the Papists or Protestants be true Catholics (1603): — A Treatise of the three Conversions of Paganism to the Christian Religion, published (as are also the two following) under the.name of N. D. [Nicholas Doleman] in 3 vols. 8vo (1603, 1604): — A Relation of a Trial made before the King of  France in 1600 between the Bishop of Evreux and the Lord Plessis Mornay (1604): — A Defence of the precedent Relation, etc. — A Review often public Disputations, etc., concerning the Sacrifices and Sacranent of the Altar (1604):The Foierunner of Bell's Downfall. of Popery (1605): — An Answer to the Fifth Part of the Reports of Sir Edward Coke, etc. (1606, 4to), published under the name of a Catholic Divine: — De sacris alienis non adeundis, quaestiones duce (1607): — A Treatise tending to Mitigation towards Catholic Subjects in England, against Thomas Morton afterwards bishop of Durham (1607)7 The Judgment of a Catholic Gentleman concerning King James's Apology, etc., — (1608): — Sober Reckoning with Thomas Morton (1609): A Discussion of Mr. Barlow's Answer to the Judgment of a Catholic Englishman concerning the Oath of Allegiance (1612); this book, being left not quite finished at our author's death, was afterwards completed and published by Thomas Fitzherbert. The following are also posthumous pieces: The Liturgy of the Sacrament of the Mass (1620): — A Memorial for the Reformation, etc.; thought to be the same with The High Court and Council of the Reformation, finished, after twenty years' labor, in 1596, but not published till after our author's death, and republished from a copy presented to James II, with an introduction and some animadversions by Edward Gee, under the title of The Jesuits' Memorial for the intended Reformation of the Church of England under their first Popish Prince (1690, 8vo). There is also ascribed to him A Declaration of the true Causes of the great Troubles presupposed to be intended against the Realm of England, etc.; seen and allowed, anno 1581. Parsons, besides, translated from the English into Spanish, A Relation of certuin Martyrs in England, printed at Madrid, 1590, 8vo. See Dr. James, Jesuits' Downfall (1612); Berington, Memoirs of Gregor Panzani (papal legate in England under Charles D. Henke, Kirchengesch. vol. 3; Dodd, Ch. Hist. (see Index); Lingard (Romans Cath.), Hist. of England; Hallam, Literary Hist. of Europe; id. Constit. Hist. of England; Green, Hist. of the English People, p. 412; Ranke. Hist. of the Papacy, i, 1439, 504; Nutt., Ch. Hist. of England; (Lond.) Gentleman's Magazine, 1823, p. 412 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1517, 1518.

## Parswanatha[[@Headword:Parswanatha]]

             is the name of the twenty-third of the deified saints of the Jainas in the present aera. Parswanatha and Mahavira, the twenty-fourth, are greatly  revered, especially in Hindostan. In a suburb of Benares, called Belupura, there is a temple honored as the, birthplace of Parswanatha. See JAINAS.

## Partake[[@Headword:Partake]]

             to receive a share. The saints are partakers of Christ and of the heavenly calling. By receiving Jesus Christ and his Spirit into their. hearts, they possess them and their blessings and influences as their own, and are effectually called to the heavenly glory (Heb 3:1-14; Heb 6:4). They are partakers of God's promises and benefits; they have ‘an interest in all the promises, and shall receive every blessing therein contained (Eph 3:6; 1Ti 6:2). They are partakers of the divine nature, and of Christ's holiness, “when, through union with Christ and fellowship with him in his righteousness and spirit, their nature is conformed to Christ (2Pe 1:4). They partake of Christ's sufferings, and of the afflictions of the Gospel, when they are persecuted for their adherence to the truth and example of Christ (1Pe 4:13; 2Co 1:7; 2Ti 1:8). They partake of the grace of Paul, and other ministers, when they receive spiritual edification from their ministry (Php 1:7). Hypocrites are partakers of the Holy Ghost. Some of them in the apostolic age enjoyed his miraculous gifts and operations; and in every age they receive such convictions, or other influences, as are separable from a state of grace (Heb 6:4). Men become partakers in other men's sins by contriving, consenting, inclining to, rejoicing in, assisting to commit, or sharing the profits or pleasures of their sin; or by occasioning them by an evil example, or offensive use of things indifferent; by provoking or tempting to, or not doing all we can to hinder their sin; or by commanding, exciting, or hiring men to sin; or by defending, extenuating, or commending their sin; by neglecting to reprove, and promote the proper punishment of sin; and by not mourning over and praying against sin (Rev 10:3-4; Eph 5:11).

## Parthenai (Or Parthenay), Anne De[[@Headword:Parthenai (Or Parthenay), Anne De]]

             an accomplished and pious lady, the wife of Anthony de Pons, count of Marennes, was duchess of Ferrara, daughter of Louis XII, and one of the brightest ornaments of the court of Renee de France. She was a protectress of learning, and was herself, on account of her abilities and accomplishments, the delight of every society into which she entered. She understood Greek and Latin, and took great pleasure in conversing with  theologians and reading the Scriptures, which induced her to turn Protestant, and to give succor to the Reformed cause.

## Parthenay, Jean de[[@Headword:Parthenay, Jean de]]

             lord of Soubise, a heroic leader among the Protestants of France, was descended from an ancient Romish family of his name, and was born about 1512. He chose the profession of arms, and having distinguished himself in it, was appointed to command Henry II's troops in Italy about 1550. Before he left Italy he imbibed the sentiments of the Reformed religion at the court of Ferrara, under the auspices of Renee. After his return to France lord Soubise applied himself with extraordinary zeal to propagate his principles in the town and neighborhood of Soubise, and he succeeded so well that in a little time the mass was forsaken all about the place by a great part of the people. He also held frequent conferences with Catharine de Medicis, queen-mother of Henry III, who became in her heart his proselyte, though she had not courage enough to declare it openly; and the duchess of Montpensier, who was always present at these ‘conferences, was so much wrought upon by Soubise's discourse that she desired on her death-bed to have the sacrament administered to her according to the Calvinistical form. The queen-mother, when she came to be regent of the kingdom during the infancy of Charles IX, appointed Parthenay gentleman of the chamber to the young monarch in 1561; and he was likewise created a knight of the order of the Holy Ghost. The same year the prince of Condd, the head of the Huguenot party, was also set at liberty: and in the very beginning of the religious war that prince, pooling, on the, large, city of Lyons which had declared for the Protestant cause, as not in safe hands under the baron D'Adret, appointed Soubise to that important command in 1562; and he answered fully all the expectations which the prince had conceived of him. He performed a hundred bold actions there, and resolutely kept the city, defending it effectually against all difficulties both from force and artifice. The duke of Nevers besieged it to no purpose, and the queen-mother attempted in vain to overreach him by negotiations. He persevered in maintaining and promoting the Protestant cause with unabated ardor till his death in 1566, when he was about fifty-four. His wife, Antoinette Bouchard, eldest daughter of the house of Aubeterre, is also noted as a most devoted advocate of the Protestant cause.

## Parthenia[[@Headword:Parthenia]]

             a surname of Artemis (Diana), and also of Hera (Juno).

## Parthenius[[@Headword:Parthenius]]

             an Eastern prelate, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was successor to Cyrill Lucar (q.v.) in the patriarchate of Constantinople. Parthenius was a man of unusual mental powers, and in his position held remarkable sway. Not only in the East, but also in Russia his influence was felt. Opposed to all reformatory inroads, the freed the Church from Calvinistic doctrinal tendencies, as well as everything that betrayed the influence of Protestant ideas. He was also the principal promoter of the Ο᾿ρθόδοξος ὁμολογία, which the Russian orthodox metropolitan Peter Mogilas (q.v.) prepared, and which in the synod at Jerusalem in 1672 was adopted as the principal confession of the whole Greek Church. Parthenius died very near the close of the 17th century. See Neale, Hist. of the Eastern Church (patriarchate of Constantinople).

## Parthenon[[@Headword:Parthenon]]

             is the temple which the Greeks dedicated at Athens to Minerva (q.v.). It is one of the most celebrated of the Greek temples, and is usually regarded as one of the most perfect specimens a Greek architecture. Many of the sculptures have been removed from the Parthenon in modern times, and the different capitals of Europe highly prize the secured relics from this historic place. SEE ATHENS.

## Parthenos[[@Headword:Parthenos]]

             (Gr, a virgin), a surname of Athene (Minerva) at Athens, where the Parthenon was dedicated to her.

## Parthia[[@Headword:Parthia]]

             SEE PARTHIAN.

## Parthian[[@Headword:Parthian]]

             (Πάρθος). Parthians are spoken of in Act 2:9 as being with their neighbors, the Medes and Elamites, present at Jerusalem on the day of  Pentecost. The persons referred to were Jews who had settled in Parthia (Παρθία in Ptolemy, Παρθυαία in Strabo and Arrian), and the passage shows how widely spread were members of the Hebrew family in the first century of our aera. SEE DIASPORA. The term originally referred to a small mountainous district lying to the north-east of Media. Afterwards it came to be applied to the great Parthian kingdom into which this province. expanded. To the history of the Parthians there seems to be but one allusion in the Old Testament, that in Daniel (Dan 11:44; comp. Tacit. Hist. v, 8) to the campaigns of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Parthia Proper was the region stretching along the southern flank of the mountains which separate the great Persian desert from the desert of Kharesm. It lay south of Hyrcania, east of Media, and north of Sagartia. The country was pleasant, and fairly fertile, watered by a number of small streams flowing from the mountains, and absorbed after a longer or a shorter course by the sands. It is now known as the Atak or “skirt,” and is still a valuable part of Persia, though supporting only a scanty population. In ancient times it seems to have been densely peopled; and the ruins of many large and apparently handsome cities attest its former prosperity (see Fraser, Khorassan, p. 245).

The ancient Parthians are called a “Scythic” race (Strabo, 11:9, § 2; Justin, 41:1-4; Arrian, Fr. 1), and probably belonged to the great Turanian family. Various stories are told of their origin. Moses of Chorene calls them the descendants of Abraham by Keturah (Hist. Armnen. 2:65); while John of Malala relates that they were Scythians whom the Egyptian king Sesostris brought with him on his return from Scythia, and settled-in a region of Persia (Hist. Univ. p. 26; comp. Arriar, l.c.). Really nothing is known of them till about the time of Darius Hystaspis, when they are found in the district which so long retained their name, and appear as faithful subjects of the Persian monarchs. We may fairly presume that they were added to the empire by Cyrus, about B.C. 550; for that monarch seems to have been the conqueror of all the north-eastern provinces. Herodotus speaks of them as being contained in the 16th satrapy of Darius, where they were joined with the Chorasmians, the Sogdians, and the Aryans, or people of Herat (Herod. 3:93). He also states that they served in the army which Xerxes led into Greece, under the same leader as the Chorasmians (7:66). They carried bows and arrows. and short spears, but were not at that time held in much  repute as soldiers. In the final struggle between the Greeks and Persians they remained faithful to the latter, serving at Arbela (Arrian, Exp. Alex. 3:8), but offering only a weak resistance to Alexander when, on his way to Bactria, he entered their country (ib. 25). In the divisior of Alexander's dominions they fell to the share of Eumenes, and Parthia for some time was counted among the territories of the Seleucidae. About B.C. 256, however, they ventured upon a revolt, and under Arsaees (whom Strabo calls “a king of the Dahae,” but who was more probably a native leader) they succeeded in establishing their independence. This was the beginning of the great Parthian empire, which may be regarded as rising out of the ruins of the Persian, and as taking its place during the centuries when the Roman power was at its height. During the Syro-Macedonian period the Parthian and Jewish history kept apart in separate spheres, but under the Romans the Parthians ,defended the party of Antigotus against Hyrcanus, and even took and plundered Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. 14:13, 3; War, 1:13).

Parthia, in the mind of the writer of the Acts, would designate this empire, which extended from India to the Tigris, and from the Chorasmian desert to the shores of the Southern Ocean. Hence the prominent position of the name Parthians in the list of those present at Pentecost. Parthia was a power almost rivaling Rome — the only existing power which had tried its strength against Rome and not been worsted in the encounter. By the defeat and destruction of Crassus near Carrhee (the scriptural Harran) the Parthians acquired that character for military prowess which attaches to them in the best writers of the Roman classical period (see Horace, Od. 2:13; Sat. 2:1, 15; Virgil, Georg. 3:31; Ovid, Ars Am. 1:209, etc.). Their armies were composed of clouds of horsemen, who were all riders of extraordinary expertness; their chief weapon was the bow. They shot their arrows with wonderful precision while their horses were in full career, and were proverbially remarkable for the injury they inflicted with these weapons on an enemy who attempted to follow them in their flight. The government of Parthia was monarchical; but as there was no settled and recognized line of succession, rival aspirants were constantly presenting themselves, which weakened the country with internal broils, especially as the Romans saw it to be their interest to foster dissensions and encourage rivalries. From the time of Crassus to that of Trajan they were an enemy whom Rome especially dreaded, and whose ravages she was content to repel without; revenging. The warlike successor of Nerva had the boldness to attack them; and his expedition, which was well conceived and  vigorously conducted, deprived them of a considerable portion of their territories. In the next reign, that of Hadrian, the Parthians recovered these losses; but their military strength was now upon the decline, and in A.D. 226 the last of the Arsacidae was forced to yield his kingdom to the revolted Persians, who, under Artaxerxes, son of Sassan, succeeded in re- establishing their empire. The Parthian dominion thus lasted for nearly five centuries, commencing in the third century before, and terminating in the third century after, our era.

It has already been stated that the Parthians were a Turanian race. Their success is to be regarded as the subversion of a tolerably advanced civilization by a comparative barbarism — the substitution of Tartar coarseness for Aryan polish and refinement. They aimed indeed at adopting the art and civilization of those whom they conquered, but their imitation was a poor travesty, and there is something ludicrously grotesque in most of their more ambitious efforts. At the same time they occasionally exhibit a certain amount of skill and taste, more especially where they followed Greek models. Their architecture was better than their sculpture. The famous ruins of Ctesiphon have a grandeur of effect which strikes every traveler; and the Parthian constructions at Akkerkuf, El Hammam, etc., are among the most remarkable of Oriental remains. Nor was grandeur of general effect the only merit of their buildings. There is sometimes a beauty and delicacy in their ornaimentation which is almost worthy the Greeks. For specimens of Parthian sculpture and architecture; see Sir R. K. Porter, Travels, vol. 1, plates 1924; vol. 2, plates 62-66 and 82, etc.4 For the general history of the nation, see Heeren, Manual of Anc. Hist. p. 229-305, Eng. transl.; Smith; Dict. of Greek and Roman Geog. s.v.; and especially. Rawlinson's Sixth Oriental Monarchy — Parthia (Lond. 1871), on whose article in Smith's Dict. of the Bible the above is chiefly founded. The geography of Parthia may be studied, besides the ancient authorities, in Cellar. Notit. 2:700; Mannert, v. 102; Forbiger, Handb. 2:546 sq. See also Anmer. Ch. Rev. Oct. 1873, art. 3; Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1874, art. 8.

## Participation[[@Headword:Participation]]

             the act of sharing jointly with others in any object or benefit. “Participation” is what is meant by “communion,” when applied by the apostle to the body and blood of Christ sacramentally received. The “communion” is “on the part of the receivers of that ordinance; the Greek word which is so rendered (κοινωνία) not signifying communication, as  from the priest, of any benefit of which he is the dispenser, but, the partaking together, the joint enjoyment, of the spiritual benefits of which Christ, by the sacrifice of himself, has called us to be partakers.” SEE COMMUNION.

## Particular Baptists[[@Headword:Particular Baptists]]

             SEE BAPTISTS.

## Particular Redemption[[@Headword:Particular Redemption]]

             SEE REDEMPTION.

## Particularists[[@Headword:Particularists]]

             a name sometimes applied to Calvinists (q.v.), at least such as hold the doctrine of particular redemption and a limited atonement. SEE GRACE.

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

             M.A., an English divine, was a native of Scotland. The time of his birth is not known to us. In 1732 he became minister of a dissenting congregation at Hampstead. He also preached at Founders' Hall, London, in 1738. He died in 1749. Partington published a Sermon (Jam 1:17) on the right Improvement of the Gifts of God's Bounty (Lond. 1733, 8vo).

## Partington, Josiah[[@Headword:Partington, Josiah]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Manchester, England, Dec. 25, 1801. He was educated privately, and studied theology under the care of a minister. In 1832 he immigrated to the United States, was licensed and ordained by Niagara Presbytery, and preached successively for the churches of Knowlesville. and Byron, N. Y.; Pelham, C. W.; and in Youngstown, N.Y., where he died, Feb. 14, 1864. Mr. Partington was a man of sterling piety and earnest zeal for the Master. He possessed special command of language, good reasoning powers, and strong concentration. He died with his armor on, and in the full triumph of faith in Jesus. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 317. (J. L. S.)

## Partition, Middle Wall Of[[@Headword:Partition, Middle Wall Of]]

             (μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ), an expression used by Paul to designate the Mosaic law as the dividing line between Jews and Gentiles (Eph 2:14). Commentators are not exactly a greed as to the special point ‘of the comparison, whether to the חֵיל, or sacred fence of stone pillars erected in the Temple to warn off all non-Jews (Josephas, ἑρκίον λιθίνου δρυφάκτου, Ant. 15:11, 5), or the inner veil of the Most Holy Place (1Ki 6:21, עַבֵּר, “he made a partition”), which was rent at the crucifixion (Mat 27:51; comp. Heb 10:20). SEE TEMPLE.

## Partridge[[@Headword:Partridge]]

             (Heb. kore, קֹרֵא, so named from its calling, 1Sa 26:20, Sept. νυκτοκόραξ, Vulg. perdix; Jer 17:11, Sept. πέρδιξ, Vulg. perdix), a bird mentioned in Scripture only in the two passages referred to above. Bochart would understand by it the snipe (Hieroz. 2:652 sq.), on the ground of the similarity of the word kore to the supposed Arabic karia; but the argument rests on a very. doubtful basis, and, besides, the snipe does not seem! from the context to be the bird intended (see Faber: on Harmer, Observ. 1:306 sq.). Faber himself understands the same bird. called in Arabic katta or katha (see Hasselquist, Travels, p, 331 sq.; Schr6der, Spec. Hieroz. 2:81), Which, however, is really a quail (see Oedmahnn, Samnml. 2:54 sq., who, in 2:57, identifies the karia of Arabic writers with the Merops apiaster, or bee-eater). For the former theories on the meaning of the word, see Rosenmüller, ad Bochart, 2:736; Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1232 sq.

The rock-partridge is strong on the wing, and fleet of foot. It is wild and shy, sagacious in availing itself of whatever facilities for concealment may be afforded by the district in which it happens to be. The flesh is used as food by the Arabs, though it is dry, and far inferior in flavor to that of our species. Its powers and craft make its pursuit an exciting sport, and hence it is hunted with avidity. Dr. Shaw (Travels, p. 236) describes the mode of hunting the partridge thus: “The Arabs have another, though a more laborious method of catching these birds; for, observing that they become languid and fatigued after they have been hastily put up twice or thrice, they immediately run in upon them, and knock them down with their zerwattys, or bludgeons, as we should call them.” On this Harmer (Observ. 2:76) comments as follows: “It was precisely in this manner that Saul  hunted David, coming hastily upon him, and putting him up from time to time, in hopes that he should at length, by frequent repetitions of it, be able to destroy him.” Egmont and Heymen (2:49) give an account of the manner of taking snipes in the Holy Land, very much like the Arab way of catching partridges. They say that if the company be numerous, they may be hunted on horseback, as they are then never suffered to rest till they are so tired that you may almost take them in your hand. But snipes delight in watery places. David, therefore, being in dry deserts, might rather mention the partridge.

It will be seen by the marginal reading that the passage in Jeremiah may bear the following interpretation: As the kore “gathereth young which she hath not brought forth.” This rendering is supported by the Sept. and Vulg., and is that which Maurer (Comment. in Jer. l.c.), Rosenmüller (Sch. in Jer. l.c.),. Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v.), and scholars generally adopt. In order to meet the requirements of this latter interpretation, it has been asserted that the partridge is in the habit of stealing the eggs from the nests of its congeners and of sitting upon them, and that when the young are hatched they forsake their false parent; hence, it is said, the meaning of the simile: the man who has become rich by dishonest means loses his riches, as the fictitious partridge her stolen brood (see Jerome in Jerem. l.c.). It is perhaps almost needless to remark that this is a mere fable, in which, however, then ancient. Orientals may have believed. There is a passage in the Arabian naturalist Damir, quoted by Bochart (Hieroz. 2:638), which shows that in his time this opinion was held with regard to some kind of partridge.

The explanation of the rendering of the text of the A.V. is obviously as follows. Partridges were often hunted in ancient times as they are at present, either by hawking, or by being driven from place to place till they become fatigued, when they are easily captured or killed in the manner above described. Thus nests were no doubt constantly disturbed, and many destroyed: as, therefore, is a partridge which is driven from her eggs, so is he that enricheth himself by unjust means — “he shall leave them in the midst of his days.” The expression in Sir 11:30, “like as a partridge taken (and kept) in a cage,” clearly refers, as Shaw (Travels, l.c.) has observed, to “a decoy partridge,” and the Greek πέρδιξ θηρευτής should have been so translated, as is evident both from the context and the Greek words; comp. Aristot. Hist. Anim. 9:9, § 3 and 4. The “hunting this bird upon the mountains” (1Sa 26:20) entirely agrees with the  habits of the Greek partridge (Caccabis saxatilis) and the desert partridge (Ammoperdix Heyi). The.specific name of the former is partly indicative of the localities it frequents, viz. rocky and hilly ground covered with brushwood. Our common partridge (Perdix cinerea), as well as the Barbary (C .petrosa) and red-leg (C. rufa), do not occur in Palestine,

Late commentators state that there are four species of the tetrao (grouse) of Linnaeus abundant in Palestine; the francolin (T. francolinus); the katta (T. alchata), the red-legged or Barbary partridge (T. petrosus), and the Greek partridge (T. saxatilis). In this now obsolete classification there are included not less than three genera, according to the more correct systems of recent writers, and not one strictly a grouse occurs in the number, though the real T. urogallus, or cock of the woods, is reported as frequenting Asia Minor in winter, and in that case is probably no stranger in Libanus. There is, however, the genus Pterocles, of which the P. alchata is the katta (ganga, cata), and pin-tailed grouse of authors, a species very common in Palestine, and innumerable in Arabia; but it is not the only one, for the sand-grouse of Latham (P. arenarius) occurs in France, Spain, Barbary, Arabia, Persia, and on the north side of the Mediterranean, or all round Palestine. P. Arabicus, and probably P. exustus, or the Arabian and singed gangas, occur equally in the open districts of the south, peopling the desert along with the ostrich. All are distinguished from other genera of Tetraonidae by their long and powerful wings, enabling them to reach water, which they delight to drink in abundance; and by this propensity they often indicate to the thirsty caravan in what direction to find relief. They feed more on insects, larvae, and worms than on seeds, and, none of the species having a perfect hind toe that reaches the ground, they run fast: these characteristics are of some importance in determining whether they were held to be really clean birds, and consequently could be the selav of the Israelites, which our versions have rendered “quail.” SEE QUAIL.

The francolin forms a second genus, of which F. vulgaris, or the common tree- partridge, is the Syrian species best known, though most likely not the only one of that country. It is larger than the ganga; the male is always provided with one pair of spurs ‘though others of the genus have two), and has the tail longer than true partridges. This species is valued for the table, is of handsome plumage, and common from Spain and France, on both sides of the Mediterranean, eastward to Bengal. The partridge is a third genus, reckoning in Syria the two species before named, both red-legged and  furnished with orange and black crescents on the sides; but the other markings differ, and “the Barbary species is smaller than the Greek. They are inferior in delicacy to the common partridge, and it is probable that Perdix rufa and the Caspian partridge, both resembling the former in many particulars, are no strangers in Syria. The expostulation of David with Saul, where he says, “The king of Israel is come out to seek a flea as when one doth hunt a partridge on the mouutains,” is perfectly natural; for the red- legged partridges are partial to upland brushwood, which is not an uncommon chatacter of the hills and mountains of Palestine; and the kore sitting on her eggs and not hatching them (Jer 17:11) alludes to the liability of the nest being trodden under foot, or robbed by carnivorous animals, notwithstanding all the care and interesting manoeuvres of the parent birds to save it or the brood; for this genus is monogamous, nestles on the ground, and both male and female sit and anxiously watch over the safety. of their young. This explanation renders it unnecessary to resort to exploded notions drawn from the ancients. Little regard is paid to specific and generic identity, by the rabbinical and Arabian writers.

The name קראֹ kore, is, we think, derived from the voice of a bird, and more than one species of bastard is thereby indicated in various tongues to the extremity of Africa and of India; among which Otis cory and Otis Arabs are so called at this day, although the first mentioned resides on the plains of Western India, the second in Arabia. Both these, however, appear to be the same species. “Cory” is likewise applied in Caffrarkia to a bustard, which from an indigenous word has been converted by the Dutch into knorhaan. Notwithstanding the pretended etymology of the word, by which it is made to indicate a long beak, none of the genus, not even Otis Denhanzi (a large bird of Northern Africa), has it long, it being, in fact, middle-sized in all. Thus it would appear that the type of the name belongs to Otis, and it might be maintained that species of that genus were known to the Hebrews; by their name keor, were it not for the fact that birds bearing this name were hunted by the Hebrews, which could not well have been the case had they not included other genera; for bustards, being without a hind toe, were considered unclean, while partridges, having it, were clean. The ganga, or katta, being provided with a small, incomplete one, may have offered an instance where the judgment of the priesthood must have decided. SEE UNCLEAN (BIRDS).

 The following account of the bird denoted by the Heb. kote, taken from Tristram's Nat. Hist. of the Bible, s.v., is probably the. most correct: “The commonest partridge of the Holy Land is the Greek partridge (Caccabis saxatilis), a bird somewhat resembling our red-legged partridge in plumage, with the richly barred feathers on the flanks, and deep-red legs and bill, but. much larger, approaching the pheasant in size, and very distinct in habits from our gray partridge. In every part of the hill country, whether wooded or bare, it abounds, and its ringing call-note in early morning echoes from cliff to cliff alike amid the barrenness of the hills of Judaea and in the glens of the forest of Carmel. The male birds will stand erect on some boulder, sending their cheery challenge, to some rival across the wady, till, the moment they perceive themselves detected, they drop down from their throne and scud up the hill faster than any dog, screening themselves from sight by any projecting rock as they run. The coveys in autumn are very large; but the birds do not pack very much in winter, probably from the necessity of dispersing themselves to obtain food. In the wilder parts of Galilee the Greek partridge is especially abundant. The Syrian bird is, I am inclined to believe, a distinct variety from any other. In coloration it closely resembles the Indian Chukor partridge, but it is much larger, exceeding even the specimens from continental Greece in size, and it has a deeper black gorget than the bird from other countries. Whether it be a species or variety, the Syrian bird is undoubtedly the largest and the finest of all the true partridges. The Greek partridge inhabits a wide range from east to west, extending from Galicia, in the west of Spain, through the Pyrenees and Alps to Greece, Asia Minor, Persia, and Northern India- at least, the species of all these countries are very closely allied.

“‘The true partridge of the wilderness is another and very different bird (A mmoperdix Heyi), decidedly smaller than the common English partridge, and a bird of most delicate penciling in its plumage. The bill and legs are a rich orange color, the back finely mottled, a bright white spot behind the eye, and the flanks striped with purple and red-brown. It is peculiar, so far as we know, to Arabia Petreea. the basin of the Dead Sea and its wadies, and to the eastern strip of the wilderness of Judaea, where it supplants in some degree the larger species, though both are found in the same localities. In the neighborhood of the Cave of Adullam it is very plentiful, and it often lays its beautiful cream-colored eggs in holes in caves, as well  as under the shelter of crevices of rocks. It runs with wonderful agility up and down the cliffs, and its call-note is like that of the other partridge.

“In the rich lowland plains, as of Gennesaret, Acre, and Phoenicia, the place of the partridge is taken by the francolin, a bird of the same family, well known in India as the black partridge, and formerly found in Southern Europe as far as Spain, but now quite extinct on the Continent. The francolin (Francolinus vulgaris) is as large and heavy as the red grouse, concealing itself in the dense herbage and growing corn of marshy plains, where its singular call can be heard, as on Gennesareth, resounding at daybreak from every part of the plain while not a bird can be seen. It is distinguished from the hajel, or partridge, by the Arabs, but was doubtless included under kore by the Hebrews. The male bird is very beautiful, with deep black breast flanks black with large white spots, and a rich chestnut colar fringed with black and. white spots.

“With the partridges may also be included the sandgrouse (Pterocles), of which several species occur in great abundance in the more and parts of the country. Some have supposed the sand-grouse to have been the ‘quail' of the Israelites in the wilderness — both, as it appears, needles conjectures. The sand-grouse are recognized by very distinct names by the Orientals. They are a peculiar group of gamebirds, in some respects approaching the pigeons, and inhabit the sandy regions of Africa and Asia in myriads. Two species are found so far north as Spain, and in the ‘Landes' in the south of France. One of these (Pterocles arenarius), the common sand-grouse, the khudry of the Arabs, inhabits the wilderness of Judaea, and the other (P. sefarnus), the pin-tailed sand-grouse, the kata of the Arabs, may be seen passing over the barer parts of the Jordan valley and the eastern desert by thousands at a time. It was beautifully described by Russell in the Natural History of Aleppo, more than a century ago. Two other species, also common in Arabia and Egypt, abound in the wilderness of Judaea and near the Dead Sea (P. exustus and P. Senegalensis), both birds remarkable for the delicate markings of their plumage, but, like all the species of the genus, of a general sandy hue, which admirably assists them in escaping observation on the bare plains.” SEE BIRD.

## Partridge, ALFRED H., D.D[[@Headword:Partridge, ALFRED H., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born December 11, 1811. He graduated from the General Theological Seminary, N.Y., in 1838, was rector of St. Matthew's, Bedford, seventeen years, then of Christ Church, Brooklyn, until his death, April 8, 1883.

## Party-spirit[[@Headword:Party-spirit]]

             is a certain limitation of that general social principle which binds together- the human species. It consists in the attachment men are disposed to feel towards any association or body they may belong to in itself, and towards  the fellow-members of the same, as such, over and above any regard they may have for them individually. Those who are unaccustomed to clearness of distinction are, when speaking of party spirit, apt to confound together the combination itself and the particular objects which in any particular case may be proposed. There is no party-spirit necessarily generated in the forming of a combination with others for fixed and definite objects, to be pursued by specified means, and under regulations distinctly laid down and strictly observed; but the party-spirit which is to be wholly removed and sedulously shunned in religious matters consists in a general indefinite conformity to the views and practices of some party, without limitation of time or objects. Those who disapprove of such adherence to a religious party found that disapprobation upon the opinion that it is setting up man in. the place of God. “Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest,” they consider to be the expression of precisely that sort of allegiance which is due to God, and not due to man. They remember the injunction, “Be not ye called Master; for one is your master, even Christ.”

## Paruah[[@Headword:Paruah]]

             [some Paru'ah] (Heb. Paru'ach, פָּרוּחִ, blessing [Gesen.], or increase [Furst]; Sept. Φαῤῥού, v.r. Φρυασούθ and Φαρουέ), the father of Jehoshaphat, which latter was Solomon's purveyor in Issachar (1Ki 4:17). B.C. cir. 1012.

## Parvaim[[@Headword:Parvaim]]

             (Heb. Parva'yim, פִּרְוִיַם, a dual form from some unknown פִּרְוִי; Sept. Φαρουίμ), a region producing gold used in adorning, Solomon's Temple (2Ch 3:6). There is very strong reason to conclude with Bochart (Can. 1:46) that it is the same with Ophir. Castell, however (Lexic. Heptagl. col. 3062), identifies it with Barbatia on the Tigris, which is named by Pliny (Hist. Nat. 6:32); and Gesenius, seeking the root of the name in the Sanscrit puriva, “before,” i.e. “eastern,” concludes it to be a general term, corresponding to our Levant, meaning east country; so that “gold of Parvaim” means Eastern gold (Thesaur. 2:25; so Wilford in the Asiat. Research. 8:276). Knobel conjectures (Volkert. p. 191) that it is an abbreviated form of Sepharvaim, which stands in the Syriac version and the Targum of Jonathan for the Sephar of Gen 10:30. Hitzig maintains (on Dan 10:5) that the name is derived from the Sanscrit  parna, “hill,” and betokens the δίδυμα ὄρη in Arabia mentioned by Ptolemy (6:7, § 11).

## Parvati[[@Headword:Parvati]]

             one of the names given in Hindû mythology to the consort of Siva. She was worshipped as the universal mother and the principle of fertility. She is also considered as the goddess of the moon. In consequence of her remarkable victory over the giant Durga she was honored as a heroine with the name of Durga, and in this form her annual festival is most extensively celebrated in Eastern India. By the worshippers of Siva the personified energy of the divine nature is termed Parvdti, Bhavdni, or Durga; and the Tautras assume the form of a dialogue between Siva and his bride in one of her many forms, but mostly as Una and Parvati, in which the goddess questions the god as to the mode of performing various ceremonies, and the prayers and incantations to be used in them. These the god explains at length, and, under solemn cautions that they involve a great mystery, on no account to be divulged to the profane. See Gardner Faiths of the World, 2:622; Moor, Hindû Pantheon (see Index).

## Parvin, Robert J.[[@Headword:Parvin, Robert J.]]

             an Episcopal clergyman, was born at Deerfield, N. J., in 1823, and was educated for holy orders at the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary of Virginia, where he graduated in 1847. After ordination he was successively stationed at Christ Church, Towanda; Trinity Church; Rochester; Pittsfield, Mass.; Le Roy, N. Y.; and in 1860 went to Cheltenham, Pa. In 1866 he became general secret mar of the Evangelical Education Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and held this position until his death on the wreck of the steamer “United States” on the Ohio river, Dec. 4, 1868. He published Sunday-school Illustrations (Phila. 1851, 18mo; very popular): — The Shepherd's Voice (1853): — —Union Notes on the Gospels (1855-58, 2 vols. 18mo); this is based on an English work, and, like all publications of Parvin, is very largely circulated. — He also contributed to many periodicals, and wrote a number of children's stories. See Newton, God's Interest in the Death of his People (Phila. 1869).

## Parvis(e)[[@Headword:Parvis(e)]]

             is the name given to an enclosed space, paradise (q.v.), or atrium, or to the court in front of a church, which is usually surrounded with cloisters. The name is also given sometimes to a churchyard. The cloister-garth at Chichester is still called paradise; and the space around a church is usually termed parvise in France. The latter term is often, however, employed to denote a room over the porch of a church, which is often used for a library, as the residence of a chantry-priest, or as a record-room or school.

The parvise is a relic of the primitive arrangement; the ancient basilicas: had a fore-court, surrounded with porticos, and containing in the center tombs, wells, fountains, and statues. At the close of the 12th century the parvise became open, and only slightly marked out, to show the episcopal jurisdiction. On it scaffolds were erected, on which delinquent clerks were exposed, and criminals did open penance; the relics were exhibited, and the inferior clergy were ranged, while their superiors occupied the open galleries above to sing the Gloria. At Rheims, and Notre Dame, Paris, the parvise was enclosed with a low wall; at Amiens and Lisieux the raised platform exists; and at Rhadegund's, Poictiers, the coped-wall, with dueling angels, dogs, and lions, and its five entrances remain perfect, A trace of the same plan may be seen in front of Lichfield. At Laach, and St. Ambrose's, Milan, the parvise and cloister remain; and the fore-court at Parenzo, Salerno, Aschaffenburg, St. Clement's, and other churches at Rome.

## Pas(S)Inelli, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Pas(S)Inelli, Lorenzo]]

             an Italian painter, was born in 1629 at Bologna. He first studied under Simone Cantarini, and next with Flaminio Torre. He afterwards went to Venice, where he became enamored of the ornamental and brilliant style of Paul Veronese, and he made the works of that master his model, though he did not servilely imitate him. Lanzi says, “He borrowed from Veronese his effective and magnificent composition, but the airs of his heads and the distribution of his colors he obtained from another source; and though he never acquired the correctness of design which distinguishes the works of Torre, yet in this respect he surpassed Paolo.” On his return to Bologna, Pasilelli found abundant employment in painting, principally for the churches. He was naturally inclined to create surprise by the display of copious, rich, and spirited compositions; such are his two pictures at the Certosa, representing Christ's Entrance into Jerusalem, and his Return into Limbo; and such, too, is his history of Coriolanus, in the Casa Ranuzzi — a piece found repeated in many collections. No one can behold these paintings without granting to Pasinelli a true painter's fire, great novelty of ideas, and an elevated character. With these gifts, he was sometimes too extravagant in his imitation of the attributes, pompous spectacles, and strange and novel draperies of Veronese, which he is thought to have carried to the extreme, as in his Preaching of John the Baptist in the Wilderness, which gave occasion to his rival Taruffi sarcastically to remark that, instead of the desert of Judaea, he discovered in it the piazza of St. Mark at Venice. He nevertheless knew how to moderate his fire according to his theme, as in his Holy Family, in the church of the Barefooted Carmelites, which partakes of the elegance and grace of Albano. The most esteemed of his paintings in the churches at Bologna are the Resurrection, in St. Francesca; and the Martyrdom of St. Ursula and her Companions, in the Palazzo Zambeccari. Pasinelli died in 1700. Basan erroneously states that Pasinelli etched some plates, and mentions two – St. John Preachinq in the Wilderness, and the Martyrdom  of St. Ursula and other saints; but these plates were engraved by Lorenzini, a scholar of Pasinelli.

## Pas-Dammim[[@Headword:Pas-Dammim]]

             (Heb. Pas Danmmim', פִּס דִּמַּים, wrist of blood [or extension of brooks, Furst]; Sept. Φασοδομή v.r. Φασοδομίν,Vulg. Aphesdomim), the form in 1Ch 11:13 of the name which in 1Sa 17:1 is given more at length as EPHES-DAMMIM. It will be observed that in the original of Pas-dammim the article (הִפִּס) has taken the place of the first letter of the other form (אֶפֶס). In the parallel narrative of 2 Samuel 23 the name appears to be corrupted (Kennicott, Dissert. p. 137) to charpham (חָרְפָם), in the A.V. rendered “there.” The present text of Josephus (Ant. 7:12, 4) gives it as Arasanos (Α᾿ράσαμος). The chief interest attaching to the appearance of the name in this passage of Chronicles is the evidence it affords that the place was the scene of repeated encounters between Israel and the Philistines, unless indeed we treat 1Ch 11:13 (and the  parallel passage, 2Sa 23:11) as an independent account of the occurrence related in 1 Samuel 17, which hardly seems possible. SEE DAVID. A ruined: site bearing the name Damun lies near the road from Jerusalem to Beit Jebrin (Van de Velde, Palest. 2:193; Tobler, Dritte Wand. p. 201), about three miles east of Shuweikeh (Socho). Dr. Porter, however, who visited and carefully surveyed this region, came to the conclusion that the camp of the Philistines must have been west and not east of Shochoh, and he does not therefore identify Ephes-dammim with Damun (Handbook for Palestine, p. 261). SEE ELAH, BROOK OF.

## Pasach[[@Headword:Pasach]]

             (Heb. Pasak', פָּסִךְ, cut off; Sept. (Φασέχ v.r. Φεσηχί), the first named of three sons of Japhlet, of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:33). B.C. cir. 1618.

## Pasagii Or Pas(S)Agini[[@Headword:Pasagii Or Pas(S)Agini]]

             a Christian heretical sect which arose in Lombardy towards the close of the 12th century, sprang out of a mixture of Judaism and Christianity, occasioned perhaps by the conquest of Jerusalem. This sect held the absolute obligation of the Old Testament upon Christians in opposition to the Manichaeans, who maintained only the authority of the New Testament. Hence they literally practiced the rites of the Jewish law, with the exception of sacrifices, which ceased to be offered at the destruction of  the Temple of Jerusalem; consequently they circumcised their followers, abstained from those meats of which the use is prohibited under the Mosaic economy, aid celebrated the Jewish Sabbath. They also revivtta the Ebionitish and Arian doctrines on the subject of the person of Christ, maintaining that he was not equal, but subordinate to the Father, and indeed merely the highest or purest of the creatures of God. The Pasagii were condemned as heretics by the Council of Verona in A.D. 1184, and, under the name of Circumcisi, they are mentioned also in the laws against heresies issued by Frederick II in 1224. “The name of this sect,” says Neander, “reminds one of the word pasgium (passage), which signifies a tour, and was very commonly employed to denote pilgrimages to the East, to the Holy Sepulchre crusades. May not this word, then, be regarded as an index, pointing to the origin of the sect as one that came from the East, intimating that it grew out of an intercourse with Palestine? May we not suppose that from very ancient times a party of Judaizing Christians had survived, of which this sect must be an offshoot? The way in which they expressed themselves concerning Christ, as being the first-born of creation, would point also more directly to the connection of their doctrine with some older Jewish theology than to a later purely Western origin.” There are also some who believe the Pasagii to have been Jews, who, to escape persecution, assumed enough of, Christian practices and doctrines to be passed unmolested, like the Cathari .(q.v.). (J. H. W.)

## Pasaginians[[@Headword:Pasaginians]]

             SEE PASAGII.

## Pascal, Blaise[[@Headword:Pascal, Blaise]]

             one of the most remarkable of men; sublime in his virtuous life; eloquent in his defense of the truth; wonderful in his vast acquisitions; remarkable for his genius; one, in short, associated with all that is splendid in the highest order of talent, and all that is bright and pure in the practice of holiness. Boyle characterizes him as “one of the sublimest spirits in the world.” Locke calls him the “prodigy of poets;” and why should he not be called a prodigy? It is certainly not a very common thing to meet in the same mind in perfect harmony, as we see in Pascal's, the reasoning powers of a great mathematician and the imagination of a great poet — the genial warm- heartedness of a philanthropist and the playful satire of a comedian — the  condensed energy of an orator and the profound and conscientious deliberations of a philosopher; or to find the canvas on which were wrought out these prodigies of genius ever aglow with the well ordered contrasts, the graceful variety, and the rich coloring of a painter of human life and manners. Blaise Pascal was born June 19, 1623, at Clermont, in Auvergne. His family was one of considerable influence in the province, several of his ancestors having held high offices in the government of France; and his father was at the time president of the Court of Aids in Auvergne. Blaise evinced in his early childhood an inquisitiveness of mind and a penetrating acuteness far above the average standard of boys.

As he was deprived of his mother when only three years of age, his father, who was an eminent mathematician, and associated much with men of learning and science, undertook the sole charge of his son's education, and to that end settled in Paris. For the purpose of concentrating all the boy's efforts upon languages, his father kept out of his reach all books treating the subject of mathematics, for which he had early evinced a decided taste; and it is recorded that by his own unaided speculations, drawing the diagrams with charcoal upon the floor, he made some progress in geometry. One account represents him as having thus mastered the first thirty-two propositions of the first book of Euclid's Elements, when his father suddenly surprised him in his studies, and was so moved by the boy's attainments that he no further thwarted him in the pursuit of mathematical investigations; and Blaise made such rapid progress that at the age of sixteen he composed a treatise on Conic Sections which displayed an extraordinary effort of mind, and evinced a strength of reasoning and knowledge of science fully equal to anything that had appeared. It extorted the almost incredulous admiration of his contemporary, Des Cartes. But this was not the only extraordinary performance of Blaise Pascal. In his nineteenth year he invented an ingenious machine for making arithmetical calculations, which excited the admiration of his times; and afterwards, at the age of twenty-four years, the conjecture of Torricelli that the atmosphere had weight, and that this quality might account for effects before ascribed to the horror of a vacuum, led him to institute many able and successful experiments on. this subject; Which confirmed the truth of Torricelli's idea, and established his own scientific reputation.

The results of these labors were collected into two essays, which appeared after his death, On the Equilibrium of Liquids, and On the Weight of the Atmosphere. Unfortunately Pascal's health gave way before his unwearied activity; from the age of eighteen the never passed a day without suffering.  Being forbidden all work by his doctor she threw himself into the vortex of the world's pleasures. But towards the end of the year 1647 he changed his course of living. He had for some time been seriously thinking of the nature and obligations of Christianity, and of the necessity of devoting himself supremely to the service of God. His associations now tended to deepen his seriousness. His father having accepted an office at Rouen, Blaise was there brought much into intercourse with a distinguished Jansenist preacher, abbe Guillebert, but a man of great eloquence, a great master of ascetic theology, by whom, and other members of the same rigid sect, as well as by the writings of Arnauld, St. Cyran, and Nicole, Blaise Pascal's mind received a decidedly religious turn; and he finally determined to abandon all scientific study, and diverted his great mind entirely to objects of religious contemplation. He studied the Holy Scriptures, diligently examined the subject of their inspiration, and after a patient investigation became fully convinced of their truth, and of the necessity of believing all that they reveal. He used often to say, “in the Scriptures, whatever is an object of faith need not be an object of reason.” Indeed. he knew exactly how to distinguish between the claims of faith and of reason.

The conviction of Pascal may therefore with propriety be cited among the most striking and satisfactory examples of the deep submission of the most powerful intellects to the truths of revelation; while it may also be numbered with other illustrious exceptions to the reproach that the high cultivation of mathematical science is little favorable to piety. It is no fair objection to the value of his example that Pascal, under the nervous excitation of bodily disease, fell into many absurd excesses of fanaticism; that he practiced the most rigid abstinence from all worldly enjoyments, and wore next his skin a cincture of iron studded with points, which he struck with his elbow into his flesh as a punishment to himself whenever any sinful thought obtruded itself into his mind. Such things may be ascribed to the inherent weakness of our corporeal nature, to some of the ordinary caprices of human disposition, or to the imaginative delusions attendant upon a particular state of bodily health; but they detract nothing from the soundness of the anterior investigation which had led a pure and unclouded reason like that of Pascal to embrace the doctrines of revelation, by a process analogous to that which had conducted him to the discovery of abstract truth. The death of his father, and his sister Jacqueline's withdrawal to Port-Royal, confirmed his deep religious tendencies, and it is to this period that we owe his magnificent though unfinished Pensees, which have extorted the- admiration even of his unbelieving and therefore  unsympathizing critics. Having fully identified himself with the Jansenist party, he was induced in 1654 to take up his residence at Port-Royal, although not as a member of the body, and there he resided till his death, entirely given up to prayer and practices of mortification.

It may be counted a curious exemplification of the anomalous conditions of the human mind, that while Pascal was immersed in his superstitious observances he published his famous “Provincial Letters,” in which, under the name of Louis de Montalto, he assailed the morality of the Jesuits with equal wit and argumentative acumen. He was induced to write this work by his adoption of the opinions of the Jansenists, whose principal exponent, the learned Arnauld (q.v.),was about to be condemned by the Sorbonne. There was every danger that the world, which did not trouble itself to read the obscure discussions of theologians, would abide by the judgment of the Sorbonne, and hold the Jesuits to have gained the cause. Pascal changed the order of battle. He addressed himself to the public; appealed from authority to common-sense, declaring that it was easier to find monks than reasons. Then, for the first time, men of the world. and women too, were constituted judges of great questions. The necessity of making one's self read and understood by such a tribunal was no small task; but Pascal disposed of it so happily that it made a chef d'euvre of Les Lettres Provinciales. They were not hastily composed — the author was often employed twenty days on a single letter; one (the eighteenth) he wrote over more than thirteen times; and all, after being written, he transmitted to Arnauld and Nicole to be carefully revised and corrected. We shall not stop to speak of the literary merits of the work — they have been universally acknowledged. The most distinguished Freich critics unite in pronouncing it a perfect model of taste and style, which has exerted a powerful influence on the literature of succeeding times. Those of other countries who are acquainted with it unite in bearing the same testimony; all agree that it is a masterpiece of the most wonderful acuteness and subtilty of genius, united with the keenest satire and the most delicate wit; an example of the precision of mathematical reasoning joined with the most convincing and persuasive eloquence. The more we study it as a literary work, the more must we be ready to adopt the language of Boileau, that “nothing surpasses it in ancient or modern times” (“Pascal surpasse tout ce qui l'a precede, ousuivi,” see Rogers in Edinb. Rev. Jan. 1847). These famous letters. (eighteen in number, not reckoning the nineteenth, which is a fragment, and the twentieth, which is by Lemaistre) are written, as if to a provincial  friend, on the absorbing controversial topic of the day. The first three are devoted to let vindication of Arnauld, and the demonstration of the identity of his doctrine with that of St. Augustine. But it was to the later letters that the collection owed both its contemporary popularity and its abiding fame. In these Pascal addresses himself to the casuistry and to the directorial system of Arnauld's great antagonists, the Jesuits; and in a strain of humorous irony which has seldom been surpassed he holds up to ridicule their imputed laxity of principle on the obligation of restitution, on simony, on probable opinions, on directing the intention, on equivocation, and mental reservation, etc.

The Jesuits and their friends loudly complain of the unfairness of the “Provincial Letters,” and represent them as in great part the work of a special pleader. The quotations, with the exception of those from Escobar, were confessedly supplied by Pascal's friends. It is charged that many of the authors cited are not Jesuits at all; that many of the opinions ridiculed and reprobated as opinions of the Jesuit order had in reality been formally repudiated and condemned in the society; that many of the extracts are garbled and distorted; that it treats as if designed for the pulpit and as mantrals for teaching works which in reality were meant but as private directions of the judgment of the confessor; and that, in almost all cases, statements, facts, and circumstances are withheld which would modify, if not entirely remove, their objectionable tendency. SEE JESUITS.

There seems, however, to be loud ground for such complaint, and the frequent replies which have been made to this charge would hardly afford us an excuse for taking space here to consider this appeal. In all his exposures Pascal deals only with the maxims, and not with persons. There is nowhere the appearance of vindictiveness over a vanquished foe.' If there be at times an indignation rising to the tone of awful majesty, there is mingled with it a philanthropy most tender and heartfelt; “he would take these men to his bosom and reform them, while he consigns their impious doctrines to destruction.” What he says to the unsuspicious monk, when taking leave of him, is the expression of his benevolent soul to all the Jesuits: “Open your eyes at length, my dear father, and if the other errors of your casuists have made no impression on you, let these last, by their very extravagance, compel you to abandon them. This is what I desire from the very bottom of my heart for your sake, and for the sake of our doctors; and my prayer to God is that he would vouchsafe to convince them how false the light must be that has guided them to such precipices; my fervent prayer is that he  would fill their hearts with that he of himself from, which they have dared to give man dispensation.” What he uttered on his death-bed was the real motive which prompted him in all his controversies: “As one about to give an account of all his actions, I declare that all my conscience gives me no trouble on the score of my Provincial Letters; in the composition of that work I was influenced by no bad motive, but solely by regard to the glory of God and the vindication of truth, and not in the least by any passion or personal feeling against the Jesuits.” Ye we do not wonder that the Jesuits charge Pascal with malice. For these letters were the handwriting on the wall against them, and the people interpreted it, “Thou art weighed in the balance, and art found wanting.' All the efforts made to suppress the letters, which had been speedily translated into the Latin, the Spanish and the Italian languages, and had been widely spread among all the nations of Europe, served only to promote their popularity. Though they were censured at Rome, and burned by the hangman at Paris, yet they circulated freely everywhere, and their principles acquired much credit and authority among the people, and took deep root in their minds. The Society of Jesus itself felt the attacks beyond any one's calculation. From the moment of the publication of the “Provincial Letters” the order degenerated, the necessary consequence of a full discovery of its principles. It hastened to its dissolution.; and if the “Provincial Letters” were not the means of the extinction of the Jesuitical brotherhood, they certainly accelerated its doom. Of course it was some time before public opinion was thoroughly aroused and the Jesuits were brought low. But the final blow came at last. In 1759 they were expelled from Portugal, in 1764 from France, in 1767 from Spain, and on July 21, 1773, they were suppressed by. the papal bull. SEE JESUITS.

If we judge of eloquence by such effects, then the “Provincial Letters” were truly eloquent. Ironical and vehement by turns, Pascal climbed to the very climax of eloquence. Sometimes he reminds us of the satire of the Dialogues of Plato; sometimes of the Philippics of Demosthenes and Cicero. Voltaire calls him the first French satirist, and says: “The first comedies of Moliere have not more salt than the first Lettres Provinciales; Bossuet has nothing more sublime than the last” (Siecle de. Louis XIV, ch. 37). “Pascal,” says Hallam, by his ‘Provincial Letters,' did more to ruin the name of Jesuit than all the controversies of Protestaritism, or all the fulminations of the Parliament of Paris. He has accumulated so long a list of scandalous decisions, and dwelt upon them with so much wit and spirit, and yet with so serious a severity, that the order of Loyola became a byword with mankind.”  The “Provincial Letters” were, however, only a pastime with Pascal. His great and favorite labors were of weightier matters. He desired purity in Christendom, and his heart longed for the strengthening of Christ's kingdom in the earth. In silence he prepared the materials for a great work, which death prevented him from accomplishing. Yet the scattered fragments which remain are sufficient to insure for their author the admiration of posterity. Persuaded that there was need of a work on the evidences of the Christian religion, he aimed in his Pensees to show the necessity of a divine revelation, and to prove the truth, reality, and advantage of the Christian religion. He proposed to demonstrate the evangelical system by the Cartesian method, He undertook to establish the religion of prophecy and (if miracle by the most severe logical induction. He summoned reason to lead thelway to those elevated region? of thought in which she must resign her charge to the guidance of faith and adoration. From a review of the relations and analogies between the nature of man and the revelation of God was to be wrought out a chain of internal evidences linking indissolubly together those primary verities which our consciousness attests and those ultimate verities which Christianity discloses. Des Cartes had demonstrated the existence of God. Pascal wished to go much farther than his master, and taking by the hand a doubting, indiffereint reader, to seat him, docile and faithful, at the feet of religion.

A pupil of Montaigne, filled with his spirit and his style, and the heir of St. Cyran, whose gloomy doctrine had been transmitted to him by Singlin and Sacy, he combined these two influences in the most remarkable manner. By a bold manoeuvre he attempted to turn the skepticism of the first, master against rational metaphysics to the advantage of the faith of the second. For him, then there is neither reason, justice, truth, nor natural law. Human nature is deeply corrupted by its original fall. Grace is the only resource, faith the only refuge for reason convinced of its own impotence. Small and incomplete as is the work, it is a mine of profound thought and evangelical piety which deserves to be explored. The ideas and sentiments, though partially evolved and imperfectly developed, display an intellect of surprising energy and expansion, a richness and novelty of illustration, a depth and pregnancy truly admirable — all expressed in a style terse and simple, and abounding with examples of that seretie eloquence which becomes the philosopher and the Christian. Of course the unqualified approbation of the Protestant is not expected for these Pensees. There are sentiments foreignand repugnant to the Protestant, arising from that system of faith in which Pascal was educated, and which, notwithstanding his high  regard for Scripture authority, exerted an influence over him — sentiments on the subject of miracles, the character of the Church and some of its ceremonies, auricular confession, and the benefit of that extravagant austerity and voluntary suffering of which he was so painful an example at the close of his life. Neither can the Protestant be perfectly satisfied with the very dark view of human life which he presents. Addison has wisely pointed out our way of escape from Pascal's extreme in the. one direction and the world's escape in the opposite extreme, when he says: “To consider the world as a dungeon, and the whole human race as-so many criminals doomed to execution, is an idea of an enthusiast; to suppose the world to be a seat of delight, where were to expect nothing but pleasure, is the dream of a Sybarite.” Waiving all these blemishes, in the Protestant's view, the thoughts even in their unfinished state must-be-recognized as constituting the most effectual perhaps of all the succors by which uninspired man has relieved the human mind from the heavy burden of religious skepticism. Dr. Vinet, in his work, Studies on Pascal (referred to below), thus comments on Pascal's ability as a Christian apologist:

“He comprehended, he explained that it was not in the head, but in the heart of man, that the belligerent parties could meet to treat of peace; and he inaugurated, or, rather, he drew from the Gospel, and laid before us, under the form which was proper to his genius land suitable to his time, that beautiful doctrine of the knowledge and the comprehension of divine truths by the heart which is the dominant thou lit and the key of his apologetics. The heart! the intuition, the internal consciousess of religious truth laid hold lupon immediately as first principles are a bold and sublime proposiition, which one much greater than Pascal had professed before him — ‘Believe my word, or else believe the works which I do.' Truth has its titles in itself; it is its own proof to itself; it demonstrates itself by showing itself. And the heart is the mirror of the truth. But this mirror, badly placed, does not reflect the light until a divine hand has turned it towards the sun. The heart requires to be inclined; that in us which receives:tie truth, that in us which knows, believes, loves, is not the heart such as it is, it is the heart inclined, and in the first instance the heart humbled, the heart offerings itself by humiliation to inspiration, as Pascal himself expresses it. Pascal here announces the advent, proclaims the authority, pleasures the empire of the Holy Spirit; Christianity coisidered as ‘existing man is the testimony the reign of the Holy Spirit. The divine and the human meet here in a glorious and ineffable unity.”,  Of Pascal as a writer, Dr. Vinet says:

“Pascal has not treated, has scarcely even touched tiny subject without having in some sort rendered it a forbidden subject to all men, besides. The most accomplished, after him, seem reduced to come near him; so closely does his thought grasp the object, so closely does his expression grasp his thought.”

“The notes of Voltaire” [to Pascal's “Thoughts”], Hallam. tells us, ‘“though always intended to detract, are sometimes unanswerable, but their splendor of Pascal's eloquence absslutely annihilites, in effect on the general reader, even this antagonist.”

The weakly frame of Pascal was reduced to premature old age by infirmities which were aggravated by his ascetic habits. But he bore his trials with exemplary patience, and died in Paris, Aug. 19, 1662, while yet a young man. The gentle and holy spirit of Blaise Pascal then returned to him who gave it, leaving to the world a name which will ever live as the representative of splendid talents united to self-denying benevolence and ardent piety. Pascal's life was written elaborately by his sister, Madame Perier, and afforded the materials for an able and interesting article in the Dictionary of Bayle. His OEuvres were collected and published in 5 vols. 8vo, 1779, well edited by the abbe Bossut. They were reprinted (Paris, 1819, 5 vols. 8vo), with an essay by M. Francois, “Sur les meilleurs ouvrages ecrits en prose dans la langue Frangaise.” As we are writing, a new edition of Pascal's works is preparing by M. Molinier for Messrs. Lemerre's collection. His Pensees sun a Religion, et sur quelques autres Sujets, being unfinished, were published, with suppressions and nmodfications, in 1669; but their fill value was only learned from the complete edition which was published. by Faugere at the instance of M. Cousin (Paris. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo). It has the fault of reproducing Pascal in his first drafts, many of which he would himself have cast aside. Since then have appeared the following editions worthv of mention here: Pensees de Pascal, publies dans leur textes authentique, avec uns Commentaire, suivi d'une etude litteraire, par E. Havet (Paris, 1852); Pensees de'Pascal, suivant le plan delauteur, dapres les textes originau avec les additions, et les variantes de Port-Royal, par J. M. Frantin (2d ed. ibid. 1853); Pensees de Pascal, disposees selon un plan .nouveau. Edition complete d'apres les derniers travaux critiques, avec des Notes, un Index, et une Preface, par J. F. Astid (Lausanne, 1856, 2 vols. 24mo). This is considered the best of all  the editions. It was inspired by St. Beuve. Another good edition is entitled Pensees de Pascal. Edition viarniorum d'apres le texte du MS. autographe, par Charles Lauandre (ibid. 1861, 18mo). ,Of all Pascal's works, the Lettres Provencales have been the most frequently reprinted. Thev were translated into Latin in the lifetime of Pascal by Nicole, under the pseudonym of a German professor, “Wilhelm Wendroc;” and an edition in four languages appeared at'Cologne in 1684. See Recueil de plusieurs pieces pour servir a histoire de Port-Royal (Utrecht, 1740); Memoires pour servir. a l'Histoire de Port-Royal et de la Mere Angelique (ibid. 1742);: Nicole, Eloge de Pascal; Bouiller, Sentiments de Ml. sur la Critique des Pensees de Pascal (1741 and 1753); Vie intfressant des Religieuses dePort-Royal (1751); Condorcet, Eloge de Pascal (1776); Voltaire, Remarques sur les Pensses de Pascal (Geneva, 1778); Bossut (Abbd), Discours sur la Vie. et les (Euvres de Pascal (1779 and 1781, 5 vols.); Baillet, Vie de Des Cartes, pt. ii, p. 330; Chateaubriand, Genie du Christianisnme. pt. 3, bk. 2, ch. vi (Paris, 1802); Dumesnil, Eloge de, Pascal (ibid. 1813); Raymond, Eloge de Pascal, avec Notes (Lyons, 1816); Monnier, Essai sur Pascal (Paris, 1822); Villemain, Pascal comn7e ecrivain et comme moraliste [Discours et Maelanges] (ibid. 1823); Cousin, Journal des Savants (ibid. 1839), p. 554; also, Bibliothque ‘de ‘l Ecole de Chartres (ibid. 1842); also, Sur la necessite'd'une nouvelle Edition des Penses. Rapport a Academie Francaise (ibid. 1842; reprinted with a new preface, ibid. 1843); Bordas-Demoulin, Eloge de Pascal; Concours de l'Academie (ibid. 1842); Faugere, Eloge de Pascal; Concours de l'A cademzie (ibid. 1842); Villemain,-Rapport sur le Concours (ibid. 1842); Saint Beuve, Port-Royal (ibid. 1842), vol. ii and 3:bk. iii; Nodier, Bulletin du Bibliophile (ibid. 1843), p. 107, 108; Flottes (Abbd), Etudes sur Pascal (Montpellier, 18434-5, 8vo); Vilet, Etudes sur Blaise Pascal (ibid. 184447, 8vo; Engl. transl. Jdinb. 1859, 12mo); Nisard, Litterature Francaise; Influence de Des Cartes sur Pascal (ibid. 1844), vol. ii, ch. iv; Revue des Deux Mondes, Du Scepticisme de Pascal (1844- 45; March 15, 1865); Thomas. De Pascali. an vere Scepticusfuerit? (These, 1844); Martin, l'Histoire de France; Cousin, Jacqueline Pascal (Paris, 1845); Ldlut (Dr.), De l'Amulette de Pascal, Etudes sous le Rapport de la Sanct de ce grande honomme a son genie (ibid. 1845); Faugere, Lettres, Opuscules, etc., de Madame Perier, etc. (ibid. 1845); Edinb. Rev. Jan. 1847, art. vii; Collet, ‘ait inedit de la Vie de Pascal (Paris, 1848, 8vo); Lescoeur, De la Methode Philosophique de Pascal (1850); Recolin, Apologetique de Pascal (Montauban, 1850); Maynard  (Abbe), Pascal, sa Vie et son Caractere, ses ecrits et son genie (1850, 2 vols. 8vo); Chavannes, Revue de Theologie [S. Role de l'autorite dans les Pensdes] (1850), vol. 8; Astid, Revue Chritienne La Methode apologetique de Pascal pent seule reverser les arguments de J. J. Rousseau] (1854). Villdmain, Revue Chretienne [art. sur l'Edition des les Pensees par Astie] (1857); Rambert, Pascal, Bibliotheque Universelle de Genive [L'Apologetique de Pascal a fait son temps] (1858); Navylle,: Reponse; Scherer, Quelques Questions d'Apologetique a propos de l'Article de Rambert et de Ernest Naville, in the Nouvelle Revue Thiol. (Strasburg, 1858), vol. ii; Pressense, Deuxs recentes Discussions sur l'Apologie de Pascal (reponse a Scherer), in the Revue Chretienne (Paris, 1858); Gerusez,jLitterature Franfaise; — Reuchlin, Pascal's Leben (Stuttgard, 1840); Neander, Ueber die Geschichtliche Bedeutung der Pensees Pascal's fur die Religionsphilosophie insbesondere (Berlin, 1847); Weingarten, Pascal als Apologet des Christenthums (Leips. 1863); Drevdorf, Pascal, sein Leben u. seine danpfe (Leips. 1870); Eeklin, Pascal (Basle. 1870); Nourisson, Tableau des Progres de la Pensde ilumaine (2d ed. Paris, 1859, 12mo), p. 437 sq.; Stephen, Lectures on the History of France (Lond. 1857, 2 vols. 8vo), 2:165 sq.; Jervis, Hist of the Church of France (ibid. 1872, 2 vols. 8vo), 1:420 sq., 428 sq.; Demogeot, Hist. de la Litterature Francaise; Bridge, Hist. of French Literature (Phila. 1874, 12mo), p. 171 sq.; Meomechet, Litterature Moderne, vol. iii; Morell, Hist. of Modern Philosophy, p. 196, 197; Christian Remembrancer, July, 1852; Kitto, Journ. of Sacred Lit. vol. iii; Princeton Rev. Jan. 1854, art. iii; Aleth. Qu. vol. 12; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. Jan. 1863, art. 7; Biblical Repertory, 1838, p. 170 sq.; Gdrusez, Essai deHistoire litteraire; Bridges, France under Richelieu and Coltert, lect. 4; Racine, Hist. Ecclesiastique, 12:127 sq.; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy; vol. 2; Zeitschr fur hist. Theologie, 1872, vol. 4,. art. 1; North British Rev. Nov. 1861, art. 1.

## Pascal, Jacqueline[[@Headword:Pascal, Jacqueline]]

             a noted French female monastic was the sister of Blaise Pascal, and greatly influenced that celebrated man in his ascetic practices. She was born at Clermont in 1625. She became religious, and entered the Port-Royal house in 1646 under the name of Sister Ste. Euphemie, and she died there in 1661. She was a most devoted sister, but her peculiar notions of an ascetic life led her to Port-Royal herself, and finally brought Blaise to the same retirement. In her youth she had enjoyed much distinction for remarkable  intellectual attainments and native talent. The poet Corneille used to visit her when she was yet a girl, and aid her in the development of her poetic talent. See Cousin, Jacqueline Pascal (Paris, 1849); Meth. Qu. Rev. July, 1854, art. 4.

## Pasch[[@Headword:Pasch]]

             a term sometimes used to denote the festival of Easter (q.v.).

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

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 23, 1661, at Dantzic. He studied at Rostock and Wittenberg, was in 1689 professor at Kiel, and died September 30, 1707. He wrote, Diss. de Rechabitis ex Jeren. 35, an essay prepared while yet at the gymnasium (Dantzic, 1681): — De Operationibus Daemonum (Wittenberg, 1684): — Diss. Physica de Pluralitate Mundorum contra Cartesianos (eod.): — Utrun Pontificii Cogantur Concedere Lutheranuos in Religione sua Salvari? (Kiel, 1689): — De Philosophia Characteristica ei Parcenetica (1705): — De Variis Modis Moralia Tradendi Liber (1707). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen, Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pasch, Johann[[@Headword:Pasch, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Hamburg in 1709, is the author of, De Eclipsi Solis in Die Passionis Christi: — De Numero Bestice Apocalyticae: — De Tikkun Sopherim: — De Angelorum Lingua Sine Lingua: — De Signo Caini: — De Schemhamphorasch: — De Voce Hebraica Selah: — De Serpente Seductore: — De Morte Immortalium Mortis Christi Testium Judaei et Gentilis: — De Johanne Baptista. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pascha[[@Headword:Pascha]]

             SEE PASSOVER.

## Pascha Annotinuum[[@Headword:Pascha Annotinuum]]

             is an expression which was used in the Church of the early Middle Ages to designate the first anniversary day of baptism, which was observed by prayer and song by the baptized and his friends. It passed out of date in the 11th century, and the frequent efforts to re-establish the “Pascha annotinumn” have failed. The Sunday Quasimodogeniti was the day appointed for such observance, and was therefore principally called Pascha or Pascha Annotinum.

## Paschal[[@Headword:Paschal]]

             antipope of Rome, flourished in the 7th century. He was early admitted to the service of the Church, and was for some time archdeacon of the Romanish Church. During the sickness of pope Conon, in order to take possession, of the gold which this pontiff had bequeathed to the clergy and to the monasteries, he wrote to Jean Platys, exarch of Ravenna, and promised him this old if he would consent to sustain his election to the poitifical throne. The exarch entered into this design, and his officers, the next day after the death of Conon (Oct. 22, 687), elected Paschal. Another party of the Roman people elected the archpriest Theodore, and took possession of the interior of the palace of Lateran, while the faction of Paschal could only occupy the exterior. In order to put an end to this scandalous struggle, the majority of the clergy, magistrates, and people voted for a priest called Sergius (Dec. 16, 687). Theodore submitted; Paschal, on the contrary, resisted, and persuaded the exarch to come to Rome with his officers. The latter arrived, but finding Sergius recognized by all, he abandoned Paschal to this unhappy fate, requiring of the new pope, in order to confirm his nomination, the hundred pounds of gold  which had been promised him. Shortly after Paschal, convicted of magic, was deprived of his office of archdeacon and imprisoned in a monastery where he died impenitent in 694. See Fleury, Hist. Eccl. bk. 40, ch. 39; Anastasius, Vitae Pontificum; Artaud. de Moutor, Hist. des souver. Pontifes Rom.Vol. 1.

## Paschal Candle[[@Headword:Paschal Candle]]

             SEE PASCHAL TAPER.

## Paschal Controversy[[@Headword:Paschal Controversy]]

             designates the various disputes which have agitated the Church regarding the proper reckoning of Easter. The three synoptical Gospels are unanimous (Mat 26:17; Mat 26:19; Mar 14:12-16; Luk 22:17-19) in their statement that our Lord instituted the holy Eucharist in his last paschal supper. John is equally precise in saying that the Jews would not enter the judgment-hall “lest they should be defiled” through blood pollution, and be precluded from eating the passover in the evening (Joh 18:28). How came it then, that our Lord should have celebrated the passover on one evening, and that the Jews should have deferred the memorial feast till the corresponding period of the next day? This is a real difficulty, which will be found discussed in full under PASSOVER SEE PASSOVER.

We here give the following as a possible solution. Since the appearance of the new moon determined the Jewish calendar, an assembly was held in the Temple on the closing day of each month, to receive intelligence respecting the first φάσις of the new moon. If nothing was announced a day was intercalated, yet if the appearance of the moon was afterwards authenticated the intercalation was canceled. This naturally caused much confusion, especially in the critical month of Nisan. Hence (Talmud, Rosh Hash. 1) it was permitted that in doubtful cases the  passover might be observed on two consecutive days. For the intercalation could hardly be known in Galilee; and, according to Maimonides (קדש חדש), in the more distant parts of Judaea the passover was in some years kept on one day, at Jerusalem on another. Our Lord, coming in from the country, followed the letter of the law; but the main body of the Jews, observing rather the “tradition of the elders,” sacrificed the passover on the following day in consequence of the intercalation of a day in the preceding month. Thus our Lord ate the passover on the evening of the 14th Nisan, and was upon the same day “the very Paschal Lamb” by the death of the cross (Harvey, Creeds, p. 328).

Easter has been the high festival of the Church since the days of the apostles; though the primitive ritual like, the primitive creed followed no invariable rule. Thus while the churches in a large majority celebrated Easter-Sunday on the first Lord's-day after the 14th of Nisan, on which our Lord suffered; others, as the Asiatic churches, commemorated our Lord's death on the 14th of Nisan as being the very day of the Savior's cross and passion. This they did irrespectively of the day of the week on which it might fall. The paschal fast also was variously observed. Tertullian speaks of it as extending over the Holy Week (De'Jejun. c. xiv); Epiphanius says, “The Catholic Church solemnizes not only the 14th of Nisan, but the entire week” (Haer. 1, 3), making a distinction from the Ebionitish Quartodecimani, who kept fast only on the 14th of Nisan. The Western and more Catholic rule was to observe the Friday preceding the Easter-Sunday as a rigid fast, the Church identifying the apostles' sorrowing with their own, and the fast was not resolved till Easter-morn; while the Asiatic Quartodecimani party regarded the 14th of Nisan from a doctrinal point of view as the commemoration-day of man's redemption; and at the hour in which our Lord said “It is finished,” i.e. at three o'clock in the afternoon, the fast was brought to an end (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 5:23), and the day closed with the collective Agape and celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Whether the fast was resumed and maintained till Easter-day does not appear, neither is it certainly known whether these churches celebrated Easter on the Lord's-day next following, or oil the next day butt one to the “14th of Nisan, on whatever day of the week that might fall. The latter, however, would seem to have been the practice from the decree of an early synod (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. v. 23) convened to consider the case, which ordained that the Feast of the Resurrection should be celebrated on the Lord's-day and on no other, and that the paschal fast should then be  brought to a close; for the ordinance would not have been needed if there had been nothing in this particular to amend. Hefele, however, sees in this decree a proof that the Asiatic-Easter was always celebrated on the Lord's- day. The Council of Arles, A.D. 314, at which British bishops were present, similarly decreed that Easter should only be celebrated on the Lord's-day. Irenaeus declares that with respect to the paschal fast there was a great divergence of practice, some churches fasting for one day, as the Ebionites, some for two, and some for the forty hours, day and night, that immediately preceded the dawn of Easter; and he speaks of it as an old-standing discrepancy, οὐ νῦν ἐφ᾿ ἡμῶν γεγονυῖα ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ πρότερον ἐπὶ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν (Ep, ad Victor Fragm. c. 3, Cambr. ed.). The primitive Church, therefore, knew no fixed rule for the universal observance of the paschal fast.

With respect to the precise day on which the Lord's death should be commemorated, there was a threefold difference of practice.

(1.) The Catholic Church affirmed that our Lord suffered on the 14th of Nisan; but seeing that the new creation dates from Easter-morning, the Lord's-day next following was the πάσχα ἀναστάσιμον, and the Friday preceding was the πάσχα σταυρώσιμον. Thus the-rule was fixed according to the day of the week on which our Lord suffered, and was declared to be the true ordinance, τάξις ἀληθεστέρα. This was the practice of the Church of Rome, and of the generality of churches throughout Christendom, and was said to have been derived from the apostles Peter and Paul (Euseb. Hist. Eccles.v. 23; Socrat. Hist. Eccles.v. 22).

(2.) The Asiatic rule was professedly based upon the authority of John ‘the Evangelist and of Philip, and was adopted by the churches of Proconsular Asia (Hist. Eccles.v. 23) and those of the neighboring provinces, also in Mesopotamia, Syria, Cilicia (Athanas. Ad Aft. c. 2, de Synod. Arim. et Sel.), and, as Chrysostom says, Antioch (In eos qui Orat. in Pascha . Jej. [ed. Bened. 1:608]). It was the belief of all the churches that our Lord was put to death on the 14th of Nisan, the day on which the paschal lamb was slain. But many denied that the Last Supper was installed at the paschal feast, or that our Lord celebrated the Passover day in the last year of his ministry, the statements of the synoptical Gospels notwithstanding (see Chron. Pasch. 1:10 - 16). The Asiatics commemorated the Lord's death on the 14th of Nisan, being guided by the day of the Jewish month, as the  more general practice followed the day of the week on which Christ died. They were taunted for the Judaizing practice, though the Church of Rome in its ritual and liturgy had more perhaps in common with the synagogue than the churches of Asia. The Quartodecimans were but a small party in the Church. Still fewer in number

(3) were the Ebionitish or Judaizing Quartodecimans who held to the observances of the Mosaic law, and engrafted on them the Christian celebration, making the 14th of Nisan a day of hybrid ceremonial, in which type and antitype, shadow and substance, law and Gospel, were hopelessly confused.

These three varying rules created a plentiful source of dissension; the Church was long unconscious of the coming evil, but while men slept the tares were' sown. At first the bond of charity was known to be stronger than all the difference of calendar made no alteration in the Gospel law of love. Thus Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, having had occasion to visit Rome (A.D. 160) to confer with pope Anicetus on other matters, found that the Asiatic rule differed essentially from that of Rome. Both could claim apostolic authority, and therefore each reverently forbore from preying a rival claim; while Anicetus assigned to his guest as his senior the privilege of consecrating the holy elements. But immediately afterwards a change came over the spirit of Rome; for the heretical Quartodeciman rule had been introduced there by Blastus — “His omnibus (Marconi et Tatiano, etc.) etiam Blastus accedens, qui latentur Judaismumvult introducere” (Pseudo- Test. de Praescr. Her. p. 53), and with it the whole sweep of Ebionitish perversion. Victor, bishop of Rome, therefore knew the Quartodeciman practice only in conjunction with a pestilential error, and never dissociated the. two in his mind.. With .a keen perception of the truth of his own position, he was blind to all that might be advanced by others, and threatened with excommunication (A.D. 180) all those (churches which commemorated their Lord's death on the first day of the week. It was the first germ of that system of aggression which reached its climax in the Hildebrandine theory and practice of the papacy. Synods were immediately held by his ordere, (Euseb. Hist. Eccles.v. 23) in Palestine, Pontus, Gaul, Alexandria, Corinth, and Rome, and the more Catholic rule was everywhere pronounced to be binding. It was also determined that the feast of the resurrection was the true close of the paschal fast, and that the Lord's-day and no other should be the day for its celebration. The Asiatics remained unconverted and unconvinced, and continued to observe the 14th  of Nisan as a day of mixed character, fasting till the ninth hour, and then rejoicing for the achieved work of man's redemption. In opposition to a somewhat crushing array of names, not of individuals, but of churches, Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, and a friend of Polycarp, put forth a writing in the name of the Asiatic bishops claiming the authority of John and Philip, whose tombs were still at Ephesus and Hierapolis, and urging the precedent of Polycarp, Melito, and other venerable bishops, in favor of their own apostolic tradition. Still Victor pronounced them “heterodox,” and not only essayed to cut them off from communion, ἀποτέμνειν τῆς ἐνωσέωη πειρᾶται, as Hefele limits the words of Eusebius, but authoritatively pronounced them excommunicate, στηλιτεί ει διὰ γραμμάτων, ἀκοινωνήτους ἄρδην πάντας τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ἀνακηρύττων ἀδελφούς (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 5:24). The violent decree, however, was a mere “brutum fulmen,” for none of the other churches assented to it, and Irenmus, bishop of Lyons. wrote a letter of expostulation to Victor on the subject. The result was that Rome stood alone in its extreme antagonism to the churches of Ephesine communion.

Hitherto the paschal controversy had turned upon two points: (1) the proper day for the memorial of our Lord's death, and (2) the day on which the paschal fast should be resolved in the joyful commemoration of Easter. A third difficulty, of an Ebionitish complexion, arose (A.D. 170) at Laodicea, the capital of Phrygia Pacatiana, in Asia Minor; it was stated that our Lord inAstituted the holy Eucharist on the 14th, and was put to death on the 15th of Nisan, the Jewish method of computing the commencement of the day from: sunset having been apparently ignored (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 4:26). The paschal feast of these schismatics combined the eucharistic with the paschal rite, and was essentially of a Jewish ordinance. The Church of course affirmed that the passover, like any typical observance, had only a temporary character, and that it was merged, in the Christian “‘commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. It was an entirely new phase of the Quartodeciman theory, and caused an evil report of Judaizing notions to be attached to the orthodox following of John and Philip and Polycarp. But the writers of the Asiatic Church at once denounced it as wholly inconsistent with Christian principle; and fragments still exist of writings that were put forth against by Melito bishop of Sardis, and Apollinaris, bishop of Hierapolis, both of whom followed the more orthodox Asiatic rule. “They err,” says this latter writer,” who affirm that our Lord ate the passover on the 14th of Nisan with his disciples, and that  he died on the great day of unleavened-bread (i.e. on the 15th of Nisan). They maintain that Matthew records the event as they have imagined it; but their notion agrees not with the law; and thereby the Gospels are made to wear a contradictory appearance” (Chronicon Paschale, 1:13, in Dundorfs Byzaznt. Hist. Script. xvi). This was the phase of the Quartodeciman which was introduced into Rome by Blastus, and was denounced at once by Irenaeus (Euseb. Hist. Ecc 5:20) in his treatise De Schismatic His follower, Hippolytus, took an active part against it (Fragm. in Chron. Paschal. 1:12, 13; and Philosoph. 7:18); and Clement of Alexandria was induced by the treatise of Melito to refute the same error in his work on Easter, a few fragments of which are preserved in the Chronicon Paschal. (ibid. 14).

“The Laodicean Quartodecimans closely followed the Jewish custom, whereby in a backward season, as regards barley-harvest, or whenever the solar cycle required it, an entire month was intercalated at the-vernal equinox. Hence in some years there was with them a double paschal celebration, and in others a total omission. These notions died out again before the end of the 3d century, but they caused an evil name to be attached to the orthodox Quartodeciman practice, and greatly embittered the differences that already existed between some of the Asiatic churches and the rest of the Christian world. Further, the Catholic practice, like the Eastern, divaricated into two branches, and the churches were unable to settle down upon one uniform rule. It is a question of astronomy; for the Jewish calendar ceased to be any trustworthy guide after the. destruction of Jerusalem. The equinox was then taken as the fixed date from whence Easter should be calculated. But astronomers differed as to the precise incidence of the equinox. At Rome it was March 18th.; at Alexandria it was the 21st, according to the Macedonian calendar. The Asiatics, retaining their old custom, commemorated the death of our Lord on the fill moon after March 21st. The rest of the world celebrated Easter on the first Sunday after the equinoctial full moon; but if them upon was at the full on Sunday, then on the succeeding Sunday, for the plain reason that the full moon in such a case coincided with the lunar age on the day of our Lord's death, and not of the resurrection. Hence those churches which followed the earlier equinox occasionally found themselves rejoicing in Easter festivities while the other churches were still practicing the mortification of Lent. And worse still, when the full moon fell on March 19, Western churches celebrated their Easter accordingly; but the Alexandrian Church  of necessity deferred their Easter till the next full moon, as being the first after the equinox of March 21. To obviate this difficulty various recurring cycles were devised, wherein the return of the full moon to the same solar position coincided after a certain number of years with the same day of the week, and the same day of the year. But they were more or less inaccurate.

The earliest was that of Hippolytus, bishop of Portus. As a rare waif of time, this was discovered incised on the right face of the pedestal of a' marble statue of Hippolytus seated on his episcopal throne, which was dug up (A.D. 1551) between Rome and Tivoli, near the church of St. Lawrence, and is now preserved in the Vatican. Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 6:22) attributes to Hippolytus the discovery of the cycle of sixteen years; and here it was found displayed for one hundred and twelve years (A.D. 222-333), Easter-Sunday in each of these years being given on the left face of the pedestal; But the cycle of sixteen years only showed the recurrence of the paschal-day with regard to the day of the year, and not of the week. The same ancient authority also shows that the paschal fast was continued till Easter. Sunday, March 18 being assumed always as the vernal equinox. Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 246265), set forth an eight years' cycle, κανόνα ὀκταετηρίδος (Euseb. Hist. Ecc 7:20).

Twelve years after his death Anatolius, an Alexandrian by birth and education, but bishop. of Laodicea, in Syria, drew out the famous nineteen years' cycle, originally the observation of Meton the astronomer. The ancient Jews could only have celebrated the passover after the vernal equinox; therefore this, with him March 19, was made the basis of computation. The cycle was adopted at Alexandria, the equinox, however, being advanced two days, to March 21; and whenever the full moon happened on Saturday, the next day, contrary to the Roman custom, was declared to be Easter- Sunday. The Asiatics still followed the Jewish computation, as harmonizing with the Savior's practice, and cared nothing for the equinox, which their Easter occasionally anticipated; and for this reason the term Protopaschitae was applied to them. The confusion caused by these differences must have been very great, and especially in conterminous churches, where one custom ended and another began; but it was not till A.D. 314 that an attempt was made to produce uniformity by synodal action. In that year the Council of Aries in its first canon decreed that Easter should be solemnized “uno die et uno tempore per omnerm orbem;” and the bishop of Rome sent forth an encyclical letter to enforce the desired harmony of action (Mansi, Coll. Conc. 2:474; Hard. 1:263). But a provincial could speak with no authority to the Church catholic; neither was the Roman bishop as yet the  supreme pontiff, and practice continued to be discordant. It then became one of the two principal subjects for discussion and arrangement in the Council of Nice. No decree on the subject appears in its canons, and it is difficult to see any reason for the omission, unless it be that the fathers were unable to make Uip their minds upon a point that could only be settled by the astronomical expert.

Thus they delegated to Eusebius of Caesarea the duty of determining the right rule of Easter, and of recommending the most accurate cycle to be adopted in framing the calendar. The Epistle of Constantine to the churches shows clearly the general points on which the Nicene fathers agreed, viz. 1. That from henceforth the vernal equinox, and not the Jewish calendar, should determine the incidence of Easter. 2. That when the equinoctial full moon fell on a Sunday, Easter should be celebrated on the Sunday following; both for the reason already given, and because the Jewish festival would have been celebrated and over. Also, by making Easter by necessity. subsequent to the vernal equinox, there was no longer danger of a double observance in the same year. But which equinoctial day was adopted, the Roman or the Alexandrian? The Latin translation of the Prologus Paschalis of Cyril of Alexandria says that the Alexandrian Church, as representing the astronomical science of the day, was ordered to announce to the Church of Rome the true incidence of Easter in each year, and that it should be notified from Rome throughout the churches (Petavius. Doct. Temp. ii, App.; Hefele, Conc. 1:313; Ideler, Handb. d. Chronol. 2:258). Leo I repeats the account (Ep. 121 al. 94), and Ambrose virtually says the same thing; the Nicene Council having, according to his statement, adopted the cycle of nineteen years, which, as has been shown, was the Alexandrian computation (Ambr. Ep. ad Epis. cop. En.). But, independently of the equinox, the paschal difficulties were not yet foreclosed. The Roman Church still clung to its faulty cycle of eighty-four years, the Alexandrian to that of nineteen; and it still continued to be a matter of reproach that the two principal churches of Christendom were often found to celebrate Easter. on different days. The Council of Sardica, therefore, as seen by the lately discovered Festal Letters of Athanasians (Cureton, from the Nitrian Syr. MS., A.D. 343), endeavored to compose a difference by drawing out a paschal scheme for half a century. But it only defined the lunations, and (A.D. 387) matters showed worse than ever when Rome celebrated Easter on March 21, but the Alexandrian Church, since the 21st was its equinox, postponed the celebration till after the next full moon or till late in April. The Quartodeciman party also still survived, the Nicene injunctions  notwithstanding, as maybe seen by the anathemas against the τεσσαρεσκαιδεκατῖται of the Council of Antioch (A.D. 341), Song of Solomon 1, and Council of Laodicea (A.D. 381), Song of Solomon 1. It may be observed here that the Jews learned from the Christian Church to frame a paschal cycle, which was first adopted in the presidencyof Hillel II at Tiberias, A.D. 358.

The paschal difference thus continued to cause more or less inconvenience and heart-burning for another century and a half, till Dionysius Exiguus did good service to chronology by first dating events from the Christian era, and by giving fixity to the cycle of nineteen years for determining Easter. This he did by adopting the Alexandrian method of calculation, and reforming the Roman calendar accordingly, in which the churches of Italy readily acquiesced; while those of Gaul and Britain still held to their “old style.” When the Heptarchy became organized; the Dionysian method was accepted in Britain, although in Wales, and in the northern parts of the island, the old eighty-four years' cycle of Rome was still retained. A council was held on the subject, A.D. 664, at Streanechalch (Whitby), king Oswy having found that his queen and her ladies were fasting in Lent while he indulged in the festivities of Easter. The Roman order was then fully confirmed in Britain. As Montalembert has justly observed, this difference had nothing to do with the Quartodeciman practice, which in fact had died away in the 6th century (Moines de l'Occid. 4:159). In our present calendar, the Prime or Golden Number marks the particular year of the nineteen years' cycle; and these golden numbers, added in the margin from: March 21 to April 18, indicate the days of the plenilunium on which Easter for each particular year depends, and which is the Sunday next following, unless Sunday should be the day of full moon, in which case Easter fallson the following Sunday. — Blunt, Dict. Hist. Theol. See also Hefele, Conciliengesch. vol. i; Ideler, Handb. d. Chronol.; Chron. Paschale, in Dindorfs Byzant. Hist. Script. vol. xvi and xvii; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. vol. i; Creton, Festal Ep. of Athanasius, transl. from the Syriac; Killen, Hist. of the Ancient Church, p. 611, 625; Neander, Dogmas, vol. ii; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 655 sq., 675, 676; Foulkes, Divisions in Christendom; Lond. Quar. Rev. 18:496: sq.; Christian Examiner, 38:41 sq; Jahrb. ur deutsche Theologie, 1870, No. 1. SEE EASTER.

## Paschal I[[@Headword:Paschal I]]

             a pope of Rome, was born at Rome near the middle of the 8th-century. After taking-the monastic vows he entered into Holy orders, and was for several years abbot of the Benefit monastery of St. Stephen at Rome. Pope Leo III elevated him to the cardinate, and upon the death of pope Stephen V he ascended the papal throne, Jan. 25, 817, by the choice of both clergy and people, who in their impatience urged him to assume the functions of the office without the imperial sanction, which was then regarded as indispensable. Paschal I was wise enough not to assume the responsibility of this step, and by special messenger informed the emperor of the disloyal precipitancy of the people. Of course the imperial forgiveness was thus easily secured, and the pontiff became a favorite of the emperor. To Paschal the pretended donation by the emperor Louis the Pious is said to have been made. He crowned as emperor Lothaire, son of Louis the Pious, in the year 823, and died the following year. He was succeeded by Eugenius II.. Shortly before his death Paschal I was subject to severe censure by the imperial friends for the summary punishment he meted out to two ecclesiastics who were believed to have been imperialists, but Paschal's position is justifiable. The punished had been guilty of disloyalty to the pope, and though they were strongly connected with the imperialists, this was no reason why the pope should not have punished them: if they were treacherous subjects, of his. On the re-outbreak of the iconoclastic controversy at Constantinople, Paschal granted an asylum to those Greek preists who favored the use of images in churches. He is the author of three letters which are found in the collection of the councils. See Pagi, Breviar. Pontif Rom 2:25 sq.; Aschbach, KirchenzLex. s.v.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:328 sq.; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity; 2:519, 529; Baxmann, Gesch. der Politik der Papste, 1, 331.

## Paschal II[[@Headword:Paschal II]]

             pope of Rome, was a Tuscan by birth. His family name was Ranieri. He was a native of Bledawhere he was born about the middle of the 11th  century. He joined the Order of Clugny, and having been sent to Rome in the interests of his monastery, he was noticed by pope Gregory VII, who made him a cardinal. After Gregory's death and the short pontificate of Urban II, Paschal was elected pope. He refused the dignity, and even concealed himself, but was at last prevailed to accept the papal chair in 1099. He prosecuted the great contest of the investitures, begun by GregoryVII with the emperor Henry IV, against, whom he launched a fresh bull of excommunication. Henry's son and namesake, availing himself of this, revolted against his father, and, having deposed him, was acknowledged as king of the Germans by the title of Henry V. He then proceeded to Italy with an army, in order to cause himself to be crowned emperor. On the question of the investitures he was as stubborn as his father. After some conferences between him and the pope's ambassadors, Paschal proposed what appeared to be a reasonable compromise of the matter in dispute. “If the emperor,” said he, “contends for his regal-rights, let him resume the donations on which those rights are founded, the duchies, margraviates, countships, towns, and manors which his predecessors have bestowed on the Church. Let the Church retain only its tithes and the donations which it has received from private bounty.

If Henry renounces the right of investiture, the Church shall restore all it has received from secular princes since the time of Charlemagne” (Pagi, Vita Paschalis II; Fleury, Hist. Eccles). This proposal went to the root of the evil, and Paschal was probably sincere in making it: but the bishops, and especially the German bishops, who were possessed of large fiefs, strongly protested against it. In the mean time Henry arrived at Rome to be crowned, in 1110. He kissed the pope's feet according to custom, and entered hand in hand with him into the church of the Vatican; ‘but here an explanation took place concerning the compromise, the result of which was that the treaty was broken off,' and Paschal refused to consecrate the emperor. The particulars have been differently viewed by the Church writers. Some say that Paschal could not fulfill his proposed renunciation of the temporalities of the Church owing to the opposition of the bishops; others say that Henry would not give up the right of investiture, because his counselors, and among the rest several German bishops who were about his person, unwilling to risk their domains and revenues, persuaded him not to renounce what they represented as an essential part of the imperial prerogatives and of the splendor of the imperial dignity. After repeated messages between the pope and the emperor, the latter, who wished to be crowned at all events, determined to frighten the pope into  compliance. At the suggestion, it is said, of two German prelates, one of whom was the archbishop of Metz, Henry ordered his German soldiers to lay hands on the pope. A scuffle ensued; and the people of Rome, irritated at seeing their pontiff prisoner, fell on the German soldiers, and drove them back with considerable slaughter to their camp outside of the town. Henry, however, kept possession of the person of the pope, whom he dragged after him, stripped of his pontifical ornaments and bound with cords.

Paschal remained for nearly two months in a state of confinement, during which he was assailed by the remonstrances of his clergy, many of whom were prisoners with him in the German camp, until at last he yielded to their entreaties, consented to consecrate Henry unconditionally, and gave up by a bull the right of investiture to the emperor. After the ceremony Henry returned to Germany, and Paschal thought it necessary to assemble a council in the Lateran to submit his conduct to the judgment of the Church. He declared to them at the same time that he would rather abdicate than break his word to the emperor, either by excommunicating or molesting him. After much deliberation, Paschal's cession of the right of investiture was solemnly condemned; and it was declared that the investiture of churchmen by lay hands was a heresy. The prelates of Franco and Italy, and even some of those of Germany, approved of the proceedings of the Lateran council, and several of the turbulent German feudatories revolted against Henry. The emperor, however; kept the field, and, having defeated his revolted subjects, marched again to Italy to terminate the question with the see of Rome. Paschal, blamed and even personally insulted by the Romans because of his indulgence towards Henry, and threatened at the same time by the latter, escaped to Benevento, and Henry, entering Rome, caused himself to be crowned again by the bishop of Benevento. After Henry's departure Paschal returned to Rome, but soon fell ill of fatigue and anxiety, and died in January, 1118. The question of the investiture was settled by a compromise in 1122, under Calixtus II, the successor of Gelasius. It was agreed that the bishops, being elected according to the canonical forms, should receive their regalia at the hand of the emperor, and do homage for them; but that in this ceremony the emperor should no longer use the ring and crosier, the insignia of spiritual authority, but the scepter only. Paschal had also been in controversy with Henry I of England on the same subject, but they had settled in 1108 on similar terms. See Vita Paschalis in Muratori, “Scriptores,” vol. 3; Gfrorer, Gregorius VII u. s. Zeit; Baxmann, Gesch. der Politik derPapste; Collier, Eccles. Hist.; Stenzel, Gesch. Deutschl.  unter denfiwnk. Kaisern (Leips. 1827), 1:571, 612, 627, 667; Gervais, Gesch. D.eutschl. unter Heinrich V (Leips. 1841); Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 4:67-125; 4:291,429-431; Hefele, Conciliengesch. vol. 5; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2:253; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, s.v. SEE INVESTITURE.

## Paschal III[[@Headword:Paschal III]]

             antipope, was electedby — the influence of the emperor Frederick I, in' opposition to Alexander III, in 1165. He took possession of Rome for a short time, Alexander being obliged to escape to Benevento, but with the departure of the imperial army fromn Rome in 1167 Paschal was obliged to quit also. He died shortly after (in 1168) at Viterbo. See Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 2:190; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 4, ‘96, 429-431. SEE ALEXANDER III.

## Paschal Light[[@Headword:Paschal Light]]

             SEE PASCHAL TAPER.

## Paschal Solemnity[[@Headword:Paschal Solemnity]]

             the week preceding and the week following Easter.

## Paschal Taper[[@Headword:Paschal Taper]]

             a taper used in the Roman Catholic Church at the time of Easter. It is lighted from the holy fire, and receives its benediction by the priest's putting five grains of incense in the form of a cross into the taper. This blessed taper must remain on the Gospel-side of the altar from Easter-eve to Ascension-day. SEE LYCHNOSCOPE.

## Paschal Term[[@Headword:Paschal Term]]

             a name given sometimes to Easter-day.

## Paschali, Giovanni Luigi[[@Headword:Paschali, Giovanni Luigi]]

             a martyr to the Protestant cause in Italy, was a native of Coni, in Piedmont, and was descended of respectable parentage. He was born about 1525, and in early life was a soldier. Converted to God, he forsook the army and went to Geneva, there to, study Protestant theology under Calvin. Paschali became so interested in the Reformed doctrines that he wrote pamphlets in their advocacy, and also urged the translation of the Bible into the Italian, in order that the populace might be more thoroughly instructed in God's truth. From Geneva. where he received the freedom of the city, he went, with some other students, to Lausanne. At the latter place he continued his studies under Viret. About this time it happened that the poor Waldensian Christians of Calabria, in the southern part of Italy, appealed to Calvin for a teacher — for the Inquisition, first of all, robbed the flocks of their shepherds, in order the better to get the sheep into its power. The necessity was duly considered by the principal persons of the Italian congregation at Geneva, and they found no one better fitted for the task than Paschali, now at Lausanne. When he heard .the news of this appointment he was on the eve of being married, but he concluded to postpone this step, and accepted the call of the Church as of the Lord. In 1559 Paschali was received with joy by the Waldenses, and he began his work among them with great zeal and courage. Of course the congregation had to be' secretly maintained, and so it came about that when his ministrations were learned. of at court he was imprisoned at Tuscaldo. His trial came off before the vicar-general, Dec. 27, 1559, but no judgment was pronounced at its conclusion, and he  was simply transported to Cosenza by ship, and there was again imprisoned.

A new hearing was given him on February 21, but as he refused to recant, he was, April 14, 1560, removed to Naples with other Protestants who refused to deny their faith. On their arrival in Naples they were all thrown into the common prison, where the water trickled from the ceiling. Paschali, after a long examination, remained there until May 9, and was then changed to the bishop's prison. But soon after they were informed that they must go to Rome. They made the journey by ship, and this prisoner of the Lord did not cease openly to preach the Gospel to his fellow-sufferers and the ship's crew, which act was, on his arrival in Rome, on May 15, charged against him as an additional crime. Together with his companions, he was placed in the prison of the Inquisition, a damp, subterranean vault of Torre di Nona, surrounded by the waters of the Tiber. They were obliged to lie on the damp ground, for not even a straw bed was given them. The next day Bartolomeo, the brother of Paschali, arrived from Coni with letters of recommendation to influential men of the papal court, and, among others, to the grand inquisitor, cardinal Alexandrini. But no one gave him any hope for the freedom of his brother; the writing of Protestant tracts was an' offense not easily forgiven. Only with great trouble did he succeed in securing permission to see his brother in presence of an inquisitor and a monk, and that on the promise that he should try to move him to recant. Bartolomeo, who was not yet converted to Protestantism, but who clung to his brother with a natural love, and had certainly risked somewhat in taking his part, described, in a letter to his son Carlos, who was in Geneva with Paschali's betrothed, the state in which he found his brother:

“I saw him,” he said, “in a narrow room, where those were kept who were shortly to be executed. There he lay with bare head, and bound hand and foot, so that the cords pressed through his skin and flesh. When I saw him. in such misery, and wished to embrace him, I fell down from anguish, and could not utter a word. Thereupon he was much troubled, and said to me, ‘My brother, are you a Christian? Why are you so deeply moved? Do you not know that not a leaf falls from the tree without the will of God? Let us rather comfort one another through Jesus Christ, since we know that these brief nimotai lives are not to be likened to our future and eternal glory.'”

As the inquisitor saw that Paschali's visitor was more likely to become a convert to the Reformed cause than bring about the conversion of the prisoner, he harshly bade Paschali be silent, and overwhelmed him with  reproaches. Of course the prisoner vainly defended himself from the teachings of the holy Gospel. At the earnest supplication of his brother he was, however, taken into another prison, containing a window, through which the two could speak together; but on this being noticed, the window was walled up. When, on his next visit, Bartolomeo wished to persuade Giovanni to submit somewhat, so that he might take him home alive, he answered: “I yearn for heavenly blessings with such a longing that I care nothing for earthly things, not even for my own life. Therefore cease your persuasions, for I have bound Jesus Christ so fast to my heart that no one cant separate me from him.” Bartolomeo Paschali used every effort to get his brother's sentence commuted to a few years' imprisonment, of which he would bear the expense, but it was all in vain. He visited him twice more, and on his second visit he gave him to understand that he must think of his own safety, as he had heard that he was himself “held in suspicion by the Inquisition for being of the, same religion as his brother.” Shortly after Paschali had overcome this additional trial, the day of his final release arrived. On Sunday, Sept. 8, 1560, he was taken to the cloister of La Miinerva, where his sentence was publicly read to him. After he had acknowledged the authenticity of his declarations, and thanked God for the honor of which he was counted worthy, he was again conducted to prison. The next day, Sept. 9, the people went to the execution. The martyr was led bound to the Campo di Fiore, in sight of the castle of St. Angelo, where the pope had gone, accompanied by the cardinals and other prelates. As Paschali undertook to preach to the people, to the pope, and his prelates, there arose a great commotion, and every one demanded that he should be immediately put to death. Thereupon the executioner quickly threw the rope about his neck and strangled him, after which his corpse was burned. See Hurst, Martyrs for the Tract Cause, p. 28 sq.; Mc'Crie, Hist. of the Ref. in Italy.

## Paschasinus[[@Headword:Paschasinus]]

             a Romish prelate of note in his day, flourished near the middle of the 5th century. We first encounter him in A.D. 451, when he was bishop of Lilybaeum, in Scily, as papal legate at the Council of Chalcedon. He there represented the interests of the Roman pontiff, together with Lucentius, bishop' of Asculum, and Bonifacius, a presbyter. Paschasinus, of whose previous history and position in life we know nothing, seems to have held the chief place among the three legates, since he subscribed the acts of the council in the name of the pope before the two others. An epistle of  Paschasinus, De Quaestione Paschali, is still extant, addressed to Leo in reply to some inquiries from the pontiff with regard to the calculations for determining the festival of Easter. It will be found under its best form in the editions of the works of Leo published by Quesnel and by the brothers Ballerini. See Schonemann, Biblioth. Patrum Lat. vol. ii, § 49; Bahr, Geschichte der ionm. Literatur, suppl. vol. pt. ii, § 166; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol. 3:131; Ceillier, Hist. des Aut. Sacrls, 10:170-175, 201 sq., 682 sq., 701.

## Paschasius Radbertus[[@Headword:Paschasius Radbertus]]

             ST., a noted Benedictine of the first half of the 9th century, was a native of Soissons, France. He embraced the monastic life while yet a youth, and was educated and domiciled at the convent at Corbey, in Aquitaine. He was there under the abbots Adelhard and Wala, whose favorite he was. The former of these abbots died in A.D. 826. Paschasius first came into public notice in A.D. 831, when he was still a simple monk. A little while after this he was employed as teacher, and in important missions. In A.D. 844 he was elected abbot of the convent, although he had never taken holy orders. In A.D. 851 he resigned this office, and died as simple monk in A.D. 865, at the atbbey of St. Riquier, where his time was zealously devoted to the study of theology and philosophy. He is now commemorated by the Church of Rome as a saint by order of pope Alexander II (A.D. 1070). In the history of Christian dogmatics Paschasius is celebrated as the originator of the transubtantiation theory, i.e. that the bread and wine no longer exist in the elements of the Eucharist after the blood and body of Christ have become present here by the act of consecration. Paschasius may thus be said to have raised a controversy which has disturbed the Western Church for more than a thousand years. It is called out into symmetrical form, as a theory, by the inquiries of a former pupil of his named Warin (whom he addresses as Placidius), who, having  become abbot of New Corbey, in Saxony, requested his old instructor to draw up a treatise on the Holy Eucharist for the guidance of the young community. In the year 831, therefore, Paschasius Radbertus wrote his work, De Sacramento corporis et sanguinis Christi, of which, when it had become the subject of controversy, he presented a large copy to the emperor, Charles the Bald, in the year 844. In this treatise Radbertus sets forth the ordinary doctrine of the Church respecting the true and real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, but he goes far beyond all previous writers in defining the mode of that presence and its consequences. There had been scarcely any controversy hitherto on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, although John of Damascus, followed by the second Council of Nicaea (A.D. 787) and the Council of Frankfort (A.D. 794), had seen cause to censure the application of “figure” and “type” to the elements, while a Council of Constantinople (A.D. 754) had asserted their legitimate use. This shows the dawn of such a controversy.

The dialectical subtlety which had been employed on doctrines concerning the person of Jesus the Christ and the Christian Trinity was now, however, to be engaged for many a generation on those connected with the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, and the full tide of strife was set flowing by the clear and uncompromising statements of Radbertus. The substance of these statements is as follows:

(1) That the very body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and which was immolated on the cross, together with the very blood that belonged to that body, and was shed upon the cross, are those which the communicants receive (and he does not hint at receiving in one kind only) in receiving the consecrated elements of the Holy Eucharist;

(2) That the bread and wine which are consecrated are wholly and entirely converted into the body and blood of Christ, so that they are no longer to be spoken of as being in any natural sense bread and wine;

(3) That this conversion ordinarily takes place in such a manner that it is not made known to the senses, God permitting the appearance and taste of the bread to remain as a veil to the great miracle which he has wrought;

(4) But that under special circumstances, to confirm the faith of doubters or to satisfy the devotion of saints, the fact of the conversion is made apparent to the senses by the substance of Christ's body and blood either in the form of a lamb, or presenting the color and. appearance of flesh and  blood. Only one such instance is narrated, but it is said to be one out of many (Pasch. Radbert. De Sacram. Corp. et Sang. Christi [in “Bibl. Max. Ludg.” 14:729]; Martene, Vet. Script. Collect. 9:367; Migne, Patrol. vol. 120).

This predise definition of the nature of the Eucharist was a novelty in the Church, as is shown by the catenas of authorities respecting that sacrament which have been collected by Pamelius in his Liturgicon, and by Grieranger in his Institutions Liturgiques. It raised a controversy at once among the theologians of the Benedictine order, and Radbertus endeavored to prove his statements in a letter addressed to one of his monks named Frudegarde, in which he collected passages from the fathers (Pasch. Radbert. Opp. Bibl. Max. Ludg. 4:749; Migne's Patrol. 120. 1351). The first to reply in writing to these novel opinions or definitions was Rabanus Maurus, abbot of Fulda (A.D. 822-847), and afterwards archbishop of Mentz (A.D. 847-856), in an epistle to a monk named Eigel, which has been lost (comp. Mabillon, Act. Sanct. Ord. Bened. sec. 4, 2:591). When the controversy attracted the attention of the emperor Charles the Bald, he required of Paschasius Radbertus a copy of the treatise, and. it was delivered to another monk of Corbey, Ratramnus, or Bertram, for examination. The result was an answer by Ratramnus in the form of a treatise bearing the same title as that of Radbertius, the point of which is to prove that there is a difference between the manner of Christ's presence when on earth and that of his sacramental presence in eucharistic elements; that in the latter “est quilerm corpus Christi sed non corporale, at spirituale;” maintaining, however, as strongly as his opponent the reality of that presence (Ratramnus, De Corp. et Sang. Domini; Migne's Patrol. 118. 815, Oxford ed. 1838). The great liturgical commentator, Walafrid Strabo, was also an opponent of Radbertus, and that portion of his work which deals with the subject is more in accordance with the writings of their Catholic predecessors (Walafridus Strabo, De Reb. Eccl. ch. 16, 17). Another opponent, and more radical than the others, was Erigena (q.v.). He held that the Eucharist is a mere memorial of Christ's death in past time, and not of his presence in the sacrament, a typical act of feeding, by which the mind of the faithful communicant intellectually and piously reminds him of the work of his Lord (Dillinger, Church Hist. 3, 73, Cox's transl.). With the death of Paschasius the controversy subsided for a while, but its revival by Berengar and Lanfranc in the 12th century makes it very evident that the doctrine pleased the superstitious tendency of those ages, and that this theory had been  extending its effects far and wide on the popular mind, and finally the views of Paschasius Radbertus were stamped upon the authoritative theology of the Roman Church, under the name of Transubstantiation, by the fourth Council of Lateran, in the year 1215.

Paschasius was also the author of works entitled De fide, spe et caritate, and De Partu virginis. The former betrays most clearly his superstitious notions in religion. The latter is a bold defense of a doctrine held also by St. Jerome, viz. that the virginity of the Holy Virgin Mary continued after the birth of Christ, or, in other words, that Mary had given birth to Christ utero clauso, and that therefore she and her offspring should be regarded as free from the taint of original sin. (See Munscher, Dogmengesch. ed. Coln, p. 85 sq.; Walch, Historia Controversio sceculi IX de Partu B. Virginis [Gott. 1758, 4to]; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2:40 sq.) The complete works of Paschasins, with a short but excellent biographical sketch as introduction, were published by the Benedictines, entitled Opera, quorum pars multo maxima nunc primum prodit ex bibliotheca Monasterii Corbiensis (Paris, 1618, fol.). The works are reprinted in Migne's Patrologia, vol. 120. Comp. besides the authors already quoted, Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index in vol. 2); Neander, Hist. of Dogmas (see Index in vol. 2); Rickert, in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. fr hist. Theologie, 1858; Dieckhoff, Die A bendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter; Baur, Dogmengesch. vol. 2; Hausher, Der h. Paschasius Radbertus (Mainz, 1862).

## Pase-Buddhas[[@Headword:Pase-Buddhas]]

             a name for the Buddhas who arise in the period in which there is no supreme Buddha, and discover instinctively the way to Nirwana, but are unable to teach it to others. If alms be given to a Pase-Buddha, it produces merit greater by one hundred times than when given to a rahat. The peculiarities of the Pase-Buddha are thus detailed by Mr. Spence Hardy in his Eastern Monachism: “He has attained the high state of privilege that he enjoys by his own unaided exertions, as he has had no one to instruct him. He is called pratyeka, severed or separated, and is solitary, alone, like the unicorn; thus his mind is light, pure, free, towards the Pase-Buddhaship, but heavy, dull, bound, towards the state of the supreme Buddhas. He has learned that which belongs to his order, but he understands not the five kinds of knowledge that are perceived by the supreme Buddhas and by no other beings; he knows not the thoughts of others; he has not the power to  see all things, nor to know all things; in these respects his mind is heavy. Thus a man, whether by day or night, arrives at the brink of a small stream, into which he descends without fear that he may cross over to the other side. But another time he comes to a river that is deep and broad; there are no steppingstones by which he can cross; he cannot see the opposite bank. It is like the ocean. In consequence of these obstacles he is afraid to venture into the water; he cannot cross the stream. In the same way the PaseBuddha is free as to that which is connected with his own order, but bound as to all that is peculiar to the supreme Buddhas.”

## Paseah[[@Headword:Paseah]]

             (Heb. Pase'ach, פָּסֵחִ, lame, Sept. Φεσσή v.r. Βεσσηέ in 1Ch 4:12, Φασή in Ezr 2:49, Φασέκ in Neh 3:6), the name of two men.

1. The second named of three sons of Eshton, among the descendants of Judah (1Ch 4:12), described as “the men of Rechah,” which in the.Targum of R. Joseph is rendered “the men of the great Sanhedrim.” B.C. post 1618.

2. The head of a family among the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:49; “Phaseah” in Neh 7:51). Jehoiada, a member of the family, assisted in rebuilding the old gate of the city under Nehemiah (Neh 3:6). B.C. ante 446.

## Pasha[[@Headword:Pasha]]

             a title used in the Ottoman empire, and applied to governors of provinces, or military and naval commanders of high rank. The name is said to be derived from two Persian words — pa, “foot,” or support, and shall, “ruler” — and signifies “the support of the ruler.” The title was limited in the early period of the Ottoman empire to the princes of the blood, but was subsequently extended to the grand-vizier, the members of the divan, the seraskier, capitan-pasha, the begler-begs, and other civil and military authorities. The distinctive badge of a pasha is a horse's tail waving from the end of a staff crowned with a gilt ball; in war this badge is always carried before him when he goes abroad, and is at other times planted in front of. his tent. The three grades of pashas are distinguished by the number of horse-tails on their standards; those of the highest rank are pashas of three tails, and include in general the highest functionaries, civil and military. All pashas of this class have the title of vizier; and the grandvizier is, par excellence, a pasha of three tails. The pashas of two tails are the governors of provinces, who are generally called by the simple title of “pasha.” The lowest rank of pasha is the pasha of one tail; the sanjaks, or lowest class of provincial governors, are of this rank. The pasha of a province has authority over the military force; the revenue, and the administration of justice. His authority was formerly absolute, but recently a check was imposed on him by the appointment of local councils. The pasha is in his own person the military leader and administrator of justice for the province under his charge, and holds office during the pleasure of the sultan — a most precarious tenure, as the sultan can at any moment, in the exercise of his despotic power, exile, imprison, or put him to death; and this has frequently been done in cases where the pasha's power has exdited the apprehension, or his wealth the avarice, of his royal master.

The word pasha does not occur in the A.V. of the Bible, but in the original the identical term פֶּחָה, pechh (rendered “captain,” “deputy,” “governor”), is applied in 1Ki 10:15 to the petty chieftains who were tributary to Solomon (2Ch 9:14); to the military commander of the Syrians (1Ki 20:24), the Assyrians (2Ki 18:24; 2Ki 23:6), the Chaldaeans (Jer 51:23), and the Medes (Jer 51:38). Under the Persian viceroys, during the Babylonian captivity, the land of the Hebrews appears to have been portioned out among “governors”' (פִּחוֹת, pachoSth) inferior in rank to the satraps (Ezr 8:36), like the other provinces which were under the dominion of the Persian king (Neh 2:7; Neh 2:9). It is impossible to determine the precise limits of their authority, or the functions which they had to perform. They formed a part of the Babylonian system of government, and are expressly distinguished from the סְגָנַים, seganim (Jer 51:23; Jer 51:28), to whom, as well as to the satraps, they seem to have been inferior (Dan 3:2-3; Dan 3:27); as also from the שָׂרַים, sarim (Est 3:12; Est 8:9), who, on the other hand, had a subordinate jurisdiction. Sheshbazhzar, the “prince” (נָשַׂיא, Ezr 1:8) of Judah, was appointed by Cyrus “governor” of Jerusalem (Ezr 5:14), or “governor of the Jews,” as he is elsewhere designated (Ezr 6:7), an office to which Nehemiah afterwards succeeded (Neh 5:14) under the title of Tirshatha (Ezr 2:63; Neh 8:9). Zerubbabel, the representative of the royal family of Judah, is also called the “governor” of Judah (Hag 1:1), but whether in consequence of his position in the tribe or from his official rank is not quite clear. Tatnai, the “governor” beyond the river, is spoken of by Josephus (Ant. 11:4, 4) under the name of Sisines, as ἔπαρχος of Syria and Phoenicia (comp. 1Es 6:3), the same term being employed to denote the Roman proconsul or proprietor as well as the procurator (Josephus, Ant. 20:8, 1). It appears from Ezr 6:8 that these governors were entrusted with the collection of the king's taxes; and from Neh 5:18; Neh 12:26, that they were supported by a contribution levied upon the people, which was technically termed “the bread of the governor” (comp. Ezr 4:14). They were probably assisted in discharging their official duties by a council (Ezr 4:7; Ezr 6:6). In the Peshito version of Neh 3:11, Pahath Moab is not taken as a proper name, but is rendered “chief of Moab;” and a similar translation is given in other passages where the words occur, as in Ezr 2:6; Neh 7:11; Neh 10:14. The “governor” beyond the river had a judgment-seat at Jerusalem,  from which probably he administered justice when making a progress through his province (Neh 3:7). SEE GOVERNOR.

## Pashur[[@Headword:Pashur]]

             [some Pa'shu/r] (Heb. Pa'shur', פֵּשְׁחוּר[Gesen., from an Arabic root, surrounded with prosperity; Furst, from a Heb. root, liberation; the etymology, as implying something favorable, seems to be referred to in Jer 20:3]; Sept. Φασχώρ, Φασούρ, v.r. Φασσούρ [Ezr 2:38; Ezr 10:22], Φασεούρ [Neh 7:41], Πασχώρ [in Jeremiah]), the name of two or three men.

1. A priest, the son of Immer, and a contemporary of Jeremiah, who acted so as to incur a severe threatening from that prophet; B.C. 607. Presuming on his position as “chief governor in the house of the Lord” (Jer 20:1) — that is, probably, being at the head of those who had the charge of maintaining order and decorum about the Temple — he smote Jeremiah, when he heard him prophesying of the desolations which were going to fall upon Jerusalem, and put him in the stocks. In this humiliating and painful situation the prophet remained for a night; and on being brought forth on the morrow, he declared to Pashur that the Lord no longer called his name Pashur, but Magor-misabib — on every side enveloped in trouble and distress. This, the prophet further intimates, was to be verified by both Pashur and his family being involved in the terrible disasters that were presently to burst on Judah and Jerusalem from the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar; they were to be all carried away into captivity to Babylon, and die in that foreign land (Jer 20:6). We have no specific account of the fortunes of the family; but the circumstances which soon took place leave no room to doubt that the prediction was verified.

2. Another priest in the time of Jeremiah, being the son of Melchiah (Jer 21:1; Jer 38:1). B.C. 589. He twice came in contact with the prophet: once when sent along with some others to inquire what was the mind of the Lord respecting the meditated assault of Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem, which drew forth an announcement of certain overthrow; and again when concurring with several others in an application to the king to have Jeremiah put to death on account of the denunciations he was uttering, as tending to discourage the people and produce in them a spirit of disaffection. The application led to Jeremiah's imprisonment, from which he was only delivered by the special interposition of Providence  (1Ch 9:12). Pashur's family, however, were among those who returned from the captivity of Babylon, and seem to have possessed a place of importance both as to position and numbers (Neh 7:41; Neh 11:12).

3. The father of Gedaliah, which latter took part with the Pashur last named in the accusation and imprisonment of Jeremiah (Jer 38:1). B.C. 589. He was perhaps identical with one or the other of the foregoing.

## Pasiphae[[@Headword:Pasiphae]]

             a goddess worshipped among the ancient Greeks at Thalamae, in Laconia. She was believed to give supernatural revelations or oracular responses in dreams to those who slept in her temple.

## Pasithea[[@Headword:Pasithea]]

             one of the Graces among the ancient Greeks.

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

             a learned German philologist, was born Aug. 1, 1570, at Ellar, in Nassau. In 1615 he became professor of philology at Herborn, and in 1616 at Franecker, where he died, Dec. 10, 1637. He is the author of a small lexicon of the New Testament, Lexicon Graeco-Latin. In N. Test. (Herborn, 1622), which has been several times republished, and he left among his papers a grammar of the New Testament, which his son Matthaeus published, with additions and improvements of his own, under the title, G. Pasoris Grammatica Graeca Sacra N.T. in tres libros distributa (Groningen, 1655). This work, which is far more fitted than the lexicon to transmit the author's name to posterity, is now a literary rarity, and is not even mentioned by Foppen (Bibliotheca Belgica, 1:342), who gives a list of Pasors other writings. See Furst, Bibl Judaica, 3:68; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Handbuch, p. 109; Theologisches Universal- Lexikon, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, 3:1284; continued by Rottermund, v. 1629; (B. P.)

## Pasor, Matthaeus[[@Headword:Pasor, Matthaeus]]

             son of the preceding, is noted also for his philological as well as mathematical attainments. He was born at Herborn in 1599. and was educated at the university in Marburg. After teaching for some time privately in Hebrew and mathematics he went to England, and was created M.A. by the University of Oxford in 1624. Not finding any opportunity there of securing a professorship he went over to France, and attended lectures at Paris. He made himself master of the Syriac and Arabic, returned to Oxford in 1625, and was shortly after made lecturer on Oriental languages. In 1626 he was made temporary professor, and  exercised this function till 1629, when he accepted an invitation to the professorship of moral philosophy at Groningen, which he entered upon in August of the same year. Upon the death of Muller, the mathematical professor, six years after, Pasor succeeded to that chair, and in 1645 he was raised to that of divinity, of which faculty he was then created doctor. On this occasion he resigned his mathematical professorship, but retained that of moral philosophy. In 1653 he made a visit to Nassau, his native country; and, going as far as Heidelberg, was entertained with great civility by the elector palatine. He died in January, 1657-8, at Groningen, having never been married. He published no books, for which he gave two admirable reasons: first, “Because he was not willing that youth should be diverted from reading the good books already published;” and, secondly, “Because he did not care that the booksellers should risk their money.” (J.H.W.)

## Pasquali, Filippo[[@Headword:Pasquali, Filippo]]

             an Italian painter, was a native of Forli, and flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He studied under Carlo Cignani at Bologna, and afterwards associated himself with Marc Antonio Franceschini, in conjunction with whom he painted manly works at Bologna, Rimini, and other places, in which he executed the ornamental parts. Some of his earlier works are to be seen in the portico of the Serviti at Bologna. Lanzi highly commends his altar-piece in the church of S. Vittore at Ravenna, which he executed alone at a more advanced age. He is supposed to have died about 1690. — Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:657.

## Pasqualini (Or Pascalini), Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Pasqualini (Or Pascalini), Giovanni Battista]]

             an Italian painter and engraver, was born at Gento, near Bologna, in the latter part of the 16th century. His earliest print is dated 1619, and the latest 1630. He studied painting under Ciro Ferri, but does not seem to have acquired much eminence in that art. He executed many etchings, mostly after Guercino, in which he endeavored to imitate with the point the  masterly pen-drawings of that master, but he did not possess a sufficient command of his instrument to accomplish it with much success. He frequently signed his plates J. B. Centensis. Nagler gives a list of forty prints by him, of which the following are of interest to us: Christ dictating the Gospel to St. John; the Resurrection of Lazarus; Christ giving the Keys to St. Peter; Christ taken in the Garden; Angels showing Mary Magdalene the Instruments of the Passion; Christ with the Disciples at Emmaus; the Incredulity of Thomas; the Virgin and Infant, with an Angel presenting Fruit; the Virgin and Infant, to whom St. John presents an Apple; St. Charles Borromeo; St. Felix resuscitating a Dead Child. All these are after Guercino. Besides, Pasqualini elaborated St. Felix kneeling before the Virgin and Infant, after L. Caracci; St. Diego working a Miracle, after Ann. Caracci; the Death of St. Cecilia, after Domenichino.

## Pasqualini, Felice[[@Headword:Pasqualini, Felice]]

             a Bolognese painter, who flourished about 1575. According to Malaysia, he was the scholar of Lorenzo Sabbatini, whose style he adopted. He executed some works for the churches, which Lanzi thinks might justly be attributed to Sabbatini, such was the part he took in their execution.

## Pasqualis, Martinez[[@Headword:Pasqualis, Martinez]]

             chief of the sect of the Illumninati (q.v.), was born about 1715 in Portugal. Of Jewish origin, he had submitted himself in 1754 for admission to the cabalistic body, and afterwards became famous by his introduction of cabalistic rites into several masonic lodges of France-at Marseilles, Toulouse, and Bordeaux. In the latter city he initiated operations which he called theurgic. One of his most devoted admirers there was Louis-Claude de Saint-Martin, then an officer in the regiment of Foix, with whom he has often been confounded, in consequence of the analogy of their names. Martinez, who presented his doctrine as a secret Biblical teaching which he had received by tradition, brought it in 1768 to Paris, and made a large number of adepts, who in 1775 took the name of Martinists. In their reunions they engaged in exercises which announced active virtues, to use consecrated language. They obtained, by sensible means, manifestations of an intellectual order, which revealed to the proselytes a science of minds, as the visions of Swedenborg, of a sentimental order, revealed a science of souls. One may conclude from Pasqualis's unpublished writings, and from those of his disciples, that he, believed, or made his disciples believe, that it is possible for men in a devoted state to produce supernatural effects, or miracles. Martinez Pasqualis left Paris in 1778 for St. Domingo, where he was called to succeed one of his relatives, and died at Port-au-Prince the following year. See Saint-Martin, (Euvres diverses, passim.

## Pasqualotto, Constantino[[@Headword:Pasqualotto, Constantino]]

             an Italian painter, flourished at Vicenza about 1700. He studied at Venice, and on returning to his native city he executed some fine works for the churches. Lanzi says he was more distinguished for the richness of his draperies and the brilliancy of his coloring than for the correctness of his design.

## Pass (Or Pase), Magdalena De[[@Headword:Pass (Or Pase), Magdalena De]]

             daughter of Crispin. de Passe, was born about 1583. She learned engraving of her father, and elaborated some small plates of portraits and other subjects in such a neat, finished style that they possess considerable merit. Among her works are, the Wise and the Foolish Virgins, after Elsheirner; fine.

## Pass (Or Passe), Crispin De[[@Headword:Pass (Or Passe), Crispin De]]

             called the Younger, a Dutch painter, was born at. Utrecht about 1630. Little is known with certainty of him. He studied design and engraving in 1659. There are only a few prints by him, among which are three of a set of four plates of the History of the Rich Man and Lazarus; the fourth was engraved by his father.

## Passage[[@Headword:Passage]]

             in the A.V., is the representative in. certain places of several forms from the root עָבִר, abar, to cross: 1, the simple verb (Num 20:21, “give passage,” elsewhere usually “pass”); 2, עֶבֶר, eber, a crossing (Jos 22:11; in the plur. Jer 22:20, Abarim [q.v.]; elsewhere ‘beyond,” etc.) SEE EBER; מִעֲבָר, maabar, fem. מִעִבָרָה, a transit, either by water (Jdg 12:5-6; Jer 51:32), a ford (as rendered often), or by land, a pass through mountains (Isa 10:29), as at Michmash (q.v.) (1Sa 12:23; 1Sa 24:4).

## Passalorynchites[[@Headword:Passalorynchites]]

             a party of Montanists who observed perpetual silence, giving literal obedience to Psa 141:3 : “Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips.” Jerome found some of them in Galatia, obeying this miserable literalism. Their name is derived from the Greek πάσσαλος,  a nail, and ῥίν. a nostril, because when they put their finger to their mouth, which they did to keep their mouth from giving utterance to their thoughts, they touched their nose. The Passalorynchites did not even pray audibly.

## Passau[[@Headword:Passau]]

             a picturesque fortified frontier town of Bavaria, containing 15,583 people, and situated at the confluence of the Inn and the Ilz with the Danube, ninety miles east-north-east of Munich, and rising like an amphitheatre on the most beautiful spot of the Danube, is strikingly effective and picturesque. The place is especially celebrated in Protestant Church history, for it was here that the treaty of Passau was signed Aug. 2, 1552, by the emperor Charles V on the one side and the Protestant princes of Germany on the other, giving public recognition to the Lutheran faith as among the ecclesiastical institutions of the empire. Among the chief buildings are the cathedral, the bishop's palace, the post-office (where the treaty of Passau was signed in 1552); the Jesuits' College, a large building now used as at school; and the church of St. Michael's. In the Cathedral Square (Domplatz) is a bronze statue of king Maximilian Joseph, of recent erection. Passau contains also numerous picture-galleries, collections of antiquities, and benevolent and charitable institutions. The natural advantages of this site, in a military point of view, were appreciated at an early period by the Romans, who erected a strong camp here, garrisoned it with Batavian troops, and from this circumstance named it Batava Castra. Passau was long the seat of a bishopric founded in the 7th century, but secularized in 1803. The cathedral of Passau and great part of the town were. consumed by fire in 1662. During the Reformation period many advocates of the new cause flourished in Passau, but the Jesuits of Vienna, who in 1612 succeeded in establishing a college at Passau, used all means at their command to reinstate Romanism at this place in its wonted glory and power, and they succeeded so well that the Protestant fold has been reduced to a mere trifle. See Spieker, Gesch. des Augsburger Religions friedens (Schlitz, 1854); Ranke, Reformationsgesch. vol. vii; Soames, Hist. of the Ref 3:747; Hefele, Conciliengesch. v. 26 sq.; Fisher, Hist. of the Ref. p. 167; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 4:206. SEE PROTESTANTISM; SEE REFORMATION.

## Passavanti, Jacopo[[@Headword:Passavanti, Jacopo]]

             an Italian ascetic writer, died June 13, 1357, at Florence, his native place. He belonged to the order of the Dominicans, and rendered his name celebrated in Italy by a treatise entitled Specchio della vesa penitenza, which Leonardi Salviati had printed in 1585. The Academy of La Crusca placed this treatise among the classical works for its excellence of style, and published an edition of it in 1681, which was reproduced in 1725 (Florence, 4to). See Echard et Quetif, Script. ord. Predicat. vol. i.

## Passerani, Alberto Radicati[[@Headword:Passerani, Alberto Radicati]]

             Count of, was an Italian philosopher, born in Piedmont, who lived in the last century. Attached to the house of king Victor Amadeus II, he was concerned in the differences which arose between that prince and the holy chair on the subject of consistorial benefices, and wrote against the court of Rome pamphlets so violent that, in consequence of a suit which was brought against him, the tribunal of the Inquisition ordered the seizure of his goods. But he was enabled to escape the effect of this judgment, and fled to England, where he allied himself with Collins, Tindal, and other freethinkers. He died in Holland, and bequeathed all that he possessed to the poor. We have several works of his in French, in which are found a singular mixture of invectives against the clergy, plans of reform, and philosophical ideas; of these we quote Dissertation sur la mort (Rotterdam, 1733). This tract, advocating materialism, justifying suicide, and denying human responsibility, was suppressed. We quote again of his works: a Recueil de pieces curieuses (ibid. 1736, 8vo), and a supposed translation under the title of La Religion Mohammedane comparee a la Pa'lenne (1737, 8vo). See Factum prefixed to the Recueil of 1736.

## Passeri, Andrea[[@Headword:Passeri, Andrea]]

             an Italian painter of Como, flourished about the year 1505. In the cathedral of his native city is a picture of The Virgin surrounded by the Apostles, in which the composition and expression of the heads are good; but Lanzi says there is a dryness in the hands, with the use of gilding, unworthy of tie age in which Passeri painted.

## Passeri, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Passeri, Giovanni Battista]]

             a distinguished painter and ecclesiastic, is author of one of the best collections of biographies of Italian artists. He was born at Rome about 1610. He received a good education, and, according to his own account, did not take up painting until comparatively late. He was first engaged in the capacity of a painter in 1635 by Canini, in the Villa Aldobranditri, at Frascati, where he contracted an intimate friendship with Domenichino, then returned from Naples. When Domenichino died in Naples, in 1641, Passeri was president of the Academy of St. Luke, and he read a funeral oration on him, and painted a portrait of him, now in the gallery Degli Uffizi, at Florence. At the close of his life Passeri entered into holy orders, and obtained in 1675 a benefice in the college of Santa Maria, in Via Lata. He died in 1679. Passeri is one of the best of the Italian historians of art; his theoretical knowledge was good, and his statements are believed to be very correct. The circumstance of his book lying for nearly a century unnoticed, or rather unpublished, was owing to its unfinished state and the severity of many of his remarks, especially on Bernini. It was first published in Rome by an anonymous editor (supposed to be Bottari, editor of the Lettere Pittoriche) in 1772, with some omissions, under the title, Vite de Pittori, Scultori, ed Architetti che anno lavorato in Roma, morti dal 1641 Jino al 1673, di Giambattista Passeri, Pittore e Poeta (492 pp. 4to), thus constituting a continuation to the work of Baglione. It contains thirty-six lives, from Domenichino to Salvator Rosa inclusive. There is only one public picture by Passeri in Rome, a Crucifixion, between two saints, in the church of San Giovanni della Malva. See English Cyclop. s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:661.

## Passeri, Giuseppe[[@Headword:Passeri, Giuseppe]]

             a nephew of the preceding, was born at Rome in 1654. According to Pascoli, he was a scholar of Carlo Maratti, and one of the most successful followers of his style. He painted many works for the churches at Rome, and at different places in the Roman territory. In the church of the Vatican he painted a pendant to the Baptism of Maratti, representing St. Peter baptizing the Centurion. This works after being copied in mosaic, was sent to the church of the Coventuals at Urbino. It was executed under the direction of Maratti himself, and is admirably colored; but in his other works at Rome, such as the Conception, in the church of St. Tommaso in Parione, the coloring is comparatively feeble. At Pesara is one of his most  eiteemed works, representing St. Jerome meditating on the Last Judgment. He painted for the collections, and was also an excellent portrait painter. Passeri lived in general esteem, and his house was much frequented by persons of the first rank for taste and literature. He died at Rome in 1714.

## Passeroni, Gian Carlo[[@Headword:Passeroni, Gian Carlo]]

             an Italian writer, for some time in .the service of the Church, was born in 1713 at Condamine, in the county of Nizza; he studied at Milan in the Jesuits' College, and afterwards took orders as a priest. He went to Rome with the papal nuncio, and afterwards returned to Milan, where he spent the rest of his life in a state of poverty often bordering upon destitution; but he was so used to be content with little that he felt no inconvenience from his condition. and constantly refused the offers of his numerous Milanese friends to relieve his wants. Passeroni was fond of study, and especially of poetry, and he had a great share in reforming the taste of the Italian writers of his age. Parini, who in his youth was intimate with Passeroni, afterwards admitted that to his precepts and example he owned the formation of his own style. The principal work of Passeroni is a half burlesque, half moral poem, styled Il Cicerone, in one hundred and one cantos. It is full of digressions, something similar in manner to Sterne's Tristram Shandy; but Passeroni's digressions are clearly intelligible, and have all a moral scope. A kind of parody of Cicero's life is used by the author as a thread whereon to hang his disquisitions. Passeroni ridicules or reproves the numerous follies and vices of society in a good-humored and often highly amusing strain, and his verses, like those of Ovid, seem to flow naturally and without effort from his pen. This facility, and the unaffected simplicity of the style, constitute the principal charm of the poem. Passeroni also wrote seven volumes of fables in verse, chiefly imitations of those of Esop, Phaedrus, and Avienus. He died at Milan in 1803.

## Passerotti, Bartolomeo[[@Headword:Passerotti, Bartolomeo]]

             an Italian painter, was born about 1540 at Bologna. He studied under Taddeo Zuccara at Rome, and is mentioned by Vasari as one of the assistants of that master. He is also commended by Borghini and Lomazzo. Passerotti resided in the early part of his life at Rome, where he executed some works for the churches, the most esteemed of which is the Martyrdom of St. Paul. On his return to Bologna he painted many altar- pieces for the churches, the most celebrated of which are, the Adoration of  the Magi, in St. Pietro; the Annunciation, in St. Martino Maggiore; The Virgin on a Throne, surrounded by St. John the Baptist and other Saints, in St. Giacomo Maggiore, which last work was avowedly painted in competition with the Caracci, and elicited their praise. The exquisite degree of diligence and refinement which Passerotti displayed in this work he rarely used; but he generally painted in a bold, free style, with remarkable facility of execution. He also excelled in portraits, and in this branch Guido ranked him next to Titian, preferring him before the Caracci themselves. He opened a school at Bologna, which was attended. by many distinguished masters. Lanzi says “he was the first at Bologna to make a grander display, and began to vary Scripture histories by drawing from the naked torsi.” Passerotti possessed remarkable skill in designing with his pen, a gift which drew to his school Agostino Caracci. He also wrote a book, from which he taught the symmetry and anatomy of the human body essential to the artist. His pictures are distinguished by a sparrow, in allusion to his name — a custom derived from the ancients, and practiced by many modern — artists. Zani describes Passerotti as a designer and engraver. He says, also, that he is called Il Maestro al Passera (the Master of the Sparrow), from his having used a sparrow between the letters B. and P. as his rebus, but this is not mentioned by any other writer. Bartsch commends Passerotti highly for his ability as a designer, and for the. freedom, and boldness of his mailer of engraving. He enumerates and describes fifteen prints by him, also two mentioned by Gori and Rost, and one doubtful; but he does not consider the catalogue complete. He says that Passerotti's prints have at all times been sought for by artists and connoisseurs, and that they have become extremely scarce, the richest collections possessing one or two at most. We append a list of Passerotti's etchings, as given by Bartsch (Peintre-Graveur, tom. 18): The Chastity of Joseph, after Parmiggiano: — The Visitation, after F. Salviati: — The Virgin, with the Infant and St. John; marked P. F. — a similar subject, with the letters B. P. — The Virgin, sitting on the ground, with the infant Jesus on her knees; signed B. Pasarot. — Jesus Christ holding a Banner; signed B. Pasarot. This and the five following are supposed to be part of a suite of thirteen, representing Christ and his Apostles: — St. Peter; the letters B. P. on the left at bottom: — St. Andrew; signed B. Pasarot. at bottom: — St. John the Evangelist; ditto: — St. Bartholomew; ditto: — St. Paul; the letters B. P. on the right at bottom: — Religion, represented by a woman seated, and surrounded by the sun; the letter B. on the right at bottom: — Painting, represented by a young female with wings; the letters  B. P. on the right at bottom: The Young Woman in Bed; B. Passarot, written backwards, the letter B. reversed and joined to the P. — The Sacrifice, in which there are eight figures; the letters B. P. on the left at bottom: The “Clarity, mentioned by Gori: — The Marriage of Isaac and Rebecca, after Perugino; mentioned by Rost: — A Holy Family, doubtful: — St. Peter delivered from Prison by an Angel. St. Peter is seated, and the angel, without wings, has placed the left hand on Peter's shoulder, and directs they with the right: at the bottom, in the corner, are the letters B. P.

## Passerotti, Tiburzio[[@Headword:Passerotti, Tiburzio]]

             an Italian painter, son of the preceding, was born at Bologna in 1575. He was instructed by his father, whose manner he adopted, though he wrought with a less bold, free, and rapid pencil. He executed some works for the churches, which were admired for their beautiful composition, and which Lanzi says possess real merit. The principal are, The Assumption, in S. Maria Mascarella; The Virgin, with St. Francis and St. Jerome, in S. Cecilia; The Annunciation, in S. Christina; and The Martyrdom of St. Catharina, in S. Giacomo Maggiore, which last is his most celebrated performance. He was also an excellent portrait-painter. He died in the prime of life in 1612.

## Passignano, Domenico Da, Or Domenico Cresti[[@Headword:Passignano, Domenico Da, Or Domenico Cresti]]

             Cavaliere, an Italian painter of note, was born at Florence about the middle of the 16th century. Some accounts give 1560, but this is probably too late; Baglione says he was eighty years old when he died, in 1638, which would place his birth in 1557 or 1558. He was the pupil of Federigo Zucchero, and lived some time in Venice, where he acquired a decided preference for the Venetian school of painting, and especially the works of Paolo Veronese. He acquired a great reputation at Rome, where he was employed by the popes Paul V and Urban VIII; he painted The Crucifixion of St. Peter for the Cappella Clementina in the great church of St. Peter at the Vatican, for which he was created Cavaliere dell' Abito di Cristo. He spent the latter part of his life at Florence, and he was one of the most influential of those painters who contributed towards the reform of the Florentine school by improving the taste for color, and rendering the mannered anatomical school less popular. Passignano was the friend and associate of Cigoli, and is said to have been the master of Lodovico  Caracci while in Florence. He had many scholars, of whom Pietro Sorri of Siena was the most distinguished.

## Passing Bell[[@Headword:Passing Bell]]

             the bell which in former times was tolled when any person was dying or passing out of this life. It is tolled in England at the burial of any parishioner, the practice being enjoined in the sixth canon of the Church of England. In the United States the practice of tolling the bell on the occurrence of death and at the funeral service was formerly very general, but it is gradually becoming rare, especially in large places. In hamlets and villages, where greater intimacy prevails among the people than in the cities, the tolling of the bell to register the death-stroke will probably continue for some time yet. One of the peculiar features of this practice is the notice by the bell of the age of the deceased.

## Passion[[@Headword:Passion]]

             (Gr. πάσχω, to suffer) expresses really the contrary of action. But first in the plural form, and now even in the singular, the word is used to describe a violent commotioi or agitation of the mind — emotion, zeal, ardor. In its widest sense it denotes all the states or manifestations of the sensibility — every form and degree of feeling. In a more restricted psychological sense it is confined to those states of the sensibility which are turbulent, and weaken our power of self-command. This is also the popular use of the phrase, in which passion is opposed to reason.

(a.) Plato arranged the passions in two classes, the concupiscible and irascible — ἐπιθυμία and θῦμος; the former springing from the body and perishing with it, the latter connected with the rational and immortal part of our nature, and stimulating to the pursuit of good aid the avoiding of excess and evil. Aristotle included all man's active principles under one general designation of oretic, and distinguished them into the appetite irascible, the appetite concupiscible, which had their origin in the body, and the body rational (βούλησις), which is in the will, under the guidance of reason. Descartes and Malebranche have each given a theory and classification of the passions, also Dr. Isaac Watts, Dr. Cogan, and Dr. Hutcheson and Le Brun. The last named makes the number of passions about twenty:

1. attention;

2. admiration;

3. astonishment;

4. veneration;

5. rapture;

6. joy, with tranquillity;

7. desire;

8. laughter;

9. acute pain;

10. pains, simply bodily;

11. sadness;

12. weeping;

13. compassion;

14. scorn;

15. horror;

16. terror or fright;

17. anger;

18. hatred;

19. jealousy;

20. despair.

All these may be represented on canvas by the pencil. Some make their number greater, adding aversion, love, emulation, etc.; these, however, may be considered as included in the above list. They are divided by some into public and private, proper and improper, social and selfish passions.

(b.) The origin of the passions is from impressions on the senses; from the operations of reason, by which good or evil is foreseen; and from the recollections of memory.

(c.) The objects of the passions are mostly things sensible, on account of their near alliance to the body; but objects of a spiritual nature also, though invisible, have a tendency to excite the passions: such as the love of God, heaven, hell, eternity, etc.

(d.) As to the innocency of the passions; in themselves they are neither good nor evil, but according to the good or ill use that is made of them, and the degrees to which they rise.

(e.) The usefulness of the passions is considerable; they were given us for a kind of spring or elasticity to correct the natural sluggishness, of the  corporeal part. They give birth to poetry, science, painting, music, and all the polite arts, which minister to pleasure; nor are they less serviceable in the cause of religion and truth. “When sanctified,” says Dr. Watts, “they set the powers of the understanding at work in the search of divine truth and religious duty; they keep the soul fixed to divine things; render the duties of holiness much easier, and temptations to sin much weaker; and render us more like Christ, and fitter for his presence and enjoyment in heaven.

(f.) As to the regulation of the passions: to know whether they are under due restraints and directed to proper objects, we must inquire whether they influence our opinions; run before the understanding; are engaged in trifling, and neglectful of important objects; express themselves in an indecent manner; and whether, they disorder our conduct. If this be the case, they are out of their due bounds, and will become sources of trial rather than instruments of good. To have them properly regulated, we should possess knowledge of our duty, take God's Word for our rule, be much in prayer and dependence on the Divine Being.

(g.) Lastly, we should study the passions. To examine them accurately, indeed, requires much skill, patience, observation, and judgment; but to form any proper idea of the human mind, and its various operations; to detect the errors that arise from heated temperament and intellectual excess; to know how to touch their various strings, and to direct and employ them in the best of all services to accomplish these ends, the study of the passions is of the greatest consequence. “Amid the numerous branches of knowledge,” says Mr. Cogan, “which claim the attention of the human mind, no one can be more important than this. Whatever most intimately concerns ourselves must be of the first moment. An attention, therefore, to the workings of our own minds; tracing the power which external objects have over us; discovering the nature of our emotions and affections; and comprehending the reason of our being affected in a particular manner, must have a direct influence upon our pursuits, our characters, and our happiness. It may with justice be advanced that the happiness of ourselves in this department is of much greater utility than abtruser speculations concerning the nature of the human soul, or even the most accurate knowledge of its intellectual powers; for it-is according as the passions and affections are excited and directed towards the objects investigated by our intellectual natures that we become useful to ourselves and others; that we rise into respectability or sink into contempt; that we  diffuse or enjoy happiness, diffuse or suffer misery. An accurate analysis of these passions and affection, therefore, is to the moralist what the science of anatomy is to the surgeon. It constitutes the first principles of rational practice; it is, in a moral view, the anatomy of the heart; it discovers why it beats, and how it beats; indicates appearances in a sound and healthy state; detects diseases with their causes, and it is infinitely more fortunate in the power it communicates of applying suitable remedies.”

See Hutcheson, Watts, Le Brun, Cogan, and Davan On the Passions; Grove, Moral Philos. vol. 1, chap. 7; Reid, Active Powers of Man; Fordyce, Elements of Moral Philos.; Burke, On the Sublime and Beautiful, p. 50; M'Cosh, Hist. of Scottish Philos.; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. (see Index in vol. 2); Southern Rev. Oct. 1874, art. 3; New- Englander, Oct. 1872, p. 289.

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

             is a term ecclesiastically applied to our Lord's crucifixion (as in Act 1:3, παθεῖν, suffering, as elsewhere rendered). For the detailed circumstances connected with this event, SEE AGONY; SEE CRUCIFIXION; SEE FLAGELLATION, etc. Monographs on the various points may be seen cited in Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 50, 52, 60, 62; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 158, 174. See also Blunt, Hist. Dict. s.v.; Lond. Qu. Rev. January, 1875, p. 106 sq.; Liddon, Div. of Christ; Bunsen, Die heilige Leidensgeschichte (Leips. 1861); Farrar, Life of Christ. For the history, SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Passion Cross[[@Headword:Passion Cross]]

             a cross of the form of that on which our Savior suffered, with a long stem and a short traverse near the top. It is of occasional occurrence as a heraldic charge, though less frequent than many other varieties of cross. A passion' cross, when elevated' on three steps or degrees (which have been said by heralds to represent the virtues of Faith, Hope, and Charity), is called a Cross Calvary.

## Passion Day[[@Headword:Passion Day]]

             SEE GOOD FRIDAY.

## Passion Plays[[@Headword:Passion Plays]]

             SEE MYSTERIES.

## Passion Week[[@Headword:Passion Week]]

             a name in Church language for the week preceding Easter, because with it, in strict sense; the commemoration of the passion of Jesus the Christ is observed by the Christian churches that observe holidays. The week was by the early Church called Hebdomas Magna, or the Great Week. St. Chrysostom says that it was so called, not because it consisted of longer days or more in number than other weeks, but because at this time great things were wrought for us by Christ; for in this week the ancient tyranny of the devil was dissolved, death was extinct, the strong man was bound, his goods were spoiled, sin was abolished, the curse was destroyed, paradise was opened, heaven became accessible, men and angels were  joined together, the middle wall of partition was broken down, the barriers were taken out of the way. the God of peace made peace between things in heaven and things in earth. Many of the early Christians. were accustomed to fast much more strictly in this than in the other weeks of Lent. Epiphanius says that in his time the people confined their diet during that week to dried meats, namely, bread .and salt and water. Nor were these used during the day, but in the evening. In another place the same ancient writer says, “Some continue the whole week, making one prolonged fast of the whole; others eat after two days; and others every evening.” Chrysostom mentions that during this week it was customary to make a more liberal distribution of alms to the poor, and the exercise of all kinds of charity to those who had need of it. To servants it was a time of rest and liberty, and the same privilege extended to, the week following as well as to the week preceding Easter. The emperors, also, granted a general release to prisoners at this season, and commanded all suits and processes at law to cease.

The Thursday of the Passion Week, being the day on which Christ was betrayed, was observed with some peculiar customs. In some of the Latin churches: the communion was administered on this day in the evening, in imitation of Christ's last supper, a provision being made for this in one of the canons of the third Council of Carthage. On this day the competentes, or candidates for baptism, publicly recited the creed in the presence of the bishop or presbyters in the church. Such public penitents, also, as had completed the penance enjoined by the Church, were then absolved. On this day, too, it was customary for servants to receive the communion. (The modern ritualists call it Maunday Thursday, q.v.) The Friday was called Good Friday (q.v.), or Pasch of the Cross, in opposition to Easter, or the Pasch of the Resurrection. From the canons of the fourth Council of Toledo it would appear that a general absolution was proclaimed to all those who observed the day with fasting, prayers, or true contrition. The Saturday, or Sabbath, in Passion Week, was commonly known by the name of the Great Sabbath. It was the only Sabbath throughout the year that the Greek churches, and some of the Western, kept as a fast. The fast was continued not only until evening, but protracted till cock-crowing in the morning, which was supposed to be the time of Christ's resurrection. The previous part of the night was spent in religious exercises of various kinds. Eusebius tells us that in the time of Constantine this vigil was kept with great pomp; for he set up lofty pillars of wax to burn as torches all over the city, and lamps burning in all places, so that the night seemed to outshine the sun at noonday. Gregory Nazianzen also  speaks of the custom of hanging up, lamps and torches both in the churches and in the private houses, which, he says, they did as a forerunner of that great Light the Sun of Righteousness arising on the world on Easter-day. This night was famous above all others for the baptism of catechumens. The fifth Sunday in Lent is sometimes called Passion Sunday, that name being applied to it in reference to Christ's prediction on that day of his approaching passion. Some persons call the week, of which Passion Sunday is the first, Passion Week, to distinguish it from the real Passion Week, which they call Holy Week.

## Passion Week (2)[[@Headword:Passion Week (2)]]

             (or Holy Week, as it is often called, though incorrectly; for Passion Week, by the proper rubrical usage, is that which precedes Holy Week) is observed with great pomp in the Romish Church. The ceremonies of the season commence on Palm-Sunday (q.v.), when the commemoration takes place of the Savior's triumphal entry into Jerusalem. On Wednesday of this week, in the afternoon, there is the service of the Tenebrae, a kind of funeral service, which is repeated at the same hour on the Thursday and Friday. The ceremonies of the Thursday consist principally of a representation of the burial of our Savior. This is followed, in Rome, by the ceremony of the pope washing the feet of thirteen pilgrims, in imitation of our Savior's washing the feet of his disciples; this ceremony being followed by the same pilgrims being served by his holiness at dinner. A singular ceremony takes place on the Thursday at St. Peters at Rome —the washing of the high-altar with wine. On Good Friday the ceremony of uncovering and adoring the cross is observed, at the close of which a procession is marshalled to bring back the host from the sepulcher in which it was deposited on the previous day. The pope and cardinals also adore the three great relics, which are glittering caskets of crystals, set in gold and silver, and sparkling with precious stones, and which are said to contain a part of the true cross, one half of the spear which pierced the Savior's side, and the Volto Santo, or holy countenance. On the Saturday of Passion Week, at Rome, converted Jews and heathen are baptized. after holywater has been consecrated for the purpose. Young men are also ordained to various sacred offices. The chief employment. of the day, however, consists of services in honor of the resurrection. For the ceremonies of Easter Sunday, SEE EASTER. The Great Week closes usually with an illumination and fireworks. See Wheatley, Commentary on Book of Common Prayer; Schaff, Church History, vol, 1; Procter, Commentary on Book of Common  Prayer. For monographs, see Volbeding, p. 120; Hase, p. 177 sq. For the events, SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Passion, Orders of the[[@Headword:Passion, Orders of the]]

             were founded in the Church during the Crusades. One of these was originated by king Richard II of England in 1380; another by king Charles VI of France in 1400, composed of soldiers against the Saracens. They were finally merged into orders of knighthood. A female order of the Passion was founded in- 1538 by Maria Laurentia Lonrga at Naples, and was composed of nuns. They were governed by the rule of the Tertiaries of St. Francis. Pope Clement VIII in 1600, and Gregory XV in 1622, confirmed this order, and it still exists in Italy. SEE PASSIONISTS.

## Passion, Symbols Of The[[@Headword:Passion, Symbols Of The]]

             are numerous, and, although rarely seen in the Catacombs and in early sculpture, they are constantly found in churches. They are the two swords of the apostles, the ear of Malchus, St. Peter's sword, the pillar and cord, the scourge, in the crown of thorns, the three dice, the spear, the sponge, the nails, the cross, the thirty pieces of silver, the hammer and pincers, the ladder, the lantern, the boxes of spice for embalming, the seamless garment, the purse and the cock; the five wounds are represented by the hands and feet with a heart in the center, each pierced with one wound, or by a heart alone with five wounds.

## Passionale[[@Headword:Passionale]]

             is the title of a work, by an unknown author (probably of the 14th century), which, in three books, sings of the lives of Jesus and of the Virgin, of the apostles and evangelists, and of seventy-five saints, “to incite men to adoration, and to strengthen their virtuous habits.” Luther edited and published it.

## Passionei, Dominic[[@Headword:Passionei, Dominic]]

             a learned Italian cardinal, was born of an ancient noble family at Fossoinbrone, in the duchy of Urbino, Dec. 2, 1682, and was educated in the Clementine College at Rome under the direction of Tomasi and Fontanini. In 1706 he went with Gualterio, the nuncio. to Paris, and, having passed two years in the French capital with the legate, he was sent in 1708 to La Haye as diplomatic agent of the pope. He was appointed in 1712 to the Congress of Utrecht, and in 1714 to that of Baden. He formed ties of friendship with prince Eugene. On his return to Rome in 1715 he resumed his studies upon classical and ecclesiastical antiquity, and entered into an active correspondence with the principal learned men of Europe. Pope Innocent XIII made him titular archbishop of Ephesus. He was also the same year appointed nuicio to the Catholic cantons of Switzerland, and interposed in the debate which arose in 1725 between the bishop of Constance and the government of Lucerne regarding the deposition of a curd who had forbidden his parishioners to dance.

Things went so far that Passionei removed his residence from Lucerne to Altorf, and a monitory letter, which must precede suspension, was issued against the council of Lucerne. Finally, by the interposition of the cardinal du Fleury, the affair was settled in 1727 by a favorable consideration of the claims of the Lucerne government, Passionei took exception to the arrangement, and did not return to Lucerne. In 1730 he was appointed nuncio to the imperial court; recalled to Rome in 1738, he was created cardinal by pope Clement XII. In 1755 pope Benedict XIV appointed Passionei librarian of the Vatican, in which situation he promoted Dr. Kennicott's great undertaking by causing the Hebrew manuscripts to be collated for his use, and the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres chase him in the same year one of its foreign associates. At the conclave of 1758 he obtained eighteen  votes; and but for his antipathy to the Jesuits, on which subject several extravagant anecdotes are related. he might have been elected pope. He warmly opposed the canonization of cardinal Bellarmine, and is said to have proscribed from his library all works written by Jesuits. He died near Rome July 5, 1761. His death was attributed to chagrin at signing the brief of condemnation issued against the “Exposition of Christian Doctrine” by the Jansenist Mesengui (q.v.). Passionei had gathered in his villa at Frascati a rich collection of inscriptions and objects of antiquity. His books were published after his death by the Augustine monastery, and added to their fine library, which is styled the Angelica, and is one of the principal public libraries at Rome. His nephew, Benedict Passionei, published a volume containing all the Latin and Greek inscriptions collected by the cardinal (Lucca, 1765; fol.). We have of his works, Acta apostolicae legationis Helveticae (Zug, 1724; Rome, 1738, 4to); — in which nothing is found concerning the contest of Passionei with the council of Lucerne: — Oratio fumebris in Principem Eugenium (Vienna, 1737; in Italian, Padua, 1737): — Letters in different collections such as the Tempe Helvetica (vol. 4), in the Commercium Epstolicum of Uffenbach, etc. See Goujet, Eloge du Cardinaul Passionei (La Haye, 1763, 12mo); Galetti, emorie peer la Vita del Cardinal Passionei (Rome, 1762, 4to); Le Beau, Eloge du Cardinal Passionei (in vol. 31 of L'Histoire de l'Academie des Inscriptions); Moreri, Dict. Hist. s.v.

## Passionists, Congregation Of The[[@Headword:Passionists, Congregation Of The]]

             are regulated clergy of the society of the Holy Cross (q.v.) and Sufferings of Christ. Their purpose is made clear in the fourth vow on assuming membership — a most faithful remembrance of Christ's life and saving passion and death, and the promotion of his cause. The duty, then, of the Passionists clearly is preaching and mission work. The founder of this congregation is Paulus Franciscus.(de cruce) of Danni, born in 1694 at Ovada, in Sardinia. Their first house was founded in 1737 at Orbitello. Pope Pius VI acknowledged them in 1775. They now have a monastery at Rome, the mother-house of the congregation, do mission work in Bulgaria and Wallachia (since 1782), and have settlements in Italy, England, Belgium, New Holland, and the United States. The Passionists wear a black habit, on the left breast of which is the badge — a heart surmounted by a white cross, and inscribed, “Jesu XR.passio” (= passion of Jesus Christ). The “fathers” or priests, who strictly constitute the “congregation,” act as missionaries, while the lay-brothers do the house-  work, tailoring, shoemaking, carpenter-work, etc. The Passionists, according to Webster's Dictionary, “unite the mortified life of the Trappists with the activity and zeal of the Jesuits and Lazarists.” The special object of the institute is to instill into men's minds by preaching, by example, and by devotional practices, a sense of the mercy and love of God as manifested in the passion of Christ. Hence the cross appears everywhere as their emblem, in their churches; in their halls, and in the courts and public places of their monasteries. A large crucifix, moreover, forms part of their very striking costume. They go barefooted, and practice many other personal austerities, rising at midnight to recite the canonical hours in the church; and their ministerial work consists chiefly. in holding what are called “missions” wherever they are invited by the local clergy, in which sermons on the passion of Christ, on sin, and on repentance, together with the hearing of confessions, hold the principal places. They have four establishments in this country. They have eight or nine priests, “with twenty-five students, lay-brothers and novices,” at “Blessed Paul's Monastery,” Birmingham (near Pittsburgh), Pa., where they have two churches. They have also at Carrollton (near Baltimore) a monastery, seven priests, six students of philosophy, and five lay-brothers, and a church; a monastery, with nine priests, six clerics, and three lay-brothers, and two churches at Dunkirk, N. Y.; also a monastery, “St. Michael's Retreat,” at West Hoboken, N. J. (opposite New York City). Passionist monasteries in the United States are intended to train priests for missionary purposes, and to give assistance to pastors of such churches as need it, and to have a chapel always open for such as may need spiritual assistance or counsel. The order, though very old in the Church, was introduced into the United States about 1855 by Rev. Father O'Connor, S. J., then bishop of Pittsburgh, and now numbers nearly one hundred members.

## Passive Obedience Of Christ[[@Headword:Passive Obedience Of Christ]]

             SEE OBEDIENCE, and SEE SUFFERINGS OF CHRIST.

## Passive Power[[@Headword:Passive Power]]

             a phrase employed to denote a power of producing change, not actively, but negatively. Dr. Williams, who has revived the use of it in theology, understands by it what some philosophers have denominated malum metasphysicum, by which is meant the immediate cause of defectibility, mutability; or limitation in creatures. Every created being and property  must necessarily be limited. Limitation is as essentially an attribute of a creature as infinity is of the Creator. This limitedness implies defectibility, fallibleness, and mutability. It is to this principle, which is entirely of a negative character, that evil is ultimately to be referred. It is not communicated to the creature by his Maker, nor could any act of will or power prevent its connection with any created nature, any more than such an act of will or power could change the very essence of creatureship, or cause an uncaused being. As the principle is not communicated or caused by the Creator, so neither are its results. They can be traced no higher than to the being in whom they ate developed. To himself alone must every one ascribe them; to himself as a creature, in relation to the principle; but to himself as sinful in relation to the moral results. Gilbert, Life of Dr. Williams, note C.

## Passive Prayer[[@Headword:Passive Prayer]]

             among the mystic divines, is a total suspension or ligature of the intellectual faculties, in virtue whereof the soul remains of itself, and, as to its own power, impotent with regard to the producing of any effects. The passive state, according to Fenelon, is only passive in the same sense as contemplation; i.e. it does not exclude peaceable, disinterested acts, but only unquiet ones, or such as tend to our own interest. In the passive state the soul has not: properly any activity, any. sensation of its own. It is a mere flexibility of the soul, to which the feeblest impulse of grace gives motion. SEE MYSTICISM.

## Passmore, Joseph C., D.D.[[@Headword:Passmore, Joseph C., D.D.]]

             an American clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Lancaster, Pa., and was a descendant of the Rev. S. Cook, a missionary of the Virginia Society for Propagating the Gospel, at Shrewsbury, N.J., in 1776. Passmore was educated at Dr. Muhlenberg's school, Flushing, N.Y. He studied law, and removed to Vicksburg, Miss. At the age of twenty-six he was chosen professor of rhetoric and philosophy in St. James College, Maryland, and remained as professor and vice-rector eighteen years. He was ordained deacon by bishop Whittingham in 1848, and priest by the same bishop, in Grace Church. Elk Ridge Landing, June 3, 1849. In. 1862 he accepted a professorship at Racine (Wis.) College, and later added to this task the rectory of St. John's, Elkhorn, Wis. He died at Racine Aug. 12, 1866. He published a Poem, and a Life of Bishop Butler, and also  edited an edition of his Sermons; with a preface. A sketch of the life of the Rt. Rev. Bishop Bowman in vol. 14 of the Church Review is from his penl, and bears the marks of his scholarly tastes and his pure and noble spirit. See Amer. Ch. Rev. 1866, p.487; Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1866, p. 612.

## Passoire[[@Headword:Passoire]]

             is in ecclesiastical language a cullender, or strainer, for the wine and water When poured into the chalice. It dates from the 7th century.

## Passover[[@Headword:Passover]]

             the first and most important of the three great annual festivals — the other two being pentecost and the Feast of tabernacles — on which the male population appeared before the Lord in Jerusalem. In the present article it is our aim to combine the Scriptural notices of this institution with whatever information ancient or modern authors give, especially the Talmudical regulations for its observance. SEE FESTIVAL.

I. Name and its Signification — The Heb. word פֶּסִח, Pesach (from פָּסִח, pasach, to pass through, to leap, to halt [2Sa 4:4; 1Ki 18:21], then tropically to pass by in the sense of sparing, to save, to show mercy [Exo 12:13; Exo 12:23; Exo 12:27; Isa 31:5]), denotes —

1. An overstepping, passover, and is so rendered by Josephus (Ant. 2:14, 6, ὑπερβασία), Aquila (ὑπέρβασις), and the English version.

2. It signifies the paschal sacrifice, by virtue of which, according to the divine appointment, the passing over, or saving, was effected (Exo 12:21; Exo 12:27; Exo 12:48; 2Ch 30:15).

3. It designates the paschal meal on the evening of the 14th of Nisan; — while the seven following days are called הג הִמִּצוֹת, the feast of unleavened bread — (Lev 23:5-6), and hence the expression ממחרת הפסח, the morrow of the Passover, for the 15th of Nisan (Num 33:3; Jos 5:11). It is used synecdochically for the whole festival of unleavened bread, which commenced with the paschal meal (Deu 16:1-3; comp. also Eze 45:21, where פסח is explained by חג שבעות ימים), — written fully הִפֶּסִה חִג (Exo 34:25). The whole feast, including the paschal-eve, is also denominated

חִג הִמִּצּוֹת, the festival of unleavened bread, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων,  ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων, festum azymorum (Exo 23:15; Lev 23:6 : 2Ch 8:13; Ezr 6:22; Luk 22:1; Luk 22:7; Act 12:3; Act 20:6; Josephus, War, 2:1, 3); or simply הִמִּצּוֹת, τὰ ἄζυμα (Exo 12:17; Mar 14:1). The simple name Pesach ( פֶּסִח= φασέκ; Sept. 2Ch 30:15; 2Ch 35:1; 2Ch 35:11; Aramaean פִּסְחָא= τὸ πάσχα; Mar 14:1), however, is the one commonly used by the Jews to the present day to denote the festival of unleavened bread; and it is for this reason that this appellation is retained untranslated in the Sept. and N.T.

Some have taken the meaning of פָּסִח, the root, of פֶּסִח, to be that of “passing through,” and have referred its application here to the passage of the Red Sea. Hence the Vulgate has rendered פֶּסִח by transitus, Philo (De Vit. Mosis, lib. 3, c. 29) by διαβατήρια, and Gregory of Nazianzum by διάβασις. Augustine take's the same view of the word; as do also Von Bohlen and a few other modern critics. Jerome applies transitus both to the passing over of the destroyer and the passing through the Red Sea (in Matthew 26). But the true sense of the Hebrew substantive is plainly indicated in Exo 12:27; and the best authorities are agreed that פָּסִחnever expresses “passing through,” but that its primary meaning is “leaping over.” Hence the verb is regularly used with the preposition עִל. But since, when we jump or step over anything, we do not tread upon it. the word has a secondary meaning “to spare,” or “to show mercy” (comp. Isa 31:5 with Exo 12:27). The Sept. has therefore used σκεπάζειν in Exo 12:13; and Onkelos has rendered זֶבִחאּפֶּסִח, “the sacrifice of the Passover,” by דְּבִח חֲיָס, “the sacrifice of mercy.” In the same purport agree Theodotion, Symmachus, several of the fathers, and the best modern critics. Our own translators, by using the word “Passover,”' have made clear Exo 12:12; Exo 12:23 and other passages, which are not intelligible in the Sept. nor in several other versions. (See Bahr, Symbolik, 2:627; Ewald, Alterthumer, p. 390; Gesenius, Thes. s.v.; Drusius, Noce Majores, in Exo 12:27; Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 394.)

Some of the Church fathers, not knowing the Heb. signification, have derived πάσχα from the Greek πάσχω to suffer. Thus Chrysostom tells us, πάσχα λέγεται, ὅτι τότε ἔπαθεν ὁ Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν.(Homil. 5, in 1 Tim.); Irenaeus says: “A Moyse osteniditur Filius Dei, cujus et diem passionis non ignoravit, sed-figuratim pronunciavit eum pascha niominans?(Adv. Fvr .iv. 22); Tertullian affirms, “Hanc solemnitatem-  praecanebat (sc. Moyset) et adjecit, Pascha esse Domini, id est, passionem Christi” (Adv. Judaeos, c. x, s. f.). Chrvsostom appears to avail himself of it for a paronomasia in the above passage, in another place the format states the true meaning: ὑπέρβασίς ἐστι καθ ἑρμηνείαν τὸ πάσχα. Gregory of Nazianzum seems to do the same (Orat. xlii), since he elsewhere (as is stated above) explains πάσχα as διάβασις (see Suicer, s.v.). Augustine, who took this latter view, has a passage which is worth quoting:

“Pascha, fratres, non sicut quidam existimant, Grsecum nomen esth sed Hebranem; opportunissime tamen occurrit in hoc nomine qusedam congrnentia utrarumquie linuutirunm. Quia eniln peati Graece πάσχειν dicitur, idea Pascha passio putata est, velut hoc nomen a passione sit appellatunm; in sna vero lingna, hoc est in Ilebraea, Pascha transi-us dicitur; propterea tune priinum Pascha celeb'ravit populus Dei, quando ex AEgypto fugientes, rubrum mare transierunt. Nunc ergo tigura illa prophetica in veritate completa est, cum sicut ovis ad imnlolandum ducitur Christus, cujus sanguine illitis postibus nostris, id est, cnjus signo crucis signatis frontibus nostris, a perditione hujus saeculi tanquam a captivitate vel iiiterempttone AEgyptia liberamur; et agimus saluberrimum transitum cum a diabolo transimus ad Christum, et ab isto instabili saeculo ad ejus fundatissimum regnum, Col 1:13” (In Joan. Tract. 4).

II. Biblical Institution and Observance of the Passover (from the time of Moses to the Captivity). — The following are the principal passages in the Pentateuch relating to the Passover: Exo 12:1-51, in which there is a full account of its original institution and first observance in Egypt; Exo 13:3-10, in which the unleavened bread is spoken of in connection with the sanctification of the first-born, but there is no mention of the paschal lamb? Exo 23:14-19, where, under the name of the feast of unleavened bread, it is first connectced with the two other great annual festivals, and also with the Sabbath, and in which the paschal lamb is styled “My sacrifice;” Exo 34:18-26, in which the festival is brought into the same connection, with immediate reference to the redemption of the first-born, aid in which the words of Exo 23:18, regarding the paschal lamb, are repeated; Lev 23:4-14, where it is mentioned in the same connection, the days of holy convocation are especially noticed, and the enactment is prospectively given respecting the  offering of the first sheaf of harvest, with the offerings which were to accompany it, when the Israelites possessed the Promised Land; Num 9:1-14, in which the divine word repeats the command for the observance of the Passover at the commencement of the second year after the Exodus, and in which the observance of the Passover in the second month, for those who could not participate in it at the regular time, is instituted; Num 28:16-25, where directions are given for the offerings which were to be made on each of the seven-days of the festival; Deu 16:1-6, where the command is prospectively given that the Passover, and the other great festivals, should be observed in the place which the Lord might choose in the Land of Promise, and where there appears to be an allusion to the Chagigah, or voluntary peace-offerings. There are five distinct statutes on the Passover in the 12th and 13th chapters of Exodus (Exo 12:2-28; Exo 12:42-51; Exo 13:1-10).

1. At the Exode. — In the first institution of the Passover it was ordained that the head of each family was to select, on the 10th of Nisan (i.e. four days beforehand, supposed to represent the four generations which had elapsed since the children of Israel had come to Egypt, Gen 15:16), a male lamb or goat of the first year, and without blemish, to kill it on the eve of the 14th, sprinkle the blood with a sprig of hyssop on the two side- posts and the lintel of the door of the house-being the parts of the house most obvious to passers-by, and to which texts of Scripture were afterwards affixed, SEE MEZUZAH — to roast (and not boil) the whole animal with its head, legs, and entrails, without breaking a bone thereof, and when thoroughly done, he and his family were to eat it on the same evening together with unleavened bread and bitter herbs, having their loins girt, their sandals on their feet, and their staves in their hands. If the family, however, were too small in number to consume it, a neighboring family might join them, provided they were circumcised sons of Israel, or household servants and strangers who had been received into the community by the rite of circumcision. The whole of the Pesach was to be consumed on the premises, and if it could not be eaten it was not to be removed from the house, but burned on the spot on the following morning. The festival was to be celebrated seven days, i.e. till the twenty-first of the month, during which. time unleavened bread was to be eaten, built cessation from all work and trade was only to be on the first and seventh day of the festival. Though instituted to dispute them from the general destruction of Egypt's first-born, the Israelites were told to regard the  Passover as an ordinance forever, to teach its meaning to their children, and that the transgression of the enactments connected therewith was to be punished with excision (Exo 12:1-28; Exo 12:48-51).

The precise meaning of the phrase בין הערבים, between the two evenings, which is used with reference to the time when the paschal animal is to be slain (Exo 12:6; Lev 23:5; Num 9:3; Num 9:5), as well as in connection with the offering of the evening sacrifice (Exo 29:39; Exo 29:41; Num 28:4), and elsewhere (Exo 16:12; Exo 30:8), is greatly disputed. The Samaritans, the Karaites, and Aben-Ezra, who are followed by Michaelis, Rosenmüller, Gesenius, Maurer, Kalisch, Knobel, Keil, and most modern commentators, take it to denote the space between the setting of the sun and the moment when the stars become visible, or when darkness sets in, i.e. between six and seven o'clock. Accordingly, Aben-Ezra explains the phrase between the two evenings as follows: “Behold we have two evenings, the first is when the sun sets, and that is at the time when it disappears beneath the horizon; while the second is at the time when the light disappears which is reflected in the clouds, and there is between them an interval of about one hour and twenty minutes” (Comment. on Exo 12:6). Tradition, however, interprets the phrase between the two evenings to mean from afternoon to the disappearing of the sun, the first evening being from the time when the sun begins to decline from its vertical or noontide point towards the west; and the second from its going down and vanishing out of sight, which is the reason why the daily sacrifice might be killed at 12:30 P.M. on a Friday (Mishna, Pesachim, v, 1; Maimonides, Hilchoth Korban Pesach. 1:4). But as the paschal lamb was slain after the daily sacrifice, it generally took place from 2:30 to 5:50 P.M. (Joseph. War, 6:9, 3).

We should have deemed it superfluous to add that such faithful followers of Jewish tradition as Saadia, Rashi, Kimchi, Ralbag, etc., spouse this definition of the ancient Jewish canons, were it not for the assertion which is made in some of the best Christian commentaries that “Jarchi [= Rashi] and Kimchi hold that the two evenings were the time immediately before and immediately after sunset, so that the point of time at which the sun sets divides them.” Now Rashi most distinctly declares, “From the sixth hour [= twelve o'clock] and upwards is called between the two evenings (בין הערבים), because the sun begins to set for the evening. Hence it appears to me that the phrase between the two evenings denotes the hours between the evening of the day and the evening of the night. The evening of the day is from the beginning of the seventh hour [= immediately after noontide], when the evening shadows begin to (Commentary on Exo 12:6). Kimchi says almost literally the same thing:” בין הערביםis from the time when ‘the sun begins to incline towards the west, which is from the sixth hour [=twelve o'clock] and upwards. It is called ערביםbecause there are two evenings, for from the ‘time' that the sun begins to decline is one evening, and the other evening is after the sun has gone down, and it is the space between which is meant by between the two evenings” (Lexicon, s.v. ערב). Eustathius, in a note on the seventeenth book of the Odyssey, shows that the Greeks too held that there were two evenings, one which they called the latter evening (δείλη ὀψία), at the close of the day; and the other the former evening (δείλη πρωϊvα), which commenced immediately after noon (see Bochart. Hieroz. pt. 1, lib. 2, cap. 1; Oper. 2:559, ed. 1712).

2. In the post-exodus legislation on this festival several enactments were introduced at different times, which both supplement and modify the original institution. Thus it is ordained that all the male members of the congregation are to appear in the sanctuary be fore the Lord with the offering of firstlings (Exo 23:14-19; Exo 34:18-26); that the first sheaf of the harvest (עמר) is to be offered on “the morrow after the Sabbath” (Lev 23:4-14); that those who, through defilement or absence from home, are prevented from keeping the. Passover on the 14th of Nisan, are in celebrate it on the 14th of the following month (Num 9:1-14); that special sacrifices are to be offered or each day of the festival (Num 28:16-25); than the paschal animals are to be slain in the national sanctuary, and that the blood is to be sprinkled on the altar instead of the two door-posts and lintels of the doors in the respective dwellings of the families (Deu 16:1-8). The ancient Jewish canons, therefore, rightly distinguished between the Egyptian Passover (פסח מצרים) and the Permanent Passover (פסח דורות), and point out. the following differences between them

(a) In the former the paschal animal was to be selected on the tenth of Nisan (Exo 12:3).

(b) It was to be killed by the head of each family in his own dwelling, and its blood sprinkled on the two door-posts and the lintel of every house (Exo 12:6-7; Exo 12:22). dressed in their journeying garments (Exo 12:11).

(d) Unleavened bread was to be eaten with the paschal animal only on the first night, and not necessarily during the whole seven days, although the Israelites were almost compelled to eat unleavened bread, because they had no time to prepare leaven (Exo 12:39).

(e) No one who partook of the Pesach was to go out of the house until the morning (Exo 12:22).

(f) The women might partake of the paschal animal.

(g) Those who were Levitically impure were not necessarily precluded from sharing the meal.

(h) No firstlings were required to be offered.

(i) No sacrifices were brought.

(j) The festival lasted only one day, as the Israelites commenced their march on the 15th of Nisan (Mishna. Pesachim, 9:5; Tosiftha, Pesachim, 7; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Che zaka, Hilchoth Korban Pesach. 10:15).

Now these regulations were peculiar to the first Passover, and were afterwards modified and altered in the Permanent Passover. Elias of Byzantium adds that there was no command to burn the fat on the altar, that neither the Hallel nor any other hymn was sung, as was required in later times in accordance with Isa 30:29, and that the lambs were not slain in the consecrated place (quoted by Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 406. For other Jewish authorities, see Otho's Lexicon, s.v. Pascha).

Dr. Davidson, indeed (Introduction to the O.T. 1:84, etc.), insists that the Deuteronomist (Deu 16:1-7) gives other variations — that he mentions both צאן, small cattle, and בקר, oxen, as the paschal sacrifice, and states that the paschal victim is to be boiled (בשל), while in the original institution in Exodus 12 it is enacted that the paschal sacrifice is to be a שה only, and is to be roasted. But against this is to be urged

(1) That the word פסח in Deu 15:1-2, as frequently is used for the whole festival of unleavened bread, which commenced with the  paschal sacrifice, and which indeed Dr. Davidson a little farther on admits, and that the sacrifices of sheep and oxen in question do not refer to the paschal victim, but to all the sacrifices appointed to be offered during the seven days of this festival. This is evident from Deu 15:3. where it is distinctly said, “Thou shalt eat no leavened bread therewith. (עליו) [i.e. with the פסה in Deu 15:2], seven days shalt thou eat therewith (עליו) [i.e. with the פסח] unleavened bread,” thus showing that the sacrifice and eating of פסחis to last seven days, and that it is not the paschal victim which had to be slain on the 14th and be consumed on that very night (Exo 12:10).

(2) בשל simply denotes to cook, dress, or fit for eating in any manner, and here unquestionably stands for בשל באש, to roast in fire,(as in 2Ch 35:13). This sense is not only given in the ancient versions (Sept., Vulg., Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, etc.), and by the best commentators and lexicographers (Rashi-Rashbam, Aben-Ezra, Ibn- Saruk, Kimchi, Furst, Keil, etc.), but is supported by Knobel (Comment. on Exodus and Leviticus p. 98), who is quite as anxious as Dr. Davidson to establish the discrepancy between the two accounts.

(3) We know from the non-canonical records that it has been the undeviating practice of the Jews during the second Temple to offer שה only as a pas'chal sacrifice, and to roast it, but not to boil it. Now the Deuteronomist, who, as we are assured by Dr. Davidson and others, lived at a very late period, would surely not contradict this prevailing practice of a later time. Besides, if the supposed variations recorded by the Deuteronomist describe practices which obtained in later times, how is it that the non-canonical records of the Jewish practices at a later period agree with the older description, and not with the supposed variations in Deuteronomy?

That the Israelites kept the Passover on the evening before they left Egypt is distinctly declared in Exo 12:28. Bishop Colenso, however, argues against the Mosaic institution of the Passover, and against the possibility of its having been celebrated, because —

(1) Moses having received the command about the Passover on the very day at the close of which the paschal lambs were to be killed, could not  possibly have communicated to every head of a family throughout the entire country the special and strict directions how to keep it;

(2) The notice to start at once in hurried flight in the middle of the night could not suddenly and completely be circulated; and

(3) As the people were 2,000,000 in number, and, if we take fifteen persons for each lamb, there must have been slain 150,000 paschal lambs, all males, one year old; this premises that 200,000 male lambs and 200,000 ewe-lambs were annually produced, “and that there existed a flock of 2,000,000 (The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined, pt. 1, chap. 10).

But

(1) from Exo 12:2-3 it is evident that, so far from receiving the command on the 14th of Nisan, Moses received it at the very beginning of the month, and that there was therefore sufficient time for the elders (comp. Exo 12:1-2 with Exo 12:21) to communicate the necessary instruction to the people, who were a well-organized body, presided over by the heads of families and leaders (Exo 5:6-23; Num 1:1, etc.; Jos 7:14, etc.). The expressions בלילה הזה(12:12) and הלילה כחצות(11:4), on which Dr. Colenso lays so much stress, do not refer to the night following the day of the command, but to the night following the day when the command was to be executed הזהhere, as frequently elsewhere, denotes the same, and expresses simultaneousness, whether past, present, or future, inasmuch as in historical narrative not only that which one can see, or, as it were, point his finger at, is regarded as present, but that which has just been mentioned (Gen 7:11; Gen 7:13; Exo 19:1; Lev 23:6; Lev 23:21; Job 10:13), and that which is immediately to follow (Gen 5:1; Gen 6:15; Gen 45:19; Isa 66:2; Jer 5:7; Psa 74:18).

(2) The notice to quit was not momentary, but was indicated by Moses long before the celebration of the Passover (Exo 11:1-8), and was most unmistakably given in the order to eat the paschal meal in traveling attire, so as to be ready to start (Exo 12:11).

(3) The average of fifteen or twenty persons for each lamb, based upon the remark of Josephus (War li, vi, 9, 3), is inapplicable to the case in question, inasmuch as those who, according to later legislation, went up in after-  times to Jerusalem to offer the paschal sacrifice were all full-grown and able-bodied men, and every company of twenty such persons, when the Jews were in their own land, where there was every facility for obtaining the requisite flocks, might easily get and consume a .sheep in one night. But among the several millions of Israelites in Egypt and in the wilderness there were myriads of women, children, invalids, uncircumcised and unclean, who did not partake of the Passover, and those who did eat thereof would fully obey the divine command if one or two hundred of them simply ate a morsel of one and the same animal when they found any difficulty in obtaining flocks, inasmuch as the paschal sacrifice was only to be commemorative; just as one loaf suffices for hundreds of persons at the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Instead, therefore, of 150,000 being required for this purpose, 15,000 animals would suffice. Moreover, Dr. Colenso, misled by the A.V., which renders שהby lamb, makes a mistake in restricting the paschal sacrifice of Egypt to a lamb. Any Hebrew lexicon will show that it denotes one of the flock, i.e. either a sheep or a goat, and it is so used in Deu 14:4, שה כבשים ושה עזים, one of the sheep and one of the goats (comp. Gesenius's and Furst's Lexicons. s.v. שה). This mistake is all the more to be deplored, since at the institution of the Passover it is expressly declared that it is to be הכבשים ומן העזֹים מן... שה, one of the sheep or of the goats (Exo 12:5). It is well known to scholars that the Jewish canons fixed a lamb for this purpose long after the Babylonian captivity. Hence the Targumist's rendering of שהby אמרor אמרא, which is followed by the A.V. It is well known also that goats have always formed a large admixture in Oriental flocks, and in the present which Jacob sent to Esau the proportion of sheep and goats is the same (Gen 32:14). Now the fifteen thousand paschal-sacrifices divided between the lambs and the goats would not be such an impossible demand upon the flocks.

3. Subsequent Notices before the Exile. — After the celebration of the Passover at its institution (Exo 12:28; Exo 12:50). we are told that the Israelites kept it again in the wilderness of Sinai in the second year after the exodus (Numbers 9). Between this and their arrival at Gilgal under Joshua, about thirty-nine years, the ordinance was entirely neglected, not because the people did not practice the rite of circumcision, and were therefore legally precluded from partaking of the paschal meal (Jos 5:10, with Exo 12:44-48), as many Christian expositors will have it, since there  were many thousands of young people that had left Egypt who were circumcised, and these were not legally disqualified from celebrating the festival; but because, as Kashi, Aben-Ezra, and other Jewish commentators rightly remark, Exo 12:25; Exo 13:5-10 plainly show that after the first Passover in the wilderness, the Israelites were not to keep it again till they entered the land of Canaan. Only three instances, however, are recorded in which the Passover was celebrated between the entrance into the Promised Land and the Babylonian captivity, viz. under Solomon (2Ch 8:13), under Hezekiah, when he restored the national worship (2Ch 30:15), and under Josiah (2Ki 23:21; 2Ch 35:1-19). Later Biblical instances are the one celebrated by Ezra after the return from Babylon (Ezra 6), and those occurring in the life of our Lord.

III. Rabbinical Regulations. — After the return of the Jews from the captivity, where they had been weaned from idolatry, the spiritual guides of Israel reorganized the whole religious and political life of the nation, and defined, modified, and expanded every law and precept of the Mosaic code, so as to adapt them to the altered condition of the people. The celebration of the Passover, therefore, like that of all other institutions, became more: regular and systematic during this period,. while the different colleges which were now established and which were attended by numerous disciples, SEE EDUCATION, have faithfully transmitted to us all the sundry laws, rites, manners, and customs connected with this and all other festivals, which it was both impracticable and impossible to record in the limited space of the canonical books of the O.T. Hence it is that the manners and customs of this period, which were those of our Savior and his apostles, and which are therefore of the utmost importance and interest to Christians, and to the understanding of the N.T., can be more easily ascertained and more minutely described. Hence, also, the simple summary notice of the fact that the Israelites kept the Passover after their return from Babylon, contained in the canonical Scriptures (Ezr 6:19-22), may be supplemented by the detailed descriptions of the manner in which this festival was celebrated during the second Temple, given in the noncanonical documents. The various practices will be better understood and more easily followed if given in connection with the days of the festival on which they were respectively observed.

1. The Great Sabbath (שִׁבִּת הִגָּדוֹל, Shabbdth Hag-Gadol) is the Sabbath immediately preceding the Passover. It is so called in the calendar because, according to tradition, the tenth of the month on which the Lord commanded every head of a family to select the paschal sacrifice (Exo 12:3) originally happened to fall on the Sabbath; and though in later legislation the animal was not required to be set aside four days beforehand, yet the Jewish canons determined that the Sabbath should be used to instruct the people in the duties of this great festival. Hence special prayers (יוצרות) bearing on the redemption from Egypt, the love of God to Israel, and Israel's obligations to keep the Passover, have been ordained for this Sabbath, in addition to the ordinary ritual. Mal 3:1-18; Mal 4:1-6, was read as Maphtir (מפטיר) = the lesson for the day, SEE HAPHTARAH, and discourses were delivered by the spiritual guides of the community explanatory of the laws and domestic duties connected with the festival (Tur Orach Chajim, sec. 430). Though the present synagogal ritual for this day is of a later date, yet there can be no doubt that this Sabbath was already distinguished as the great Sabbath (μεγάλη ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ σαββάτου, Joh 19:31) in the time of the second Temple, and was used for preparing the people for the ensuing festival. SEE SABBATH.

2. The 13th of Nisan. — On the evening of the 13th, which, until that of the 14th, was called the preparation for the Passover (עֶרֶב פֶסִח, παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, Joh 19:14), every head of the family searched for and collected by the light of a candle all the leaven (Mishna, Pesachim, 1:1). Before beginning the search he pronounced the following benediction: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and hast enjoined us to remove the leaven” (Talmud, Pesachim, 7 a; Maimonides, Yad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Chamez U-Maza, 3:6). After the search he said “Whatever leaven remains in my possession which I cannot see, behold it is null, and accounted as the dust of the earth” (Maimonides, ibid.). What constituted leaven will be understood when the ancient definition of unleavened bread is known. According to the Jewish canons, the command to eat unleavened bread (Exo 13:6; Exo 23:15; Exo 34:18; Lev 23:6; Num 28:17; Deu 16:3) is executed by making the cakes (מצוע) which are to be eaten during the seven days of this festival of wheat, barley, spelt, oats, or rye (Mishna, Pesachim, 2:5). They appear to have been usually made of the finest wheat flour (Buxtorf, Sysn. Jud. c. 18, p.  397). It was probably formed into dry, thin biscuits, not unlike those used by the modern Jews. From these five kinds of grain (מיני דגן חמשת), which can be used for actual fermentation, the cakes are to be prepared before the dough begins to ferment; anything else made from one of these five kinds of corn with water constitutes leaven, and must be removed from the house and destroyed. Other kinds of produce and preparations made therefrom do not constitute leaven, and may be eaten. Thus we are told, “Nothing is prohibited on the Feast of Passover because of leaven except the five kinds of corn, viz. wheat, barley, spelt, oats, and rye. Leguminous plants, such as rice, millet, beans, lentils, and the like, in these there is no leaven; and although the meal of rice or the like is kneaded with hot water and covered with cloths till it rises like leavened dough, yet it may be eaten, for this is not leaven, but putrefaction. Even the five kinds of corn, if simply kneaded with the liquor of fruit, without water, are not accounted leaven. Though the dough thus made stands a whole day and rises, yet it may be eaten, because the liquor of fruit does not engender fermentation but acidity. The fruit-liquor, oil, wine, milk, honey, olive-oil, the juice of apples, of pomegranates, and the like, but no water, is to be in it, because any admixture of water, however small, produces fermentation” (Maimonides, Yad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Chamnez U-Maza, v. 1; 2).

3. The 14th of Nisan. — On this day, which, as we have seen, was till the evening called the preparation for the Passover, and which was also called the first day of Passover or of unleavened bread (Lev 23:5-6; Num 9:3; Num 28:16; Jos 5:10; Eze 45:21; 2Ch 30:15; 2 Chronicles 35 :l; Joseph. War, v. 3, 1), for the reason stated under the 13th of Nisan, handicraftsmen, with the exception of tailors, barbers, and laundresses, were obliged to relinquish their work either from morning or from noon, according to the custom of the different places in Palestine (Mishna, Pesachim, 4:1-8). Leaven was only allowed to be eaten till mid- day, when all leaven collected on the previous evening and discovered on this day had to be burned. The time for desisting from eating and burning the leaven was thus indicated: “Two desecrated cakes of thanksgiving- offering were placed on a bench in the Temple: as long as they were thus exposed all the people ate leaven; when one of them was removed they abstained from eating, but did not burn it; and when the other was removed all the people began burning the leaven” (ib. 1:5). It was on this day that every Israelite who was not infirm, ceremonially impure, uncircumcised, or who was on this day fifteen miles without the walls of Jerusalem (Mishna,  Pesachim, 9:2; Maimonides, Hilchoth Korban Pesach. v. 89), appeared before the Lord in Jerusalem with an offering in proportion to his means (Exo 23:15; Deu 16:16-17). Though women were not legally obliged to appear in the sanctuary, yet they were not excluded from it (1Sa 1:7; Luk 2:41-42). The Israelites who came from the country to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover were gratuitously accommodated by the inhabitants with the necessary apartments (Luk 22:10-12; Mat 26:18); and the guests left in return to their hosts the skins of the paschal lambs, and the vessels which they had used in their religious ceremonies (Joma, 12 a). It was, however, impossible to house all the pilgrims in Jerusalem itself, since the circumference of the city was little more than one league, and the number of the visitors was exceedingly great. Josephus tells us that there were 3,000,000 Jews at the Passover A.D. 65 (Wars 2:14, 3), and that at the Passover in the reign of Nero there were 2,700,000, when 256,500 lambs were slain (ib. 6:9, 3), and most of them must therefore have encamped in tents without the walls of the town, as the Mohammedan pilgrims now do at Mecca. It is therefore not surprising that seditions broke out on these occasions, and that the Romans, fearing lest these myriads of pilgrims should create a disturbance, and try to shake off the foreign yoke when thus massed together, took all the precautionary measures of both force and conciliation during the festival (Joseph. Ant. 17:9, 3; War, 1:3, etc.; Mat 16:5; Luk 13:1). — In confirmation of Josephus's statement, which has been impugned by sundry writers, it is to be remarked that ancient Baraitha, preserved in Tosiftha Pesachim, cap. 4. (s.f.), and the Babylon Pesachim, 64 b, relate as follows: Agrippa was anxious to ascertain the number of the Jewish population. He therefore ordered the priests to put down the number of the paschal lambs, which were found to be 1,200,000; and as there was to every lamb a company of no less than ten persons, the number of Jews must have been tenfold.

4. The Offering of the Paschal Lamb. — Having selected the lamb, which was neither to be one day above a year nor less than eight days old (Maimonides, Hilchoth Korban, 1:12, 13) — being an extension of the law about firstlings and burnt-offerings (Exo 22:30; Lev 22:27) — and agreed as to the exact number of those who were to join for one lamb, the representatives of each company went to the Temple. The daily evening sacrifice (Exo 29:38-39), which was usually. killed at the eighth hour and a half (= 2:30 P.M.), and offered up at the ninth hour and a  half (3:30 P.M.), was on this day killed at 1:30, and offered at 2:30 P.M., an hour earlier; and if the 14th of Nisan happened on a Friday, it was killed at 12:30 and offered at 1:30 P.M., two hours earlier than usual (Mishna, Pesachim, v. 1; Maimonides, Hilchoth Korban Pesach. 1:4). All the representatives of the respective companies were divided into three bands or divisions. — “The first division then entered with the paschal sacrifices, until the court of the Temple was filled, when the doors of the court were closed, and the trumpets were sounded three times, differing in the notes (תקעו והריעו ותקעו). The priests immediately placed themselves in two rows, holding bowls of silver and gold in their hands, i.e. one row holding silver bowls and the other gold ones. These bowls were not mixed up, nor had they stands underneath, in order that they might not be put down and. the blood become coagulated. The Israelites themselves killed their own paschal sacrifices, the nearest priest caught the blood, handed it to his fellow-priest, and he again passed it on to his fellow-priest, each receiving a full bowl and returning an empty one, while the priest nearest to the altar sprinkled it in one jet towards the base of the altar. Thereupon the first division went out, and the second division entered; and when the second again went out, the third entered; the second and third divisions acting in exactly the same way as the first. The Hallel was recited, SEE HALLEL, the whole time, and if it was finished before all the paschal animals were slain, it might be repeated a second and even a third time.... The paschal sacrifice was then suspended on iron hooks, which were affixed to the walls and pillars, and its skin taken off. Those who could not find a place for suspending and skinning it had pieces of wood provided for them, which they put on their own shoulders and on the shoulders of their neighbor, and on these they suspended the paschal sacrifice, and thus took off its skin. When the 14th of Nisan happened on a Sabbath, on which it was not lawful to use these sticks, one of the offerers put his left hand on the right shoulder of his fellow-offerer, while the latter put his right hand on the shoulder of the former, whereon they suspended the paschal sacrifice, and took off its skin.”

As soon as it was opened, the viscera were taken out with the internal fat. The fat was carefully separated and collected in the large dish, and the viscera were washed and replaced in the body of the lamb, like those of the burnt sacrifices (Lev 1:9; Lev 3:3-5; comp. Pesachim, 6:1). Maimonides says that the tail was put with the fat (Not. in Pesach. v. 10). The fat was burned on the altar, with incense, that same evening. On the Sabbath, the first division, after leaving the court, remained on the Temple Mountain, the second between the ramparts (i.e.  the open space between the walls of the court of the women and the trellis- work in the Temple, comp. Mishna, Middoth, 2:3), while the third remained in its place. When it became dark, they all went out to roast their paschal sacrifices (Mishna, Pesachim, v. 5-10). A spit, made of the wood of the pomegranate-tree, was put in at the mouth of the paschal lamb, and brought out again at its vent; it was then carefully placed in the oven so as not to touch its sides, lest the cooking should be affected (comp. Exo 12:9; 2Ch 35:13), and if any part of it happened to touch the earthenware oven, it had to be pared off; or if the fat which dripped from it had fallen on the oven, and then again fallen back on the lamb, the part so. touched had also to be cut out (Pesachim, 7:1, 2). If any one broke a bone of the paschal lamb, so as to infringe the command in Exo 12:46, he incurred the penalty of forty stripes (Pesachimn, 7:11). The bone, however, for the breaking of which the offender was to receive the stripes, must either have some flesh on it or some marrow in it, and he incurred the penalty even if some one had broken the same bone before him (Maimonides, Hilcloth Korban Pesach. 10:1, 3). The oven was of earthenware, and appears to have been in shape something like a bee- hive, with an opening in the side to admit fuel. According to Justin Martyr, a second spit, or skewer, was put transversely through the shoulders, so as to form the figure of a cross. As Justin was a native of Flavia Neapolis, it is a striking fact that the modern Samaritans roast their paschal lambs in nearly the same manner at this day. “The lambs (they require six for the community now) are roasted all together by stuffing them vertically, head downwards, into an oven which is like a small well, about three feet in diameter, and four or five feet deep, roughly stoned, in which a fire has been kept up for several hours. After the lambs are thrust in, the top of the hole is covered with-bushes and earth, to confine the heat till they are done. Each lamb has a stake or spit run through him to draw him up by; and, to prevent the spit from tearing away through the roast meat with the weight, a cross piece is put through the lower end of it” (Miss Rogers's Domestic Life in Palestine). Vitringa, Bochart, and Hottinger have taken the statement of Justin as representing the ancient Jewish usage; and, with him, regard the crossed spits as a prophetic type of the cross of our Lord. But it would seem more probable that the transverse spit was a mere matter of convenience, and was perhaps never in use among the Jews. The Rabbinical traditions relate that the lamb was called Galeatus, “qui quum totus assabatur, cum capite, cruribus, et intestinis, pedes autem et intestina ad latera ligabantur inter assandum, agnus ita quasi armatum  repraesentaverit, qui galea in capite et ense in latere est munitus” (Otho, Leax. Rab. p. 503).

5. The Paschal Supper. — The paschal sacrifices, having been taken to the respective abodes of the companies, and the meals prepared, the parties arranged themselves in proper order, reclining at ease on the left side, round the table. A cup of wine was filled for everyone, over which the following benediction was pronounced: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the vine! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen us above all nations, and exalted us above all peoples, and hast sanctified us with thy commandments. Thou hast given us, O Lord our God, appointed seasons for joy, festivals and holy days for rejoicing, such as the feast of unleavened bread, the time of our liberation, for holy convocation, to commemorate our exodus from Egypt. Yea, thou hast chosen us, and hast sanctified us above all nations, and hast given us thy holy festivals with joy and rejoicing as an inheritance. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who hast sanctified Israel and the festivals! Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast preserved us and kept us, and hast safely brought us to this period!” The cup of wine was then drunk, and a basin of water and a towel were handed round, or the celebrators got up to wash their hands; (Joh 13:4-5; Joh 13:12), after which thebles sing belonging thereto was pronounced. A table was then brought in, upon which were bitter herbs and unleavened bread, the Charseth (see below), the body of the paschal lamb, and the flesh of the Chagigah, or feast offering. The president of the meal then took the herb, dipped it in the Charoseth, and, after thanking God for creating the fruits of the earth, he ate a piece of the size of an olive, and gave a similar portion to each one reclining with him at the table (Mat 26:23; Joh 13:26).

A second cup of wine was then poured out, and the son, in accordance with Exo 12:26, asked his father as follows: “Wherefore is this night distinguished from all other nights? On all other nights we may eat either leavened or unleavened bread, but on this night unleavened bread only; on all other nights we may eat every kind of herbs, but on this night bitter herbs only; on all other nights we may eat meat either roasted, boiled, or cooked in different ways, but on this night we must eat roasted meat only; on all other nights we may dip once what we eat, but on this night twice. On all other nights we may eat either sitting or reclining, but on this night reclining only.” To this the father replied: “Once we were slaves to Pharaoh in Egypt, but the Lord our  God delivered us there-from with a strong hand and outstretched arm. If the Holy One — blessed be he — had not delivered our fathers from Egypt, we and our children, and our children's children, might still be in Egyptian bondage; and although we may all be sages, philosophers, elders, and skilled in the law, it is incumbent upon us to speak of the exodus from Egypt, and whoso dwells much on the exodus from Egypt is all the more to be praised.” The father then expounded Deu 26:5-12, as well as the import of the paschal sacrifice, the unleavened bread, and the bitter herbs; saying with regard to the latter, “The paschal sacrifice is offered because the Lord passed over the houses of our, ancestors in Egypt, in accordance with Exo 12:27; the unleavened bread is eaten because our ancestors were redeemed from Egypt before they had time to leaven their dough, and the bitter herbs, are eaten because the Egyptians embittered the lives of our ancestors. It is therefore initimbent on everyone, in all ages, to consider as if he had personally gone forth from Egypt, as it is said in Exo 12:27. We are therefore in duty bound to thank, praise, adore, glorify, extol, honor, bless, exalt, and reverence him who wrought all these miracles for our forefathers and for us; for he brought us forth from bondage to freedom. He changed our sorrow into joy, our mourning into a feast; he led us from darkness into a great light, and from servitude to redemption. Let us therefore sing in his presence Hallelujah!” The first part of the Hallel was then recited (see below), i.e. Psalms 113, 114, and the following blessing pronounced: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast redeemed us, and redeemed our forefathers from Egypt,” etc. A third cup of wine was then pounred out, and the grace after meals was recited. After pouring out the fourth cup the Hallel was finished (i.e. Psalms 115-118), and the blessing of the song (i.e. נשמתand!יהללו) was said. The meal being ended, it was unlawful for anything to be introduced in the way of dessert (Mishna, Pesachim, 10:1-8; Maimonides, Yad Ha-Chezaka Hilchoth Chonmez U-Maza, 8:1-3).

In this connection it is proper to notice more in detail several points relating to the meal under consideration.

(a) The Bitter Herbs and the Sauce. — According to Pesachim (2:6), the bitter herbs (מְרֹרַים;. Sept. πικρίδες; Vulg. lactucae agrestes, Exo 12:8) might be endive, chicory, wild lettuce, or nettles. These plants were important articles of food to the ancient Egyptians (as is noticed by Pliny), and they are said to constitute nearly half that of the  modern Egyptians. According to Niebuhr they are still eaten at the Passover by the Jews in the East. They were used in former times either fresh or dried, and' a portion of them is said to have been eaten before the unleavened bread (Pesach. 10:3).

The sauce into which the herbs, the bread, and the meat were dipped as they were eaten (Joh 13:26; Mat 26:23), is not mentioned in the Pentateuch. It is called in the Mishna חֲרַוֹסֶת, charoseth. According to Bartenora it consisted of only vinegar and water; but others describe it as a mixture of vinegar, figs, dates, almonds, and spice. The same sauce was used on ordinary occasions thickened with a little flour; but the Rabbinists forbade this at the Passover, lest the flour should occasion a slight degree of fermentation. Some say that it was beaten up to the consistence of mortar or clay, in order to commemorate the toils of the Israelites in Egypt in laying bricks (Buxtorf, Lex. Tal. col. 831; Pesachimn 2:8; 10:3, with the notes of Bartenora, Maimonides, and Surenhusius).

(b) The Four Cups of Wine. — There is no mention of wine in connection with the Passover in the Pentateuch; but the Mishna strictly enjoins that there should never be less than four cups of it provided at the paschal meal even of the poorest Israelite (Pesach. 10:1). The wine was usually red, and it was mixed with water as it was drunk (Pesach. 7:13, with Bartenora's note; and Otho's Lex. p. 507). The cups were handed round in succession at specified intervals in the meal (see above). Two of them appear to be distinctly mentioned in Luk 22:17; Luk 22:20. “The cup of blessing” (1Co 10:16) was probably the latter one of these, and is generally considered to have been the third of the series, after which a grace was said; though a comparison of Luk 22:20 (where it is called “the cup after supper”) with Pesach. 10:7, and the designation כּוֹס הִלֵּל, “cup of the Hallel,” might rather suggest that it was the fourth and last cup. Schottgen, however, is inclined to doubt whether there is any reference in either of the passages of the N.T. to the formal ordering of the cups of the Passover, and proves that the name “cup of blessing” (כּוֹס שֵׁל בְּרָכָה) was applied in a general way to any cup which was drunk with thanksgiving, and that the expression was often used metaphorically, e.g. Psa 116:13 (Hor. Heb. in 1Co 10:16; see also Carpzov, App. rit. p. 380).  The wine drunk at the meal was not restricted to the four cups, but none could be taken during the interval between the third and fourth cups (Pesach. 10:7).

(c) The Hallel. — The service of praise sung at the Passover is not mentioned in the law. The name is contracted from הִלְלוּאּיָהּ(Hallelujah). It consisted of the series of Psalms from 113 to 118. The first portion, comprising Psalms 113, 114, was sung in the early part of the meal, and the second part after the fourth cup of wine. This is supposed to have been the “hymn” sung by our Lord and his apostles (Mat 26:30; Mar 14:26; Buxtorf, Lex. Tal. s.v. hה, and Syn. Jud. p. 48; Otho, Lex. p. 271; Garpzov. App. Crit. p. 374. SEE HALLEL.

(d) Persons Partaking. — No male was admitted to the table unless he was circumcised, even if he was of the seed of Israel (Exo 12:48). Neither, according to the letter of the law, was any one of either sex admitted who was ceremonially unclean (Num 9:6; Joseph. War, 6:9, 3). But this rule was on special occasions liberally applied. In the case of Hezekiah's Passover (2 Chronicles 30), we find that a greater degree of legal purity was required to slaughter the lambs than to eat them, and that numbers partook “otherwise than it was written,” who were not “cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary.” The Rabbinists expressly state that women were permitted, though not commanded, to partake (Pesach. 8:1; Chargigqah, 1:1; comp. Joseph. War, 6:9, 3), in accordance with the instances in Scripture which have been mentioned of Hannah and Mary. But the Karaites, in more recent times, excluded all but full grown men. It was customary for the number of a party to be not less than ten (Joseph. War, 6:9, 3). It was perhaps generally under twenty, but it might be as many as a hundred, if each one could have a piece of the lamb as large as an olive (Pesach. 8:7).

(e) Position at the Table. — When the meal was prepared, the family was placed round the table, the paterfamilias taking a place of honor, probably somewhat raised above the rest. There is no reason to doubt that the ancient Hebrews sat, as they were accustomed to do at their ordinary meals (see Otho, Lex. p. 7). But when the custom of reclining at table had become general, that posture appears to have been enjoined, on the ground of its supposed significance. The Mishna says that the meanest Israelite should recline at the Passover “like a king, with the ease becoming a free man” (Pesach. 10:1, with Maimonides's note). He was to keep in mind  that when his ancestors stood at the feast in Egypt they took the posture of slaves (R. Levi, quoted by Otho, p. 504). Our Lord and his apostles conformed to the usual custom of their time, and reclined (Luk 22:14, etc.).

6. The 15th of Nisan. — On this day there was a holy convocation, and it was one of the six days on which, as on the Sabbath, no manner of work was allowed to be done; with this exception, however, that while on the Sabbath the preparation of the necessary articles of food was not allowed (Exo 16:5; Exo 16:23; Exo 16:29; Exo 35:2-3), on holy convocation it was permitted (Exo 12:16; Lev 23:7; Num 28:18). The other five days on which the Bible prohibits servile work are the seventh day of this festival, the day of Pentecost, New-Year's day, and the first and last days of the feast of Tabernarcles. The needful work which was lawful to be done on these days is defined by the Jewish canons to be such as killing beasts, kneading dough, baking bread, boiling, roasting, etc.; but not such work as may be done in the evening of a fast-day, as, for instance, reaping, threshing, winnowing, or grinding; while servile work is building, pulling down edifices, weaving, etc. If any one engaged in servile work he was not to be stoned to death, as in the case of violating the Sabbath (Num 15:32; Num 15:35), but received forty stripes save one (Maimonides, Yad Ha- Chezaka, Hilchoth Yom Tob 1:1, etc.). In addition to the daily ordinary sacrifices, there were offered on this day and on the following six days two young bullocks, a ram, and seven lambs of the first year, with meat- offerings for a burnt-offering, and a goat for a sin-offering (Num 28:19-23).

Besides these public sacrifices, there were the voluntary offerings which were made by every private individual who appeared before the Lord in Jerusalem, in accordance with the injunction in Exo 23:15; Deu 16:16. The Jewish canons ordained that this freewill- offering from every attendant at the sanctuary (ראייה) was to be a threefold one: 1, A burnt-offering of not less value than one meah silver =16 grains of corn; 2, a festive offering, called Chagigah (see below), of not less value than two meahs =32 grains of corn; and 3; a peace or joyful offering (Deu 27:7), the value of which was entirely left to be determined by the good-will of the offerer, according to Deu 16:16. The last two were alike denominated peace-offerings. They were generally offered on the first day of the festival, and if any one failed to bring them on this day, they might be brought on any other day of the  festival; but if they were neglected during the festival, they could not be offered afterwards (Chagigah, 1, 6; Maimonides, Hilchoth Chagigah, 1:4, 5). Those who contracted any legal impurity were not allowed to offer the Chagigdh (Mishna, Pesachim, 6:3).

The special sort of sacrifice named above as connected with the Passover, as well as with the other great festivals, is called in the Talmud חֲגַיגָה(Chagigah, i.e. “festivity”). It was a voluntary peace-offering made by private individuals. The victim might be taken either from the flock or the herd. It might be either male or female, but it must be without blemish. The offerer laid his hand upon its head and slew it at the door of the sanctuary. The blood was sprinkled on the altar, and the fat of the inside, with the kidneys, was burned by the priest. The breast was given to the priest as a wave offering, and the right shoulder as a heave-offering (Lev 3:1-5; Lev 7:29-34). What remained of the victim might be eaten by the offerer and his guests on the day on which it was slain, and on the day following; but if any portion was left till the third day, it was burned (Lev 7:16-18; Pesach. 6:4). The connection of these free-will peace-offerings with the festivals appears to be indicated in Num 10:10; Deu 14:26; 2Ch 30:22, and they are included under the term Passover in Deu 16:2 : “Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the Passover unto the Lord thy God, of the flock and of the herd.” Onkelos here understands the command to sacrifice from the flock to refer to the paschal lamb, and that to sacrifice from the herd to the Chagigah. But it seems more probable that both the flock and the herd refer to the Chagigah, as there is a specific command respecting the paschal lamb in Deu 16:5-7 (see De Muis's note in the Crit. Sac.; and Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Joh 18:28). There are evidently similar references in 2Ch 30:22-24; 2Ch 35:7. Hezekiah and his princes gave away at the great Passover which he celebrated two thousand bullocks and seventeen thousand sheep; and Josiah, on a similar occasion, is said to pave supplied the people at his own cost with lambs “for the Passover offerings,” besides three thousand oxen. From these passages and others, it may be seen that the eating of the Chagigah was an occasion of social festivity connected with the festivals, and especially with the Passover. The principal day for sacrificing the passover Chagigah was the 15th of Nisan, the first day of holy convocation, unless it happened to be the weekly Sabbath. The paschal lamb might be slain on the Sabbath, but not the Chagigah. With this exception, the Chagigah might be offered on any day of the festival, and on  some occasions a Chagigah victim was slain on the 14th, especially when the paschal lamb was likely to prove too small to serve as meat for the party (Pesach. 4:4; 10:3; Lightfoot, Temple Service, c. 12; Reland, Ant. 4, c. ii, § 2).

That the Chagigah might be boiled, as well as roasted, is proved by 2Ch 35:13, “And they roasted the passover with fire according to the ordinance; but the other holy offerings sod they in pots, and in caldrons, and in pans, and divided them speedily among all the people.”

7. The 16th of Nisan. — On the 16th, or the day after the holy convocation, called “the morrow after the Sabbath”, SEE PENTECOST, the omer (עמר, τὰ δράγματα, munipulus epicarum) of the first produce of the harvest was brought to the priest, to be waved before the Lord in accordance with the injunction in Lev 23:10-14 which was of barley, being the grain which ripened before the wheat (Exo 9:31-32; 2Sa 21:9; Rth 2:23; 2Ki 4:42; Manachoth, 84 a). The omer had to be from the best and ripest standing corn of a field near Jerusalem. The measure of an omer had to be of the meal obtained from the barley offering. Hence three seahs =one ephah, or ten omers, were at first gathered in the following manner: “Delegates from the Sanhedrim went [into the field nearest to Jerusalem] a day before the festival, and tied together the ears in bundles, while still fastened to the ground, so that they might easily be cut. [On the afternoon of the 16th the inhabitants of the neighboring towns assembled together, that the reaping might take place amid great tumult. As soon as it became dark, each of the reapers asked, Has the sun gone down? To this the people replied, Yes. He asked again, Has the sun gone down? To this the people again replied, Yes. Each reaper then asked, Is this the scythe? To this the people replied, Yes. Is it the scythe? Yes, was again the reply. Is this the box? Yes, they replied. Is it the box.? Yes, was again the reply. Is this the Sabbath? Yes, his the Sabbath they replied. Is it the Sabbath? Yes, this is the Sabbath, was again the reply. Shall I cut? Yes, cut, they replied. Shall I cut? Do cut, they again replied. Every question was asked three times, and the people replied to it each time. This was done because of the Boethuseans (ביתוסים), who maintained that the reaping of the omer was not to be at the exit of the festival. When cut it was laid in boxes, brought into the court of the Temple, threshed with canes and. stalks, that the grains might not be crushed, and laid on a roast with holes, that the fire might touch each grain;  it was then spread in the court of the Temple for the wind to pass over it, and ground in a barley-mill [which left the hulls unground]. The flour thus obtained was sifted through thirteen different sieves Each one finer than its predecessor], and in this manner was the prescribed omer, or tenth part, got from the seah. The residue was redeemed, and could be used by every one. They mixed the omer of meal with a log [=half a pint] of oil, put on it a handful of frankincense (Lev 2:15), as on other meat-offerings, waved it, took a handful of it, and caused it to ascend in smoke (Lev 2:16), and the residue was eaten by the priests.” Immediately after the ceremony, bread, parched corn, green ears, etc., of the new crop were exposed for sale in the streets of Jerusalem, as prior to the offering of the omer no use whatever was allowed to be made of the new corn (Mishna, Menachoth, 10:2-5; Maimonides, Yad Ha-Chezakl, Hilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin, 7:4-21; comp. also Josephus, Ant. 3:10, 5). From this day the fifty days began to be counted to the day of Pentecost (Lev 23:15).

8. The 17th to the 20th of Nisan. — This period was half-holy day (חול חמועד), called the middle days of the festival, or the lesser festival (מועד קטן), which had already commenced with the 16th. The people either left Jerusalem and returned to their respective homes, or remained and indulged in public amusements, as dances, songs, games, etc., to fill up the time in harmony with the joyful and solemn character of the festival. The work allowed to be done during the middle days of the festival was restricted to irrigating dry land, digging watercourses, repairing conduits, reservoirs, roads, market-places, baths, whitewashing tombs, etc. Dealers in fruit, garments, or in utensils were allowed to sell privately what was required for immediate use. Whatever the emergencies of the public service required, or was necessary for the festival, or any occupation the omission of which might cause loss or injury, was permitted. Hence no new graves were allowed to be dug, nor wives espoused, nor houses, slaves, or cattle purchased, except for the use of the festival. Mourning women, though allowed to wail, were not permitted to clap their hands together. The work allowed to be done during these days of the festival is strictly regulated by the Jewish canons contained in the Mishna, Moed Katon. In the Temple, however, the additional sacrifices appointed for the festival were offered up, except that the lesser Hallel was now recited, and not the Great Hallel.

9. The 21st of Nisan. — On the last day of the festival, as on the first, there was again a holy convocation. It was in all respects celebrated like the first day, except that it did not commence with the paschal meal. As at all the festivals, cheerfulness was to prevail during the whole week, and all care was to be laid aside (Deu 27:7; comp. Joseph. Ant. 11:5; Michaelis, Laws of Moses, art. 197).

10. The Second or Little Passover. — According to the injunction in Num 9:9-12, any one who was prevented by legal impurity, or by being at too great a distance from Jerusalem, from celebrating the regular Passover on the eve of the 14th of Nisan, was obliged to keep it on the 14th of the following month. This is called by the ancient Jewish tradition the Second or the Little Passover (פֶּסִח קָטוֹן, פֶּסח שֵׁנַי), and the Jewish canons also add, most justly, that those-who have been prevented from observing the first or ordinary Passover through error or compulsory force, are absolutely bound to keep the second Passover. The difference between the two Passovers is thus summed up in these canons: “In the case of the first Passover no leaven was to be seen or found in the house, the paschal sacrifice could not be offered with leaven, no piece thereof was allowed to be removed from the house in which the company ate it, the Hallel had to be recited at the eating thereof, the Chagigah had to be brought with it and it might be offered in uncleanness in case the majority of the congregation contracted it by contact with a corpse; while in the case of the second Passover both leavened and unleavened bread might be kept with it in the house, the Hallel had not to be recited at the eating of it, portions thereof might be removed from the house in which the company ate it, no Chagigah was brought with it, and it could not be offered under the above- named legal impurity” (Mishna, Pesachim, 9:3; Maimonides, Hilchoth Korban Pesach. 10:15).

11. Release of Prisoners. — It is a question whether the release of a prisoner at the Passover (Mat 27:15; Mar 15:6; Luk 23:17; Joh 18:39) was a custom of Roman origin, resembling what took place at the lectisternium (Livy, v. 13), and in later times on the birthday of an emperor; or whether it was an old Hebrew usage belonging to the festival, which Pilate allowed the Jews to retain. Grotius argues in favor of the former notion (on Mat 27:15). But others (Hottinger, Schottgen, Winer) consider that the words of St. John — ἔστι δὲ συνήθεια ὑμῖν — render it most probable that the custom was essentially Hebrew. Schottgen thinks that there is an allusion to it in Pesachinz (8:6),  where it is permitted that a lamb should be slain on the 14th of Nisan for the special use of one in prison to whom a release had been promised. The subject is discussed at length by Hottinger, in his tract De Ritu dimittendi Reun in Festo Paschatis, in the Thesaurus Novus Theologico-Philologicus.

IV. The Manner in which the Passover is Celebrated at the Present Day. — With the exception of those ordinances which were legal, and belonged to the Temple, and the extension and more rigid explanation of some of the rites, the Jews to the present day continue to celebrate the feast of Passover as in the days of the second Temple. Several days before the festival all the utensils are cleansed (הגהת כלים); on the eve of the 13th of Nisan the master of the family, with a wax candle or lamp in his hand, searches most diligently into every hole and crevice throughout the house, lest any crumb of leavened bread should remain in the premises (בדיקת חמוֹ). Before the search commences he pronounces the benediction, and after this he recites the formal renunciation of all leaven given in the former part of this article. On the 14th of Nisan, the Preparation Day (ערב פסח), all the first-born males above thirteen years of age fast in commemoration of the sparing of the Jewish first-born at the time when all Egypt's first-born were destroyed. On this evening the Jews put on their festive garments, resort to the synagogue, and offer up the prayers appointed for the occasion, after which they return to their respective homes, where they find the houses illuminated and the tables spread. Three of the thin, round, and perforated unleavened cakes, which are made of wheaten flour, resembling the oatmeal bread made in Scotland, and which are eaten during the whole of the Passover week, are put on a plate, wrapped up in a napkin in such a manner as to be separated from each other, though lying one above the other. These three cakes represent the division of the Jews into the three orders, viz. Priests, Levites, and Israelites. SEE HAPHTARAH.

A shank-bone of a shoulder of lamb, having a small bit of meat thereon roasted on the coals to commemorate the paschal lamb, and an egg roasted hard in hot ashes, to signify that it was to be roasted whole, are put on another dish; the bitter herbs are on a third dish, while the Charoseth (חרוסת), in remembrance of the bricks and mortar which the Israelites made in Egypt, and some salt water or vinegar in memory of their passage through the Red Sea, are put into two cups. When all the family have sat round the table, including the servants, to remind them that they were all alike in bondage, and should equally  celebrate their redemption; and when the paterfamilias, arrayed in his death-garments, has reclined at the. head of the table to indicate the freedom of Israel, the following order is gone through:

1. (קדש) Each one has a cup of wine, over which they all, standing up and holding their respective cups in their hand, pronounce the blessing for the juice of the grape, welcome the festival, and drink the first cup leaning on the left side;

2. (רחוֹ) Thereupon the head of the family washes his hands;

3. (כרפס) Takes the parsley or shervil, dips it into the salt water, and hands it round to every one at the table, pronouncing the following benediction: “Blessed art thou, O Lord-our God, King of the universe, who hast created the fruit of the earth;”

4. (יחוֹ) He then breaks in two the middle of the. three unleavened cakes on the dish, conceals one half for an after-dish ( אפיקומן= ἐπίγενμα), and leaves the other half on the dish;

5. (מגיד) He then uncovers the unleavened cake, takes the egg and the bone of the lamb from the dish, holds them up and says, “Lo! this is the bread of affliction which our forefathers ate in the land of Egypt. Whosoever is an hungered let him come and eat with us; whosoever is needy let him come and celebrate with us the Passover. This year we are here, next year we shall be in the land of Israel; this year we are servants, next year we shall be free children.” The second cup is then filled, and the son asks the father the meaning of this festival, who replies to him in the manner described above. Having given a summary of the Egyptian bondage, and the deliverance therefrom, they all, lifting up the cup, exclaim, “Therefore it is our duty to give thanks,” etc. The cup is then put down, the unleavened cakes covered, and the first part of the Hallel is recited.

The unleavened cakes are again uncovered, the cups of wine taken up, and the following benedictions are pronounced: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast redeemed us and redeemed our forefathers from Egypt, and preserved us this evening to eat thereon unleavened bread and bitter herbs. Let us thus, O Lord our God, and our fathers' God, also peacefully reach other festivals and holy days, to which we look forward. Cause us to rejoice in the rebuilding of thy city, and to be joyful in thy service, so that we may there eat of the thanksgiving offering  and the paschal sacrifices, whose blood was sprinkled on the sides of thine altar as an acceptance. Then shall we sing unto thee a new song for our redemption and deliverance. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who redeemeth Israel!” The blessing over, the second cup is then filled, a blessing pronounced, and the wine drunk, whereupon each one washes his hands, and says, ‘Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined us to wash the hands.” The master of the family takes up all the three unleavened cakes together in the order in which they are arranged, pronounces the following blessing over the uppermost cake: Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who bringest forth food from the earth!” and then pronounces the blessing for eating unleavened bread over the middle broken cake, which is as follow's: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined us to eat unleavened cakes!” He next breaks off a piece from the upper whole cake, and a piece from the half central cake, dips them in salt, and eats the two pieces in a reclining position. He then takes some of the bitter herbs, dips them in the Chardseth, pronounces the blessing over them. distributes them all round, and they eat them, not reclining. The master then takes a piece from the undermost cake and some of the bitter herbs, and eats them in a reclining position, saving, “In remembrance of the Temple according to Hillel. Thus Hillel did at the time when the Temple still existed. He wrapped up unleavened cakes with bitter herbs and ate them together, in order to perform what is said, It shall be eaten with unleavened cakes and bitter herbs.”

This concludes the first part of the ceremony, and the supper (שלחן עור)ִ is now served. After the supper the master takes the half cake, which has been concealed (צפון) for the after- dish (אפיקומן), eats thereof the size of an olive, and gives each one of the household a similar piece; whereupon (בר)ִ the third cup is filled, the usual grace after meals is said, the blessing over the fruit' of the vine is pronounced, and the third cup drunk in a reclining position. A cup of wine is now poured out for the prophet Elijah, when profound silence ensues for a few seconds; then the door is opened for this harbinger of the Messiah to enter, and the following passages of Scripture are recited at the moment when he is expected to make his appearance: “Pour out thy wrath upon the heathen that have not known thee, and upon the kingdoms that have not called upon thy name, for they have devoured Jacob and laid waste his dwelling-place (Psa 79:6-7). Pour out thine indignation upon them,  and cause thy fierce anger to overtake them; pursue them in wrath, and destroy them from under the heavens of the Lord” (Lam 3:66). The fourth cup is then filled and the Hallel is finished, pieces are recited which recobine the power and goodness of God, the wonderful things which he wrought at midnight in Egypt, and in connection with the Passover; the blessing is pronounced over the fourth cup, which is drunk, and after which the following last blessing is said: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, for the vine and for the fruit of the vine, and for the increase of the field, and for that desirable good and broad land wherein thou hast pleasure, and which thou hast given to our forefathers as an inheritance, to eat of its fruit and be satisfied with its goodness. Have mercy, O Lord our God, on Israel thy people, on Jerusalem thy city, on Zion the habitation of thy glory on thine altar. Rebuild Jerusalem, the holy city, speedily in our days; bring us back to it; cause us to rejoice in it, that we may eat its fruit, be satisfied with its goodness, and we shall bless thee for it in holiness and purity. Cause us to rejoice on this day, the feast of unleavened bread, for thou, O Lord, art good and gracious to all. We will therefore praise thee for the land and the fruit of the vine. Blessed art thou, O Lord, for the land and for the fruit of the vine!” The whole is concluded with the singing of the soul-stirring Paschal Hymn:

“He is mighty, He will rebuild his house speedily;

Quickly, quickly in our days, speedily,

God build, God build, O build thy house speedily,”

etc. The same service is gone through the following evening, as the Jews have doubled the days of holy convocation. In the morning and evening of the festive week the Jews resort to the synagogue and recite the prayers appointed for the feasts. The lessons from the law and prophets read on the days of holy convocations, as well as on the middle days of the festival, are given in the article HAPHTARAH SEE HAPHTARAH . It must be remarked that, in accordance with the injunction in Lev 23:10-11; Lev 23:15-16, the Jews to the present day begin to count the forty-nine days until Pentecost at the conclusion of the second evening's service, when they pronounce the following benediction: “Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and has enjoined us to count the omer! This day is the first day of the omer. May it please thee, O Lord our God, and the God of our fathers, to rebuild the sanctuary speedily in our days, and give us our portion in thy law!”  There are many curious particulars in the mode in which the modern Jews observe this festival to be found in Buxtorf, Syn. Jud. c. 18, 19; Picart, Cerem. Religieuses, vol. I; Mill, The British Jews (Lond. 1853); Stauben, Scenes de la vie Juive en Alsace (Paris, 1860).

V. Christ's last Passover. — Whether or not the meal at which our Lord instituted the sacrament of the Eucharist was the paschal supper according to the law is a question of great difficulty. No point in the Gospel history has been more disputed. SEE PASCHAL CONTROVERSY.

1. Statement of the Case. —

(1.) If we had nothing to guide us but the first three Gospels, no' doubt of the kind could well be raised, though the narratives may not be free from difficulties in themselves. We find them speaking, in accordance with Jewish usage, of the day of the supper as that on which “the passover must be killed,” and as “the first day of unleavened bread” (Mat 26:17; Mar 14:12; Luk 22:7). (Josephus in like manner calls the 14th of Nisan the first day of unleavened bread [War, v. 3, 1]; and he speaks of the festival of the Passover as lasting eight days [ib. 2:15, 1]. But he elsewhere calls the 15th of Nisan “the commencement of the feast of unleavened bread” [Ant. 3:10, 5]. Either mode of speaking was evidently allowable: in one case regarding it as a matter of fact that the eating of unleavened bread began on the 14th, and in the other distinguishing the feast of unleavened bread, lasting from the first day of holy convocation to the concluding one, from the paschal meal.) Each of the three evangelists relates that the use of the guestchamber was secured in the manner usual with those who came from a distance to keep the festival. Each states that “they made ready the Passover,” and that, when the evening was come, our Lord, taking the place of the head of the family, sat down with the twelve. He himself distinctly calls the meal “this Passover” (Luk 22:15-16). After a thanksgiving, he passes round the first cup of wine (Luk 22:17), and, when the supper is ended, the usual “cup of blessing” (comp. Luk 22:20; 1Co 10:16; 1Co 11:25). A hymn is then sung (Mat 26:30; Mar 14:26), which it is reasonable to suppose was the last part of the Hallel.

If it be granted that the supper was eaten on the evening of the 14th of Nisan, the apprehension, trial, and crucifixion of our Lord must have occurred on Friday the 15th, the day of holy convocation, which was the  first of the seven days of the Passover week. The weekly Sabbath on which he lay in the tomb was the 16th, and the Sunday of the resurrection was the 17th.

(2.) But, on the other hand, if we had no information but that which is to be gathered from John's Gospel, we could not hesitate to infer that the evening of the supper was that of the 13th of Nisan, the day preceding that of the paschal meal. It appears to be spoken of as occurring before the feast of the Passover (Joh 13:1-2). Some of the disciples suppose that Christ told Judas, while they were at supper, to buy what they “had need of against the feast” (Joh 13:29). In the night which follows the supper, the Jews will not enter the prmetorium lest they should be defiled, and so not be able to “eat the passover” (Joh 18:28). When our Lord is before Pilate, about to be led out to crucifixion, we are told that it was “the preparation of the Passover” (Joh 19:14). After the crucifixion, the Jews are solicitous, “because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the Sabbath day, for that Sabbath day was a high day” (Joh 19:31).

If we admit, in accordance with the first view of these passages, that the last supper was on the 13th of Nisan, our Lord must have been crucified on the 14th, the day on which the paschal lamb was slain and eaten; he lay in the grave on the 15th (which was a “high day” or double Sabbath, because the weekly Sabbath coincided with the day of holy convocation), and the Sunday of the resurrection was the 16th.

It is alleged that this view of the case is strengthened by certain facts in the narratives of the synoptical Gospels, as well as that of John, compared with the law and with what we know of Jewish customs in later times. If the meal was the paschal supper, the law of Exo 12:22, that none “shall go out of the door of his house until the morning,” must have been broken, not only by Judas (Joh 13:30), but by our Lord and the other disciples (Luk 22:39). (It is true that, according to Jewish authorities, this law was disused in later times. But even if this were not the case, it does not seem that there can be much difficulty in adopting the arrangement of Greswell's Harmony, that the party did not leave the house to go over the brook till after midnight.) In like manner it is said that the law for the observance of the 15th, the day of holy convocation with which the paschal week commenced (Exo 12:16; Lev 23:35, etc.), and some express enactments in the Talmud regarding legal proceedings and  particular details, such as the carrying of spices, must have been infringed by the Jewish rulers in the apprehending of Christ, in his trials before the high-priest and the Sanhedrim, and in his crucifixion; and also by Simon of Cyrene, who was coming out of the country (Mar 15:21; Luk 23:26); by Joseph, who bought fine linen (Mar 15:46); by the women who brought spices (Mar 16:1; Luk 23:56), and by Nicodemus, who brought to the tomb a hundred pounds weight of a mixture of myrrh and aloes (Joh 19:39). The same objection is considered to lie against the supposition that the disciples could have imagined, on the evening of the Passover, that our Lord was giving directions to Judas respecting the purchase of anything or the giving of alms to the poor. The latter act (except under very special conditions) would have been as much opposed to rabbinical maxims as the former (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. on Mat 27:1).

It is further urged that the expressions of our Lord, “My time is at hand” (Mat 26:18), and “this Passover” (Luk 22:15), as well as Paul's designating, it as “the same night that he was betrayed,” instead of the night of the Passover (1Co 11:23), and his identifying Christ as our slain paschal lamb (v. 7), seem to point to the time of the supper as being peculiar, and to the time of the crucifixion as being the same as that of the killing of the lamb (Neander and Lucke).

(3.) It is not surprising that some modern critics should have given up as hopeless the task of reconciling this difficulty. Several have rejected the narrative of John (Bretschneider, Weisse), but a greater number (especially De Wette, Usteri, Ewald, Meyer, and Thiele) have taken an opposite course, and have been content with the notion that the first three evangelists made a mistake, and confounded the meal with the Passover.

2. The reconciliations which have been attempted fall under the following principal heads:

(1.) Those which regard the supper at which our Lord washed the feet of his disciples (John 13) as having been a distinct meal eaten one or more days before the regular Passover, of which our Lord partook in due course according to the synoptical narratives. This method has the advantage of furnishing the most ready way of accounting for John's silence on the institution of the Holy Communion. It has been adopted by Maldonat (On Joh 13:1), Lightfoot, and Bengel, and more recently by Kaiser (Chronologie und Harmonie der vier Ev.; mentioned by Tischendorf,  Synop. Evang. p. 45). Lightfoot identifies the supper of John xiii with the one in the house of Simon the leper at Bethany two days before the Passover, when Mary poured the ointment on the head of our Savior (Mat 26:6; Mar 14:3); and quaintly remarks, “While they are grumbling at the anointing of his head, he does not scruple to wash their feet” (Ex. Heb. on Joh 13:2, and Mat 26:6). Bengel supposes that it was eaten only the evening before the Passover (On Mat 26:17, and Joh 18:28).

But any explanation founded on the supposition of two meals appears to be rendered untenable by the context. The fact that all four evangelists introduce in the same connection the foretelling of the treachery of Judas with the dipping of the sop, and of the denials of Peter and the going out to the Mount of Olives, can hardly leave a doubt that they are speaking of the same meal. Besides this, the explanation does not touch the greatest difficulties, which are those connected with “the day of preparation.”

Dernburg (in Juynboll, Roorder, etc., Orientalia, Amsterdam, 1840, i, p. 175 sq.) has endeavored to unite both views, namely, that Jesus slew the passover at the same time with the Jews, but only ate the customary supper, in the following manner: In that year in which the first paschal day fell on a Sunday, the paschal lamb could not be slain on the previous day, the Jewish Sabbath; nor could it conveniently have been slain on Friday, the preparation for the Sabbath. Suppose, then, that it was slain on Thursday, to be eaten on Sunday, the 14th of Nisan; but that Jesus, in view of his own approaching death, chose to anticipate the day. But we are expressly assured by the Mishna (Pesach. 6:1) that the passover could be slain on Sunday, and this authority cannot be overthrown by a passage of the Gemara. Besides, the expression “eat the passover” (see esp. Luk 22:7; Luk 22:11) cannot well be referred to such a customary meal. This reconciliation of the Synoptics with John thus depends upon a makeshift supposition that the former expressed themselves very inaccurately. Under such a view, how is it possible that the day on which Jesus slew and ate the paschal lamb could be called “the first day of unleavened bread?” (Mat 26:17; Mar 14:12; Luk 22:7). (For a careful discussion of this question, see the art. on “The alleged discrepancy,” etc., in the Biblioth. Sac. 1845, p. 406 sq.)

(2.) The current of opinion in modern times (Lucke, Ideler, Tittmann, Bleek, De Wette, Neander, Tischendorf, Winer, Ebrard, Alford, Ellicott; of  earlier critics, Erasmus, Grotius, Suicer, Carpzov) has set in favor of taking the more obvious interpretation of the passages in John, that the supper was eaten on the 13th, and that our Lord was crucified on the 14th. It must, however, be admitted that most of those who advocate this view in some degree ignore the difficulties which it raises in any respectful interpretation of the synoptical narratives. Tittmann (Meletemata, p. 476) simply remarks that ἡ πρώτη τῶν ἀζύμων (Mat 26:17; Mar 14:12) should be explained as προτέρα τῶν ἀζύμων. Dean Alford, while he believes that the narrative of John “absolutely excludes such a supposition as that our Lord and his disciples ate the usual passover,” acknowledges the difficulty and dismisses it (On Mat 26:17).

Those who thus hold that the supper was eaten on the 13th day of the month have devised various ways of accounting for this circumstance, of which the following are the most important. It will be observed that in the first three the supper is regarded as a true paschal supper, eaten a day before the usual time; and in the other two, as a meal of a peculiar kind.

(a.) It is assumed that a party of the Jews, probably the Sadducees and those who inclined towards them, used to eat the passover one day before the rest, and that our Lord approved of their practice. But there is not a shadow of historical evidence of the existence of any party which might have held such a notion until the controversy between the Rabbinists and the Karaites arose, which was not much before the 8th century. Then (Dissertationes, vol. ii, diss. 10 and 12), forgetting the late date of the Karaite controversy, supposed that our Lord might have followed them in taking the day which, according to their custom, was calculated from the first appearance of the moon. Carpzov (App. Crit. p. 430) advocates the same notion, without naming the Karaites. Ebrard conjectures that some of the poorer Galilaeans may have submitted to eat the passover a day too early to suit the convenience of the priests, who were overdone with the labor of sprinkling the blood and (as he strangely imagines) of slaughtering the lambs.

(b.) It has been conjectured that the great body of the Jews had gone wrong in calculating the true Passover-day, placing it a day too late, and that our Lord ate the passover on what was really the 14th, but what commonly passed as the 13th. This was the opinion of Beza, Bucer, Calovius, and Scaliger. It is favored by Stier. But it is utterly unsupported by historical testimony.

(c.) Calvin supposed that on this occasion, though our Lord thought it right to adhere to the true legal time, the Jews ate the passover on the 15th instead of the 14th, in order to escape from the burden of two days of strict observance (the day of holy convocation and the weekly Sabbath) coming together (Harm. in Matthew 26:17; 2:305, edit. Tholuck). But that no practice of this kind could have existed so early as our Lord's time is satisfactorily proved in Cocceius's note to Sanhedrim, vol. i, § 2 (Surenhusius's Mishna, 4:209).

(d.) Grotius (On Mat 26:19, and Joh 13:1) thought that the meal was a πάσχα μνημονευτικόν (like the paschal feast of the modern Jews), and such as might have been observed during the Babylonian captivity, not a πάσχα θύσιμον. But there is no reason to believe that such a mere commemorative rite was ever observed till after the destruction of the Temple.

(e.) A view which has been received with favor far more generally than either of the preceding is that the Last Supper was instituted by Christ for the occasion, in order that he might himself suffer on the proper evening on which the paschal lamb was slain. Neander says, “He foresaw that he would have to leave his disciples before the Jewish Passover, and determined to give a peculiar meaning to his last meal with them, and to place it in a peculiar relation to the Passover of the Old Covenant” (Life of Christ, § 265). This view is substantially the same as that held by Clement, Origen, Erasmus, Calmet, Kuinol, Winer, and Alford. Dean Ellicott regards the meal as “a paschal supper” eaten twenty-four hours before that of the other Jews, “within what were popularly considered the limits of the festival,” and would understand the expression in Exo 12:6, “between the two evenings,” as denoting the time between the evenings of the 13th and 14th of the month. A somewhat similar explanation is given in the Journal of Sacred Literature for October, 1861. Erasmus (Paraphrase on Joh 13:1; Joh 18:18; Luk 22:7) and others have called it an “anticipatory Passover,” with the intention, no doubt, to help on a reconciliation between John and the other ‘evangelists. But if this view is to stand, it seems better, in a formal treatment of the subject, not to call it a Passover at all. The difference between it and the Hebrew rite must have been essential. Even if a lamb was eaten in the supper, it can hardly be imagined that the priests would have performed the essential acts of sprinkling the blood and offering the fat on any day besides the legal one  (see Maimonides, quoted by Otho, Lex. p. 501). It could not therefore have been a true paschal sacrifice.

(3.) Those who take the facts as they appear to lie on the surface of the synoptical narratives (Lightfoot, Bochart, Reland, Schottgen, Tholuck, Olshausen, Stier, Lange, Hengstenberg, Robinson, and Davidson) start from a simpler point. They have nothing unexpected in the occurrences to account for, but they have to show that the passages in John may fairly be interpreted in such a manner as not to interfere with their own conclusion, and to meet the objections suggested by the laws relating to the observance of the festival. We shall give in succession, as briefly as we can, what appear to be their best explanations of the passages in question.

(a.) Joh 13:1-2. Does πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς limit the time oully of the proposition in the first verse, or is the limitation to be -carried on to Joh 13:2, so as to refer to the supper? In the latter case, for which De Wette and others say there is “a logical necessity,” εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς must refer more directly to the manifestation of his love which he was about to give to his disciples in washing their feet; and the natural conclusion is that the meal was one eaten before the paschal supper. Bochart, however, contends that πρὸ τῆς ἑορτῆς is equivalent to ἐν τῷ προεορτίῳ, “quod ita prmececedit festum, ut tamen sit pars festi.” Stier agrees with him. Others take πάσχα to mean the seven days of unleavened bread as not including the eating of the lamb, and justify the limitation by Luk 22:1 (ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα). But not a few of those who take this side of the main question (Olshansen, Wieseler, Tholuck, and others) regard the first verse as complete in itself; understanding its purport to be that “Before the Passover, in the prospect of his departure, the Savior's love was actively called forth towards his followers, and he gave proof of his love to the last.” Tholuck remarks that the expression δείπνου γενομένου (Tischendorf reads γινομένου), “while supper — was going on” (not as in the A.V., “supper being ended”), is very abrupt if we refer it to anything except the Passover. The evangelist would then rather have used some such expression as καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον; and he considers that this view is confirmed by 21:20, where this supper is spoken of as if it were something familiarly known and not peculiar in its character —ὃς καὶ ἀνέπεσεν ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ. On the whole, Neander himself admits that nothing can safely be inferred from Joh 13:1-2 in favor of the supper having taken place on the 13th.

(b.) Joh 13:29. It is purged that the things of which they had “need against the feast” might have been the provisions for the Chagigah, perhaps with what else was required for the seven days of unleavened bread. The usual day for sacrificing the Chagigah was the 15th, which was then commencing. But there is another difficulty, in the disciples thinking it likely either that purchases could be made, or that alms could be given to the poor, on a day of holy convocation. This is of course a difficulty of the same kind as that which meets us in the purchases actually made by the women, by Joseph and Nicodemus. Now it must be admitted that we have no proof that the strict rabbinical maxims which have been appealed to on this point existed in the time of our Savior, and that it is highly probable that the letter of the law in regard to trading was habitually relaxed in the case of what was required for religious rites, or for burials. There was plainly a distinction recognized between a day of holy convocation ‘and the Sabbath in the Mosaic law itself, in respect to the obtaining and preparation of food, under which head the Chagigah might come (Exo 12:16); and in the Mishna the same distinction is clearly maintained (Yom Tob, v. 2, and legilla, 1:5). It also appears that the school of Hillel allowed more liberty in certain particulars on festivals and fasts in the night than in the day time (Pesachim, 4:5. The special application of the license is rather obscure. See Bartenora's note. Comp. also Pesachim, 6:2). And it is expressly stated in the Mishna that on the Sabbath itself wine, oil, and bread could be obtained by leaving a cloak (טִלַּית) as a pledge, and when the 14th of Nisan fell on a Sabbath the paschal lamb could be obtained in like manner (Sabbath, 23:1). Alms also could be given to the poor under certain conditions (ib. 1:1).

(c.) Joh 18:28. The Jews refused to enter the praetorium lest they should be defiled, and so disqualified from eating the passover. Neander and others deny that this passage can possibly refer to anything but the paschal supper. But it is alleged that the words ἵνα φάγωσι τὸ πάσχα may either be taken in a general sense, as meaning “that they might go on keeping the Passover,” or that τὸ πάσχα may be understood specifically to denote the Chagigah. That it might be so used is rendered probable by Luk 22:1; and the Hebrew word which it represents (פֶּסִח) evidently refers equally to the victims for the Chagigah and the paschal lamb (Deu 16:2), where it is commanded that the passover should be sacrificed “of the flock and the herd.” In the plural it is used in the same manner (2Ch 35:7; 2Ch 35:9). It is moreover to be kept in view that  the passover might be eaten by those who had incurred a degree of legal impurity, and that this was not the case in respect to the Chagigah. (See 2Ch 30:17; also Pesachim, 7:4, with Maimonides's note.) Joseph appears not to have participated in the scruple of the other rulers, as he entered the praetorium to beg the body of Jesus (Mar 15:43). Lightfoot (Ex. Heb. in loc.) goes so far as to draw an argument in favor of the 14th being the day of the supper from the very text in question. He says that the slight defilement incurred by entering a Gentile house, had the Jews merely intended to eat the supper in the evening, might have been done away in good time by mere ablution; but that as the festival had actually commenced, and they were probably just about to eat the Chagigah, they could not resort even to such a simple mode of purification. Dr. Fairbairn takes the expression that they might eat the passover” in its limited sense, and supposes that these Jews, in their determined hatred, were willing to put off the meal to the verge of, or even beyond, the legal time (Herm. Manual, p. 341).

In opposition to this view it may be argued,

(i.) That according to the Mishna (Pesach. 6:4) the flesh of these voluntary offerings might be eaten at any time within two days and one night; and even this. might be postponed for individuals.

(ii.) By the same passage, since the 14th of Nisan fell in that year on a working-day, these sacrifices might have been brought at the same time with the paschal lamb, and the sacrificial meal must already have been eaten by many of the Jews. In this case the expression of the evangelist is too general, and the Sanhedrim would certainly have sent to the heathen procurator such delegates as had no further reason to fear the uncleanness thus contracted.

(iii.

) Since the paschal lamb must be slain in the Temple by those who offered it, this, according to the prescribed regulations, was done from the first to the fifth hour, and could be done only by those who were clean; such uncleanness continuing until evening was a hinderance, and would certainly be avoided in the general fear of an impurity, which would disturb this festival (comp. Lucke, Op. cit. 725).

(iv.) Again, the mode of speech in Deu 16:2, “Thou shalt sacrifice the passover,” cannot prove any wider meaning of the words “eat the passover” than the common one, least of all a technical or offerings alone, to the exclusion of the paschal lamb; and indeed the effect of the loose use of these words in the second verse is completely removed by the strict use of the same. phrase in the sixth.

(v.) In the same manner the argument from. 2Ch 30:22 is without force, since “eating throughout the feast” (2Ch 30:22) is distinguished clearly enough from “eating the passover” (2Ch 30:18).

(d.) Joh 19:14. “The preparation of the Passover” at first sight would seem as if it must be the preparation for the Passover on the 14th, a time set apart for making ready for the paschal week and for the paschal supper in particular. It is naturally so understood by those who advocate the notion that the last supper was eaten on the 13th. But they who take the opposite view affirm that, though there was a regular “preparation” for the Sabbath, there is no mention of any “preparation” for the festivals (Bochart, Reland, Tholuck, Hengstenberg). The word παρασκευή is expressly explained by προσάββατον (Mar 15:42 : Lachmann reads πρὸς σάββατον). It seems to be essentially connected with the Sabbath itself (Joh 19:31). It cannot, however, be denied that the days of holy convocation are sometimes designated in the O.T. simply as Sabbaths (Lev 16:31; Lev 23:11; Lev 23:32). It is therefore not quite impossible that the language of the Gospels considered by itself might refer to them. There is no mention whatever of the preparation for the Sabbath in the O.T., but it is mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 16:6, 2), and it would seem from him that the time of preparation formally commenced at the ninth hour of the sixth day of the week. The προσάββατον is named in Jdt 8:6 as one of the times on which devout Jews suspended their fasts. It was called by the rabbins עֲרוּבְתָּא; quia est עֶרֶב שִׁבָּת(Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. col. 1659).

The phrase in Joh 19:14 may thus be understood as the preparation of the Sabbath which fell in the Passover week. This mode of taking the expression seems to be justified by Ignatius, who calls the Sabbath which occurred in the festival σάββατον τοῦ πάσχα (Ep. ad Philippians 13), and by Socrates, who calls it σάββατον τῆς ἑορτῆς (Hist. Eccles. 5:22). If these arguments are admitted, the day of the preparation mentioned in the Gospels might have fallen on the day of holy convocation, the 15th of Nisan. (Comp. Reland, 4:3, 11; Gabler, Op. cit. 445 sq.; Baur, Gottesd. Verfiss. 2, 227; Tholuck, John, p. 300 sq.; Jahn, Archceol. 3:314; Guericke, in the Neues krit. Journ. der Theol. 3:257 sq.; Olshausen, Bibl. sq.; Kern, in the Tubinger Zeitschr. 1836, 3:7 sq.; Crusius, John ii,138, 148; Wieseler, Chroi. Synops. p. 339 sq. Ebrard, on the Evaig. Joh. p. 42 sq.; Von Ammer, Leben Jesu 3:295, 411 sq.)

All this, however, seems forced, and contradicts the usus loquendi (see Thiele, in Neues krit. Journ. v. 129 sq.). The explanation of “the preparation of the Passover,” also, by the Sabbath of the Passover (comparing Ignat. ad Philip. c. 13), cannot well be accepted; for Ignatius, a Christian writer, simply calls the Saturday before Easter the preparation for Easter, which is altogether analogous to the preparation of the Passover, in the usual sense; nor indeed is the reference certain (Bleek, Op. cit. p. 119). It would seem that Greek readers would understand this phrase (παρασκευὴ τοῦ π.) only of the preparation for the Passover. It would require good proof to lead even a Jew to understand it as an abridged way of saying “the preparation for the Passover-Sabbath.” But suppose this proof discovered, how could John use this mode of speech, intelligible to none but Jews, in his Gospel ?

(e.) Joh 19:31. “That Sabbath-day was an high day” — ἡμέρα μεγάλη. Any Sabbath occurring in the Passover week might have been considered “a high day,” as deriving an accession of dignity from the festival. But it is assumed by those who fix the supper on the 13th that the term was applied owing to the 15th being “a double Sabbath,” from the coincidence of the day of holy convocation with the weekly festival. Those, on the other hand, who identify the supper with the paschal meal, contend that the special dignity of the day resulted from its being that on which the omer was offered, and from which were reckoned the fifty days to Pentecost. One explanation of the term seems to be as good as the other.

(f.) The difficulty of supposing that our Lord's apprehension, trial, and crucifixion took place on the day of holy convocation has been strongly urged, especially by Greswell (Dissert. 3:156). If many of the rabbinical maxims for the observance of such days which have been handed down to us were then in force, these occurrences certainly could not have taken place. But the statements which refer to Jewish usage in regard to legal proceedings on sacred days are very inconsistent with each other. Some of them make the difficulty equally great whether we suppose the' trial to have taken place on the 14th or the 15th. In others, there are exceptions permitted which seem to go far to meet the case before us. For example,  the Mishna forbids that a capital offender should be examined in the night or on the day before the Sabbath or a feast-day (Sanhedrins. 4:1). This law is modified by the glosses of the Gemara (see the notes of Cocceius in Surenhusius, 4:226). But if it had been recognized in its obvious meaning by the Jewish rulers, they would have outraged it in as great a degree on the. preceding day (i.e. the 14th) as on the day of holy convocation before the Sabbath. It was also forbidden to administer justice on a high feast-day, or to carry arms (Yom Tob, v. 2). But these prohibitions are expressly distinguished from unconditional precepts, and are reckoned among those which may be set aside by circumstances. The members of the Sanhedrim were forbidden to eat any food on the same day after condemning a criminal (Bab. Gem. Sanhedrim, quoted by Lightfoot on Mat 27:1). Yet we find them intending to “eat the passover” (Joh 18:28) after pronouncing the sentence (Mat 26:65-66). The application of this prohibition to the point in hand will, however, hinge on the way in which we understand it not to have been lawful for the Jews to put any man to death (Joh 18:31), and therefore to pronounce sentence in the legal sense. If we suppose that the Roman government had not deprived them of the power of life and death, it may have been to avoid breaking their law, as expressed in Sanhedrim, 4:1, that they wished to throw the matter on the procurator. (See Biscoe, Lectures on the Acts, p. 166; Scaliger's note in the Critici Sacri on Joh 18:31; Lightfoot, Ex. Heb. Mat 26:3, and Joh 18:31, where the evidence is given which is in favor of the Jews having resigned the right of capital punishment forty years before the destruction of Jerusalem.) It was, however, expressly permitted that the Sanhedrim might assemble on the Sabbath as well as on feast-days, not indeed in their usual chamber, but in a place near the court of the women (Gemara, Sanhedrim). And there is a remarkable passage in the Mishna in which it is commanded that an elder not submitting to the voice of the Sanhedrim should be kept at Jerusalem till one of the three great festivals, and then executed, in accordance with Deu 17:12-13 (Sanhedrim, 10:4). Nothing is said to lead us to infer that the execution could not take place on one of the days of holy convocation. It is, however, hardly necessary to refer to this, or any similar authority, in respect to the crucifixion, which was carried out in conformity with the sentence of the Roman procurator, not that of the Sanhedrim.

But we have better proof than either the Mishna or the Gemara can afford that the Jews did not hesitate, in the time of the Roman domination, to  carry arms and to apprehend a prisoner on a solemn feast-day. We find them at the feast of Tabernacles, on the “great day of the feast,” sending out officers to take our Lord, and rebuking them for not bringing him (Joh 7:32-45). St. Peter also was seized during the Passover (Act 12:3-4). And, again, the reason alleged by the rulers for not apprehending Jesus was, not the sanctity of the festival, but the fear of an uproar among the multitude which was assembled (Mat 26:5).

On the whole, then, notwithstanding the express declaration of the law and of the Mishna that the days of holy convocation were to be observed precisely as the Sabbath, except in the preparation of food, it is highly probable that considerable license was allowed in regard to them, as we have already observed. It is very evident that the festival times were characterized by a free and jubilant character which did not belong, in the same degree, to the Sabbath, and which was plainly not restricted to the days that fell between the days of holy convocation (Lev 23:40; Deu 12:7; Deu 14:26). It should also be observed that while the law of the Sabbath was enforced on strangers dwelling among the' Israelites, such was not the case with the law of the festivals. A greater freedom of action in cases of urgent need would naturally follow, and it is not difficult to suppose that the women who “rested on the Sabbath-day according to the commandment” had prepared the spices and linen for the entombment on the day of holy convocation. To say nothing of the way in which the question might be affected by the much greater license permitted by the school of Hillel than by the school of Shammai, in all matters of this kind, it is remarkable that we find, on the Sabbath-day itself, not only Joseph (Mar 15:43), but the chief priests and Pharisees coming to Pilate, and, as it would seem, entering the praetorium (Mat 27:62).

(g.) Finally, it must be admitted that the narrative of John, so far as the mere succession of events is concerned, bears consistent testimony in favor of the last supper having been eaten on the evening before the Passover. That testimony, however, does not appear to be so distinct, and so incapable of a second interpretation, as that of the synoptical Gospels in favor of the meal having been the paschal supper itself, at the legal time (see especially Mat 26:17; Mar 14:1; Mar 14:12; Luk 22:7). Whether the explanations of the passages in John, and of the difficulties resulting from the nature of the occurrences related, compared with the enactments of the Jewish law, be considered satisfacfory or not, due weight should be given to the antecedent probability that the meal was no nother  than the regular Passover, and that the reasonableness of the contrary view cannot be maintained without some artificial theory, having no proper foundation either in Scripture or ancient testimony of any kind.

3. Evidence of Later Writers. There is a strange story preserved in the Gemara (Sanhedrin, 6:2) that our Lord, having vainly endeavored during forty days to find an advocate. was sentenced and, on the 14th of Nisan, stoned, and afterwards hanged. As we know that the difficulty of the Gospel narratives had been perceived long before this statement could have been written, and as the two opposite opinions on the chief question were both current, the writer might easily have taken up one or the other. The statement cannot be regarded as worth anything in the way of evidence. Other rabbinical authorities countenance the statement that Christ was executed on the 14th of the month (see Jost, Judenth. 1:404). But this seems to be a case in which, for the reason stated above, numbers do not add to the weight of the testimony.

Not much use can be made in the controversy of the testimonies of the fathers. But few of them attempted to consider the question critically. Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 5:23, 24) has recorded the traditions which were in favor of John having kept Easter on the 14th of the month. It has been thought that those traditions rather help the conclusion that the supper was on the 14th. But the question on which Eusebius brings them to bear is simply whether the Christian festival should be observed on the 14th, the day ἐν ῃ θύειν τὸ πρόβατον Ι᾿ουδαίοις προηγόρευτο, on whatever day of the week it might fall, or on the Sunday of the resurrection. It seems that nothing whatever can be safely inferred from them respecting the day of the month of the supper or the crucifixion. Clement of Alexandria and Origen appeal to the Gospel of John as deciding in favor of the 13th. Chrysostom expresses himself doubtfully between the two. St. Augustine was in favor of the 14th. Numerous patristic authorities are stated by Maldonat On Matthew 26.

On this question respecting the Lord's Supper, see, in addition to the works cited above, Robinson, Harmony of the Gospels, and Bibliotheca Sacra for Aug. 1845; Tholuck, On John 13; Stier, On John 12 i; Kuinol, On Matthew 26; Neander, Life of Christ, § 265; Greswell, Harm. of the Evang. and Dissertations; Wieseler, Chronol. Synopsis der vier Evang.; Tischendorf, Syn. Evang. p. 45; Bleek, Dissert. fiber den Monatstag des Todes Christi (Beitirge zur Evangelien-Kritik, 1846); Frisch. muth,  Dissertatio, etc. (Thes. Theol. Philolog.); Haren. berg, Demonstratio, etc. (Thes. Novus Theol. Philippians vol 2); Eude, Demonstratio quod Chr. in Caon. σταυρωσίμῳ agnum paschalem non comedeorit (Lips. 1742); Ellicott, Lectures on the Life of our Lord, p. 320; Fairbairn, Hermeneutical Manual, 2:9; Davidson, Introduction to the N.T. 1:102; Andrews, Life of our Lord, p. 425 sq.; Lewin, Fasti Sacri, p. 31 sq.; Ebrard, Kritik d, evang. Gesch. p. 615 sq.; Caspari, Chronol. — geogr. Einleit. p. 164 sq.; Westcott, Introd. to the Gosp. p. 335 sq.; Stud. und Krit. 1832, 3:537; Isenberg, Der Todestag des Herrn (Hannov. 1868; maintains that Jesus died on the 14th of Nisan according to the Roman reckoning). SEE LORDS SUPPER.

VI. Origin and Import of the Feast of Passover. —

1. Naturalistic Interpretation. — Each of the three great festivals contained a reference to the annual course of nature. Two, at least, of them — the first and the last — also commemorated events in the history of the chosen people. The coincidence of the times of their observance with the most marked periods in the process of gathering in the fruits of the earth has not unnaturally suggested the notion that their agricultural significance is the more ancient; that, in fact, they were originally harvest feasts observed by the patriarchs, and that their historical meaning was superadded in later times (Ewald).

Hupfeld has devised an arrangement of the passages in the Pentateuch bearing on the Passover so as to show, according to this theory, their relative antiquity. The order is as follows:

(1) Exo 23:14-17;

(2) Exo 34:18-26;

(3) Exo 13:3-10;

(4) Exo 12:15-20;

(5) Exo 12:1-14;

(6) Exo 12:43-50; Num 9:10-14.

It may seem at first sight as if some countenance were given to the notion that the feast of unleavened bread was originally a distinct festival from the Passover, by such passages as Lev 23:5-6 : “In the fourteenth day of the first month at even is the Lord's Passover; and on the fifteenth day of the same month is the feast of unleavened bread unto the Lord: seven days ye must eat unleavened bread” (see also Num 28:16-17).  Josephus, in like manner, speaks of the feast of unleavened bread as “following the Passover” (Ant. 3:10, 5). But such language may mean no more than the distinction between the paschal supper and the seven days of unleavened bread, which is so obviously implied in the fact that the eating of unleavened bread was observed by the country Jews who were at home, though they could not partake of the paschal lamb without going to Jerusalem. Every member of the household had to abstain from leavened bread, but some only went up to the paschal meal (see Maimonides, De Fernentato et Azymo, 6:1). It is evident that the common usage, in later times at least, was to employ, as equivalent terms, the feast of the Passover, and the feast of unleavened bread (Mat 26:17; Mar 14:12; Luk 22:1; Josephus, Ant. 14:2, 1; War, 2:1, 3).

That the feast of Passover, as such, was instituted to commemorate the deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt will be admitted by all who give credence to the historical veracity of the Pentateuch. Its institution, however, to commemorate this great historical fact has been thought by some by no means to preclude the idea that a festival, of somewhat similar rites, was celebrated by the Jews at this season, in common with other nations of antiquity, containing a reference to the annual course of nature. The following circumstances are adduced to sustain this view. When the first appeal was made to Pharaoh to let the Israelites go, it was that they might celebrate an approaching festival (Exo 3:19; Exo 5:1). Moreover, it is a well-known fact that all the Eastern nations, who were dependent upon the course of the sun, celebrated two principal annual festivals referring to the seasons: viz. the spring festival, at the time when the sun passes over (פָּסִח) into the sign of Aries, and when the corn began to ripen; and the other, the autumn festival, when the last fruits were gathered in, which is identical with the feast of Tabernacles (סֻכּוֹת). We are told that, since the time of this spring festival was both an occasion of gratitude and anxiety-inasmuch as not only was the barley gathered, but it decided the fertility or the barrenness of the year-the spring festival was celebrated in a double manner: (a) As a token of gratitude, the fresh grains of barley were quickly ground into flour, bread was made of the dough at once, before it had time to leaven, and thus offered; and (b) as an expression of anxiety, and of a desire to conciliate the divine favor, an, expiatory sacrifice was offered for the transgressions of the past year. Indeed Epiphanius declares (Adv. Haer. cap. 19:3) that the Egyptians on this occasion marked their sheep with red, because of the general conflagration which once raged  at the time when the sun passed over into the sign of Aries, thereby to symbolize the fiery death of those animals which were not actually offered up; while Von Bohlen assures us that the ancient Peruvians marked with blood the doors of the temples, royal residences, and private dwellings, to symbolize the triumph of the sun over the winter (Ates Indien, 1:140; also General Introduction to the Pentateuch, p. 140; comp. Kalisch, Commentary on Exodus, p. 184; Ewald, Alterthumer, p. 390). Now it is admitted that two of the three great Jewish festivals — viz. Pentecost and Tabernacles — refer to the annual course of nature, SEE FESTIVAL, and that the festival of New Moon, which existed prior to the Mosaic legislation, was introduced by the inspired legislator into the cycle of Jewish festivals. SEE NEW MOON, FEAST OF THE.

There can therefore be no difficulty in admitting that the third festival was also celebrated in the patriarchal age as a barley-harvest festival, which is indicated by the very name, Abib (אביב), of this month, and that God in his infinite wisdom and goodness chose to redeem Israel at the time of this festival, and thus connected with the celebration of the regeneration of nature the celebration of the birth of the nation (Isa 43:1; Isa 43:15-17; Eze 16:4; Hos 2:5), super-adding thereto rites and ceremonies commemorative of the historical event, as well as assigning to some already existing ceremonies a spiritual and original significance. This explains the fact why the unleavened bread, which was undoubtedly connected with sacrifices before the institution of the Passover, and which was enjoined to be eaten with the paschal sacrifices, without giving to it any significance in the original ordinance (Exo 12:1-20), was afterwards made to symbolize the haste in which the children of Israel had to leave Egypt (Exo 12:34; Deu 16:3). That the unleavened bread could not from the first have been the symbol of the fact that there was no time for the dough to leaven (Exo 12:33-34; Exo 12:39) is evident from Exo 12:8; Exo 12:15, where the Israelites were commanded to eat unleavened bread before their departure, and when there was plenty of time for the dough to leaven. Moreover, the fact that this primeval festival has been divested of many old superstitions, and invested with new ideas of a most exalting tendency, in being made to commemorate the exodus as well as the barley harvest, sets aside the arguments brought against the possibility of its having been celebrated at the exodus, inasmuch as the people were quite prepared for the celebration, so far as arrangements and cattle were concerned.

On the other hand, the above view of Baur, that the Passover was an astronomical festival and the lamb a symbol of the sign Aries, and that of Von Bohlen, that it resembled the sun-feast of the Peruvians, are well exposed by Bahr (Symbolik). Spencer has endeavored in his usual manner to show that many details of the festival were derived from heathen sources, though he admits the originality of the whole. It must be admitted that the relation to the natural year expressed in the Passover was less marked than that in Pentecost or Tabernacles, while its historical import was deeper and more pointed. It seems hardly possible to study the history of the Passover with candor and attention, as it stands in the Scriptures, without being driven to the conclusion that it was, at the very first, essentially the commemoration of a great historical fact. That part of its ceremonies which has a direct agricultural reference — the offering of the omer — holds a very subordinate place. But as regards the whole of the feasts, it is not very easy to imagine that the rites which belonged to them connected with the harvest were of patriarchal origin. Such rites were adapted for the religion of an agricultural people, not for that of shepherds like the patriarchs. It would seem, therefore, that we gain but little by speculating on the simple impression conveyed in the Pentateuch, that the feasts were ordained by Moses in their integrity, and that they were arranged with a view to the religious wants of the people when they were to be settled in the Land of Promise.

2. Historical Significance of the Festival as a Whole. — The deliverance from Egypt was regarded as the starting- point of the Hebrew nation. The Israelites were then raised from the condition of bondmen under a foreign tyrant to that of a free people owing allegiance to no one but Jehovah. “Ye have seen,” said the Lord, “what I did unto the Egyptians, and how I bare you on eagles' wings and brought you unto myself” (Exo 19:4). The prophet in a later age spoke of the event as a creation and a redemption of the nation. God declares himself to be “the creator of Israel,” in immediate connection with evident allusions to his having brought them out of Egypt; such as his having made “a way in the sea, and a path in the mighty waters,” and his having overthrown “the chariot and horse, the army and the power” (Isa 43:1; Isa 43:15-17). The exodus was thus looked upon as the birth of the nation; the Passover was its annual birthday feast. Nearly all the rites of the festival, if explained in the most natural manner, appear to point to this as its primary meaning. It was the yearly memorial of the dedication of the people to him who had saved their first-born from the  destroyer, in order that they might be made holy to himself. This was the lesson which they were to teach to their children throughout all generations. When the young Hebrew asked his father regarding the paschal lamb,” “What is this?” the answer prescribed was, “By strength of hand the Lord brought us out from Egypt, from the house of bondage: and it came to pass, when Pharaoh would hardly let us go, that the Lord slew all the firstborn in the land of Egypt, both the first-born of man and the first-born of beast; therefore I sacrifice to the Lord all that openeth the womb, being males; but all the first-born of my children I redeem” (Exo 13:14-15). Hence, in the periods of great national restoration in the times of Joshua, Hezekiah, Josiah, and Ezra, the Passover was observed in a special manner, to remind the people of their true position, and to mark their renewal of the covenant which their fathers had made.

3. Import of the Details. —

(1.) The paschal lamb must of course be regarded as the leading feature in the ceremonial of the festival. Some Protestant divines during the last two centuries (Calov, Carpzov), laying great stress on the fact that nothing is said in the law respecting either the imposition of the hands of the priest on the head of the lamb, or the bestowing of any portion of the flesh on the priest, have denied that it was a sacrifice in the proper sense of the word. They appear to have been tempted to take this view, in order to deprive the Romanists of an analogical argument bearing on the Romish doctrine of the Lord's Supper. They affirmed that the lamb was a sacramentum, not a sacrificium. But most of their contemporaries (Cudworth, Bochart, Vitringa), — and nearly all modern critics, have held that it was in the strictest sense a sacrifice. The chief characteristics of a sacrifice are, all distinctly ascribed to it. It was offered in the holy place (Deu 16:5-6); the blood was sprinkledon the altar, and the fat was burned (2Ch 30:16; 2Ch 35:11). Philo and Josephus commonly call it θῦμα or θυσία. The language of Exo 12:27; Exo 23:18; Num 9:7; Deu 16:2; Deu 16:5, together with 1Co 5:7, would seem to decide the question beyond the reach of doubt.

As the original institution of the Passover in Egypt preceded the establishment of the priesthood and the regulation of the service of the tabernacle, it necessarily fell short in several particulars of the observance of the festival according to the fully developed ceremonial law (see II, 1). The head of the family slew the lamb in his own house, not in the holy  place; the blood was sprinkled on the doorway, not on the altar. But when the: law was perfected, certain particulars were altered in order to assimilate the Passover to the accustomed order of religious service. It has been conjectured that the imposition of the hands of the priest was one of these particulars, though it is not recorded (Kurtz). But whether this was the case or not, the other changes which have been stated seem to be abundantly sufficient for the argument. It can hardly be doubted that the paschal lamb was regarded as the great annual peace-offering of the family, a thank-offering for the existence and preservation of the nation (Exo 13:14-16), the typical sacrifice of the elected and reconciled children of the promise. It was peculiarly the Lord's own sacrifice (Exo 23:18; Exo 34:25).

It was more ancient than the written law, and called to mind that covenant on which the law was based. It retained in a special manner the expression of the sacredness of the whole people, and of the divine mission of the head of every family, according to the spirit of the old patriarchal priesthood. No part of the victim was given to the priest as in other peace-offerings, because the father was the priest himself. The custom, handed on from age to age, thus guarded from superstition the idea of a priesthood placed in the members of a single tribe, while it visibly set forth the promise which was connected with the deliverance of the people from Egypt, “Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation” (Exo 19:6). In this way it became a testimony in favor of domestic worship. In the historical fact that the blood in later times sprinkled on the altar had at first had its divinely appointed place on the lintels and door-posts, it was declared that the national altar itself represented the sanctity which belonged to the house of every Israelite, not that only which belonged to the nation as a whole. As regards the mere place of sprinkling in the first Passover, on the reason of which there has been some speculation, Bahr reasonably supposes that the lintels and door- posts were selected as the parts of the house most obvious to passers-by, and to which inscriptions of different kinds were often attached (comp. Deu 6:9).

A question, perhaps not a wise one, has been raised regarding the purpose of the sprinkling of the blood on the lintels and door-posts. Some have considered that it was meant as a mark to guide the destroying angel. Others (especially Bochart and Bahr) suppose that it was merely a sign to confirm the faith of the Israelites in their safety and deliverance. Surely neither of these views can stand alone. The sprinkling must have been an  act of faith and obedience which God accepted with favor. “Through faith (we are told) Moses kept the Passover and the sprinkling of blood, lest he that destroyed the first-born should touch them” (Heb 11:28). Whatever else it may have been, it was certainly an essential part of a sacrament, of an “effectual sign of grace and of God's good-will,” expressing the mutual relation into which the covenant had brought the Creator and the creature. That it also denoted the purification of the children of Israel from the abominations of the Egyptians, and so had the accustomed significance of the sprinkling of blood under the law (Heb 9:22), is evidently in entire consistency with this view.

No satisfactory reason has been assigned for the command to choose the lamb four days before the paschal supper. Kurtz (following Hofmann) fancies that the four days signified the four centuries of Egyptian bondage. As in later times the rule appears not to have been observed, the reason of it was probably of a temporary nature.

That the lamb was to be roasted and not boiled has been supposed to commemorate the haste of the departure of the Israelites (so Bahr and most of the Jewish authorities). Spencer observes on the other had that, as they had their cooking-vessels with them, one mode would have been as expeditious as the other. Some think that, like the dress and the posture in which the first Passover was to be eaten, it was intended to remind the people that they were now no longer to regard themselves as settled down in a home, but as a host upon the march, roasting being the proper military mode of dressing meat. Kurtz conjectures that the Iamb was to be roasted with fire, the purifying element, because the meat was thus left pure, without the mixture even of the water, which would have entered into it in boiling. The meat in its purity would thus correspond in signification with the unleavened bread.

It is not difficult to determine the reason of the command, “not a bone of him shall be broken.” The lamb was to be a symbol of unity; the unity of the family, the unity of the nation, the unity of God with his people whom he had taken into covenant with himself. While the flesh was divided into portions, so that each member of the family could partake, the skeleton was left one and entire to remind them of the bonds which united them. Thus the words of the law are applied to the body of our Savior, as the type of that still higher unity of which he was himself to be the author and center (Joh 19:36).  The same significance may evidently be attached to the prohibition that no part of the meat should be kept for another meal, or carried to another house. The paschal meal in each house was to be one, whole and entire.

(2.) The unleavened bread ranks next in importance to the paschal lamb. The notion has been very generally held, or taken for granted, both by Christian and Jewish writers of all ages, that it was intended to remind the Israelites of the unleavened cakes which they were obliged to eat in their hasty flight (Exo 12:34; Exo 12:39). But there is not the least intimation to this effect in the sacred narrative. On the contrary, the command was given to Moses and Aaron that unleavened bread should be eaten with the lamb before the circumstance occurred upon which this explanation is based (comp. Exo 12:8 with 12:39).

It has been considered by some (Ewald, Winer, and the modern Jews) that the unleavened bread and the bitter herbs alike owe their meaning to their being regarded as unpalatable food. The expression “bread of affliction,” לֶחֶם עֹנַי(Deu 16:3), is regarded as equivalent to fasting- bread, and on this ground Ewald ascribes something of the character of a fast to the Passover. But this seems to be wholly inconsistent with the pervading joyous nature of the festival. The bread of affliction may mean bread which, in present gladness, commemorated, either in itself, or in common with the other elements of the feast, the past affliction of the people (Bahr, Kurtz, Hofmann). It should not be forgotten that unleavened bread was not peculiar to the Passover. The ordinary “meat - offering” was unleavened (Lev 2:4-5; Lev 7:12; Lev 10:12, etc.), and so was the shewbread (Lev 24:5-9). The use of unleavened bread in the consecration of the priests (Exo 29:23), and in the offering of the Nazarite (Num 6:19), is interesting in relation to the Passover, as being apparently connected with the consecration of the person, On the whole, we are warranted in concluding that unleavened bread had a peculiar sacrificial character, according to. the law, and it call hardly be supposed that a particular kind of food should have been offered to the Lord because it was insipid or unpalatable. Hupfeld imagines that bread without leaven, being the simplest' result of cooked grain, characterized the old agricultural festival which existed before the sacrifice of the lamb was instituted.

It seems more reasonable to accept Paul's reference to the subject (1Co 5:6-8) as furnishing the true meaning of the symbol.  Fermentation is decomposition, a dissolution of unity. This must be more obvious to ordinary eyes where the leaven in common use is a piece of sourdough, instead of the expedients at present employed in this country to make bread light. The pure dry biscuit, as distinguished from bread thus leavened, would be an apt emblem of unchanged duration, and, in its freedom from foreign mixture, of purity also. The root מָצִוֹsignifies “to make dry.” Kurtz thinks that dryness rather than sweetness is the idea מִצּוֹת. But sweet in this connection has the sense of uncorrupted, or incorruptible, and hence is easily connected with dryness. Perhaps our authorized version has lost. something in expressiveness by substituting the term “unleavened bread” for the “sweet bread” of the older versions, which still holds its place in 1Es 1:19. If this was the accepted meaning among the Jews, “the unleavened bread of sincerity and, truth” must have been a clear and familiar expression to Paul's Jewish readers. Bahr conceives that as the blood of the lamb figured the act of purifying, the getting rid of the corruptions of Egypt, the unleavened bread signified the abiding state of consecrated holiness.

(3.) The bitter herbs are generally understood by the Jewish writers (Maimonides in Pesach. 8:4) to signify the bitter sufferings which the Israelites had endured (Exo 1:14). But it has been remarked by Aben-Ezra that these herbs are a good and wholesome accompaniment for meat, and are now, and appear to have been in ancient times, commonly so eaten.

(4.) The offering of the omer, though it is obviously that part of the festival which is immediately connected with the course of the seasons, bore- a- distinct analogy to its historical significance. It may have denoted a deliverance from winter, as the lamb signified deliverance from the bondage of Egypt, which might well be considered as a winter in the history of the nation. This application of the rite perhaps derives some support from the form in which the ordinary first-fruit offering was presented in the Temple. SEE FIRST-FRUITS. The call of Jacob ( a Syrian ready to perish”), and the deliverance of his children from Egypt, with their settlement in the land that flowed with milk and honey, were then related (Deu 26:5-10). It is worthy of notice that, according to Pesachim, an exposition of this passage was an important part of the reply which the father gave to his son's inquiry during the paschal supper. The account of the procession in offering the first-fruits in the Mishna  (Bikurin). with the probable reference to the subject in Isa 30:29, can hardly have anything to do with the Passover. The connection appears to have been suggested by the tradition mentioned by Aben-Ezra that the army of Sennacherib was smitten on the night of the Passover. Regarding this tradition, Vitringa says, “Non recipio, nec sperno” (In Isaiam 30:29).

Again, the consecration of the first-fruits, the firstborn of the soil, is an easy type of the consecration of the first-born of the Israelites. This seems to be countenanced by Exo 13:2-4, where the sanctification of the first-born, and the unleavened bread which figured it, seem to be emphatically connected with the time of year, Abib, the month of green ears (see Gesenius, Thesaur. In the Sept. it is called μὴν τῶν νέων, sc. καρπῶν). If Nisan is a Shemitic word, Gesenius thinks that it means the month of flowers, in agreement with a passage in Macarius (Hom. 17), in which it is called μὴν τῶν ἀνθῶν. But he seems inclined to favor an explanlation of the word suggested by a Zend root, according to which it would signify the month of New-year's day.

4. Typical Import of the Festival. — No other shadow of good things to come contained in the law can vie with the festival of the Passover in expressiveness and completeness. Hence we are so often reminded of it, more or less distinctly, in the ritual and language of the Church. Its outline, considered in reference to the great deliverance of the Israelites which it commemorated, and many of its minute details, have been appropriated as current expressions of the truths which God has revealed to us in the fullness of times in sending his Son upon earth.

It is not surprising that ecclesiastical writers should have pushed the comparison too far, and exercised their fancy in the application of trifling or accidental particulars either to the facts of our Lord's life or to truths connected with it. The crossed spits on which Justin Martyr laid stress are noticed above. The subject is expanded by Vitringa (Observat. Sac. 2:10). The time of the new moon, at which the festival was held, has been taken as a type of the brightness of the appearing of the Messiah; the lengthening of the days at that season of the year as figuring the ever-increasing light and warmth of the Redeemer's kingdom; the advanced hour of the day at which the supper was eaten, as a representation of the fullness of times; the roasting of the lamb, as the effect of God's wrath against sin; the thorough cooking of the lamb, as a lesson that Christian doctrine should be well arranged and digested; the prohibition that any part of the flesh should  remain till the morning, as a foreshowing of the haste in Which the body of Christ was removed from the cross; the unfermented bread, as the emblem of an humble spirit, while fermented bread was the figure of a heart puffed up with pride and vanity (see Suicer, sub πάσχα). In the like spirit Justin Martyr and Lactantius take up the charge against the Jews of corrupting the O.T., with a view to deprive the Passover of its clearness as a witness for Christ. They specifically allege that the following passage has been omitted in the copies of the book of Ezra: “Et dixit Esdras ad populum: Hoc pascha salvator noster est, et refugium nostrum. Cogitate et ascendat in cor vestrum, quoniam habemus humiliare eum in signo; et: post haec sperabimus in eum, ne deseratur hic locus in: aeternum tempus” (Just. Mart. Dialog. cun Tryp.; Lact. Inst. 4:18). It has been conjectured that the words may have been inserted between vers. 20 and 21 in Ezra 6. But they have been all but universally regarded as spurious.

But, keeping within the limits of sober interpretation indicated by Scripture itself, the application is singularly full and edifying. The deliverance of Israel according to the flesh from the bondage of Egypt was always so regarded and described by the prophets as to render it a most apt type of the deliverance of the spiritual Israel from the bondage of sin into the glorious liberty with which Christ has made us free. The blood of the first paschal lambs sprinkled on the doorways of the houses has ever been regarded as the best defined foreshadowing of that blood which has redeemed, saved, and sanctified us (Heb 11:28). The lamb itself, sacrificed by the worshipper without the intervention of a priest, and its flesh being eaten without reserve as a meal, exhibits the most perfect of peace-offerings, the closest type of the atoning Sacrifice who died for us and has made our peace with God (Isa 53:7; Joh 1:29; comp. the expression “my sacrifice,” Exo 34:25, also Exo 12:27; Act 8:32; 1Co 5:7; 1Pe 1:18-19). The ceremonial law, and the functions of the priest in later times, were indeed recognized in the sacrificial rite of the Passover; but the previous existence of the rite showed that they were not essential for the personal approach of the worshipper to God (Isa 61:6; 1Pe 2:5; 1Pe 2:9). The unleavened bread is recognized as the figure of the state of sanctification which is the true element of the believer in Christ (1Co 5:8). The haste with which the meal was eaten, and the girt-up loins, the staffs and the sandals, are fit emblems of the life of the Christian pilgrim, ever hastening  away from the world towards his heavenly destination (Luk 12:35; 1Pe 1:13; 1Pe 2:11; Eph 5:15; Heb 11:13).

It has been well observed by Kurtz (on Exo 12:38), that at the very crisis when the distinction between Israel and the nations of the world was most clearly brought out (Exo 11:7), a “mixed multitude” went out from Egypt with them (Exo 12:38), and that provision was then made for all who were willing to join the chosen seed and participate with them in their spiritual advantages (Exo 12:44). Thus, at the very starting-point of national separation, was foreshadowed the calling in of the Gentiles to that covenant in which all' nations of the earth were to be blessed.

The offering of the omer, in its higher signification as a symbol of the first- born, has already been noticed. But its meaning found full expression only in that Firstborn of all creation, who, having died and risen again, became the first-fruits of them that slept” (1Co 15:20). As. the first of the first-fruits, no other offering of the sort seems so likely as the omer to have immediately suggested the expressions used in Rom 8:23; Rom 11:16; Jam 1:18; Rev 14:4.

The crowning application of the paschal rites to the truths of which they were the shadowy promises appears to be that which is afforded by the fact that our Lord's death occurred during the festival. According to the divine purpose, the true Lamb of God was slain at nearly the same time as “the Lord's Passover,” in obedience to the letter of the law. It does not seem needful that, in order to give point to this coincidence, we should (as some have done) draw from it an a priori argument in favor of our Lord's crucifixion having taken place on the 14th of Nisan. It is enough to know that our own Holy Week and Easter stand as the anniversary of the same great facts as were foreshown in those events of which the yearly Passover was a commemoration.

As compared with the other festivals, the Passover was remarkably distinguished by a single victim essentially its own, sacrificed in a very peculiar manner. (The only parallel case to this, in the whole range of the public religious observances of the law, seems to be that of the scapegoat of the day of atonement.) In this respect, as well as in the place it held in the ecclesiastical year, it had a formal dignity and character of its own. It was the representative festival of the year, and in this unique position it stood in a certain relation to circumcision as the second sacrament of the  Hebrew Church (Exo 12:44). We may see this in what occurred at Gilgal, when Joshua, in renewing the divine covenant, celebrated the Passover immediately after the circumcision of the people. But the nature of the relation in which these two rites stood to each other did not become fully developed until its types were fulfilled, and the Lord's Supper took its place as the sacramental feast of the elect people of God. (It is worthy of remark that the modern Jews distinguish these two rites above all others, as being immediately connected with the grand fulfillment of the promises made to their fathers. Though they refer to the coming of Elijah in their ordinary grace at meals, it is only on these occasions that their expectation of the harbinger of the Messiah is expressed by formal observances. When a child is circumcised, an empty chair is placed at hand for the prophet to occupy. At the paschal meal a cup of wine is poured out for him; and at an appointed moment the door of the room is solemnly set open for him to enter.) Hupfeld well observes: “En pulcherrima mysteriorum nostrorum exempla: circumcisio quidem baptismatis, scilicet signum gratiae divinae et feederis cum Deo pacti, quo ad sanctitatem populi sacri vocamur; Paschalis vero agnus et ritus, continuate quippe gratis divinae et servati feederis cum Deo signum et pignuts, quo sacra et cum Deo et cum caeteris populi sacri membris communio usque renovatur et alitur, ccene Christi sacrae typus aptissimus!”

VII. Literature. — The Mishna, Pesachim (with the notes by Surenhusius),. Chagiga, and Moed Katon; and the Talmud or Gemara on these Tractates; Maimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Chamez U-Maza; Hilchoth Korban Pesach., and Hilchoth Chagiga; Lightfoot, The Temple Service, cap. xii-xiv, p. 951, 961, vol. i, fol. ed.; Hupfeld, De Fest. Hebr.; Bochart, De Aqno Paschali (vol. i of the Hierozoicon); Ugolini, De Ritibus in Cmn. Dom. ex Pasch. illustr. (vol. 17 of the Thesaurus); Maimonides, De Fermentato et A zyno; Rosenmüller, Scholia in Exodus xii, etc.; Otho, Lex. Rab. s.v. Pascha; Carpzov, App. Crit.; Vitringa, Obs. Sac. lib. 2:3, 10; Reland, Antiq. 4:3; Spencer, De Leg. Heb 2:4; Kurtz, Hist. of the Old Covenant, 2:288 sq. (Clark's ed.); Hottinger, De Ritu dimittendi Reum in Fest. Pasch. (Thes. Nov. Theologico-Philolog. vol. ii); Buxtorf, Syzag. Jud. xviii; Cudworth, True Notion of the Lord's Supper; Meyer, De tempp. sacris Hebrceorum, p. 278 sq.; Bahr. Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultzs, 2:613 sq., 627 sq.; Saalschitz, Das Mosaische Recht (Berlin, 1853), p. 406 sq.; Ewald, Die Alterthumer des Volkes Israel (Gbttingen, 1854), p. 390 sq.; Kalisch, Historical and Critical  Commentary on Exodus, p. 178, etc.; Keil, Handbuch der biblischen Archaologie, p. 380 sq.; Knobel, Die Buicher Exodus und Leviticus, p. 91 sq., 532 sq.; The Jewish Ritual, entitled Derech. Ha-Caojim (Vienna, 1859), p. 233 sq.; Landshuth, Hagada, Vortrag fur die beiden Pessachabende, which contains a masterly dissertation on the respective ages of the different portions constituting the Passover service, written in Hebrew by the editor, and a valuable treatise on the bibliography of the Passover service, written in German bv the erudite Steinschneider; also the monographs cited byVolbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 50, 52, 59, 60, 62, 121, and by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 138, 174. SEE EASTER.

## Pastophori[[@Headword:Pastophori]]

             a title among the ancient Greeks for those of their priests whose duty it was to carry the Pastos (q.v.) in the sacred rites of heathen antiquity. The priests of His and Osiris among the ancient Egyptians, who were so denominated, were arranged in incorporated colleges, which again were divided into lesser companies, each consisting of ten Pastophori, headed by an officer, who was appointed every five years, to preside over them. Along with the Egyptian worship, the Pastophori were long after found in Greece. The duty of this class of priests was to carry in their religious processions the pastos, or sacred shawl, often employed in covering and concealing from public view the adytum or shrine containing the god. It was customary for the Pastophori to chant sacred music in the temple, and to draw aside the pastos that the people might behold and adore their deity. Generally speaking, this order of priests had the custody of the temple and all its sacred appurtenances. The Pastophori were looked upon by the Egyptians as eminently skilled in the medical art.

## Pastophoria[[@Headword:Pastophoria]]

             has been applied in ecclesiastical language to different purposes:

(1) It designates that which was borne on a shrine.

(2) A small chapel (paston), the sacristy of the Greek chapel (from πάσσω, in the sense of an embroidery which was wrought upon the curtain that hung before it). It comprehended the διακονικόν and σκηνοφυλάκιον.

(3) The watcher's chamber.  The ancient (i.e. classical) Greeks used the term to denote the residence within an Egyptian temple appropriated to the Pastophori (q.v.). The same word occurs in the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, where in Eze 40:17 it is used for the chambers in the outward court of the Temple. Jerome, in commenting upon the passage, says that in the translations of Aquila and Syminachus it is rendered Gazophylacium and Exedra, and signified chambers of the treasury, and habitations for the priests and Levites round about that court of the Temple. This explanation of the word was probably derived from the writings of Josephus, who mentions the pastophorium as a part of the Temple at Jerusalem, constituting the treasury, in which the offerings ,of the people were deposited. Jerome, in another passage in his commentary on Isaiah, terms the pastophorium the chamber or habitation in which the ruler of the Temple dwelt. It is plain, therefore, that the word must have been employed in a very extensive signification.

## Pastor[[@Headword:Pastor]]

             (רֹעֶה, roch, from רָעָה, to feed, Jer 2:8; Jer 3:15; Jer 10:21; Jer 12:10; Jer 17:16; Jer 22:22; Jer 23:1-2; ποιμήν, Eph 4:11), a shepherd (as elsewhere rendered). Besides this literal sense, the word is' employed figuratively in the Scriptures in somewhat the same way as it is now used to denote a stated minister appointed to watch over and instruct a congregation. SEE SHEPHERD.

## Pastor, Christian[[@Headword:Pastor, Christian]]

             literally a shepherd, from pastor in Latin. It may be considered the exact equivalent of ποιμήν in Greek and רֹעֶהin Hebrew. See above.

No idea has been for ages more familiar in Oriental countries than that of the shepherd as the feeder and guide of a flock. Yet the terms expressing it seem never to have been applied in the Old Testament in their figurative sense to the Jewish priests except by the later prophets, more especially Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, whose writings have a strong Messianic tinge. Those prophets denounced terrible woes against the “brutish pastors”' who sought not the Lord, but who destroyed and scattered the sheep of his pasture. That they were also authorized to announce the glorious coming day of “the Lord our righteousness,” and to promise that he should “feed his flock like a shepherd,” “gather the lambs with his arm,  and carry them in his bosom,” “seek that which was lost,” “bind up that which was broken,” “strengthen that which was sick,” “feed them with judgment,” and “be their shepherd.” They also recorded God's promise, in which he said, evidently with reference to the days of the Messiah “I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding” (Jer 3:15). Under the new dispensation the Lord Jesus Christ was prominently recognized as “the great Shepherd of the sheep,” “the chief Shepherd,” and “the Shepherd and Bishop of souls.” In this character Christ portrayed himself when he said, “I am the good Shepherd and know my sheep, and am known of mine.” “The: good Shepherd giveth his life for the sheep” (Joh 10:11; Joh 10:14). He employed a similar idea when giving his parting injunctions to his disciples: “Feed my lambs,” “Feed my sheep.”

The foregoing injunctions, taken in connection with the great commission, “Go teach all nations,” show at once the nature and importance of the pastoral office in Christianity. That office is a function of the Christian ministry supplementary to the preaching of the Word. In order to make full-proof of his ministry, the man of God must be both a preacher and a pastor. Preaching and the pastoral care have a common object. Nevertheless they employ somewhat different though never antagonistic mnans for its accomplishment. Their relations and correspondences will be better understood from a comparative view. Preaching is the initial work. It awakens attention, arouses conscience, proclaims the terrors of the law, offers the mercy of salvation, and persuades men to be reconciled to God. Pastoral care feeds the flock of Christ, nourishes and cherishes the lambs of his fold, gives milk to babes, and strong meat to them that are of full age. Preaching introduces the Gospel. Pastoral care establishes and perpetuates the institutions of Christianity. Preaching enlarges the area of Christian influence. Pastoral care individualizes the application and consolidates the results of pulpit labor. Pastoral care increases attendance upon preaching, and secures interested hearers. Preaching attracts hearers within the circle of pastoral influence, and pastoral care waters the seed sown in their hearts. Preaching is aggressive. It is the pioneer work of the Church. Pastoral care follows as the work of occupation. Preaching challenges attention and. awakens inquiry. Pastoral care removes doubts, settles anxieties, and imparts consolation and instruction. , Preaching attacks error in its various forms, and unfolds and defends the truth of God. Pastoral care folds, watches, and guards the gathered flock. Preaching not followed,  or not duly sustained by pastoral care, fails of its ultimate objects. Pastoral care, without preaching, is insufficient to accomplish the designs of a Christian Church. Churches in which preaching is neglected decline both in numbers and spirituality. Those in which preaching is depreciated, or becomes powerless, verge over into ritualistic ceremonies and profitless formalities. Churches in which pastoral care is neglected lose their organic power, and tend to dissolution. Preaching and the pastoral care are, in fact, so closely correlated, and so reciprocal to each other, that they should always be maintained in unison, and in mutual co-operation. Yet there are some particulars in which the administration of the two functions widely differs.

Preaching, in some important senses, is a universal duty, whereas the pastoral care is committed to comparatively few. All God's people may be prophets, to the extent that they may, by their lives, their example, and their influence, preach Christ, and make known the knowledge of his name and the power of his grace, thus multiplying Christian activities at every point of contact between the Church and the world. Pastoral duties cannot be thus subdivided and made diffusive. They are limited in extent of territory, and for completeness and efficiency they must necessarily focalize in an individual pastor, however he may be aided by assistant pastors or lay helpers. Not merely is a pastor to take the spiritual oversight of his flock, but also to stimulate and guide the individual efforts of its members. Into this responsibility a stranger cannot enter, however good or great as a preacher. The spirit of true Christianity always demands illustration, by private as well as public labor, for the propagation of the faith and the salvation of men. It is therefore important that such labor be under wise direction, and not wasted through circumscribed views or impulses, lacking a worthy and specific aim. As well might there be many heads to an army as many pastors for a single flock. The apostle James rebuked this error when he said, “My brethren, be not many masters.” Rather should the energies of an entire flock be guided by the wisdom and zeal of a single responsible head. In this view Christian churches should not be too large, so that individual talent will be in danger of being overlooked or unemployed. When, however, by internal growth or centripetal attraction, a pastorate becomes too large for efficient superintendence or practical work, preaching, as a centrifugal force, should come to its relief by going forth with colonies to plant new centers of Church action. While in all these respects the wise pastor will encourage and guide the efforts of his  people, he will not forget that he, too, is a preacher, and that, in order to make full proof of his ministry, he must personally “preach the Word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long- suffering and doctrine” (2Ti 4:2).

The administration of the ordinances, whether of baptism or of the Lord's Supper, is peculiarly a pastoral function, and its right discharge involves no little solicitude and personal attention to their subjects. The ordinances of Christianity are not to be administered heedlessly or by mere routine, but rather with a just discrimination as to their design and significance. Nor is the minister to act merely as a judge in discriminating character, but also as an instructor to the ignorant, a helper to the weak, a guide to the erring, and as an appointed agent, by appropriate means, to turn men from the service of Satan to the obedience of the truth and the service of God.

The exercise of the preaching office is a primary requirement of the divine call. Whoever has received that call should preach wherever hearers can be found, and whether invested with the pastoral office or not. Faithful preaching will usually, if not invariably, create the necessity of the pastoral care, but that care will not necessarily devolve on the original preacher. Many useful preachers, in fact, never accept the pastoral oversight of a flock. Some feel themselves unadapted to it. Others are prevented from engaging in it by the demands of the Church in other departments of labor. Some, from constitutional or cultivated preferences, choose to labor wholly as evangelists, while other good men may not be chosen or accepted as pastors by the people. The last remark develops a distinctive peculiarity of the pastoral office. It cannot exist, in any proper sense, without the consent of those who are embraced within its jurisdiction. There are, indeed, various ways in which the pastoral relation may be established; as, for example, by a formal compact between churches and ministers, or by the routine of a system accepted by both. In other instances the pastoral relation may be imposed by government authority or private patronage, and may have a legal and ceremonial existence, even contrary to the wishes of the people; but in no case can it be fully exemplified without the personal and cordial consent of its proper subjects. The pastoral relation, as between a minister and his people, being practically a matter of agreement, is capable of dissolution by either party. Owing to this fact. good ministers are sometimes dismissed or excluded from pastorates through misapprehension or the untowardness of circumstances. In such cases their pastoral functions may be involuntarily suspended for a longer  or a shorter time, but not necessarily their duty of preaching. They may go forth and seek other fields, found other churches, and again resume pastoral relations under more favorable auspices. But if from any cause the pastoral relation should not be resumed, the preaching office, so far from being abandoned, may still be maintained, and great usefulness result from even its occasional exercise.

The ultimate rather than the primary order of pastoral labor in the Church is indicated by the New-Testament record. The whole period of our Lord's earthly ministrations was that of preparatory and missionary effort, and the pastoral office was not definitely established till near its close, while that of preaching was appointed at its beginning. It was during the last six months of Christ's public ministry that the Savior distinctly illustrated to his disciples, then somewhat prepared to understand it, his own character as the good Shepherd who was to lay down his life for the sheep. It was not till the night before his betrayal that the Savior instituted the Holy Eucharist and commanded its perpetuation in the Church, and not till after his resurrection that he gave to his disciples, through Peter, the urgent and comprehensive command, “Feed my lambs,” “Feed my sheep” commands speedily and significantly followed by the great commission, “Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” When our Lord sent forth his disciples on a mission of evangelization, he sent them two by two, thus indicating that in the early stages of evangelical labor a plurality of preachers is needed. In like manner the apostles, in their more important missionary tours, went not singly, but- accompanied by one or more assistants. Modern efforts for the propagation of Christianity, whether in pagan nations or in nations nominally Christian, illustrate a similar necessity for a preponderance of evangelical rather than pastoral effort up to the time when churches become established. After that, a single pastor can take the oversight of a flock that has been gathered by multiplied labors, of which preaching is usually the leading and principal agency.

While preaching is not limited to the Sabbath, yet the regular and most impressive occasions for its exercise occur on that day; whereas the most laborious duties of the pastoral office, such as pastoral visiting and the visitation of the sick, are necessarily to be performed on week-days.

Summarily stated, the chief duties of a pastor are:

1. To feed the flock of God;

2. To guide its members in the pathway of duty and holiness;

3. To guard them so far as may be possible from moral and spiritual evil of every kind.

In the discharge of these duties, not only ministerial but personal influence must be employed with the greatest diligence. In this manner only may be illustrated the design of the Savior's gift of pastors and teachers as supplementary to that of apostles and evangelists, viz. “for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ” (Eph 4:12). The coupling of the terms pastor and teacher together in this connection is in itself a comment on the meaning of both. It shows that the pastor is to feed his flock with intellectual and spiritual food, while as a religious teacher he is to communicate the saving knowledge of the Son of God as a means of edifying, singly and collectively, the body, of Christ. Pastors are also to be watchmen, as indicated in the apostolic injunction, “Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls. as they that must give account” (Heb 13:17). The idea of watchfulness for souls had been strikingly illustrated in connection with the prophetic office among the Jews. “I set watchmen over you, saying, Hearken to the sound of the trumpet” (Jer 6:17). “If the watchman see the sword come, and blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come and take any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity, but his blood will I require at the watchman's hand” (Eze 33:6).

Paul, in the last epistle written by his inspired pen, specially enjoins watchfulness on Timothy as essential to the accomplishment of his ministerial work. “Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry” (2Ti 4:5). The human mind cannot grasp a higher sense of responsibility than that with which the watchman for souls is invested. He should recognize himself and should be recognized by his flock as, in an important sense, his brother's keeper. The care of souls rests upon him as an anxiety for which he can have no relief but in their salvation. Yet how has this sacred idea been trifled with in the perfunctory discharge or habitual neglect of pastoral duties! True pastors, according to St. Paul, are made overseers of the flock of God by the Holy Ghost. Peter also enjoins the duty of oversight, not by constraint, but willingly, and thus teaches that pastoral oversight is not that of a taskmaster lording it over God's heritage, but rather that of the tenderest and most disinterested solicitude for the welfare of each member  of the flock. It is the solicitude of the nurse for her charge. “We were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children; so, being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you not the Gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were dear unto us” (1Th 2:7-8). The apostolic tenderness and solicitude rose higher than even that of the nurse, and became parental. “Ye know how we exhorted and comforted, and charged every one of you as a father doth his children” (1Th 2:11). Again the same apostle says to the Corinthians, “My beloved sons, I warn you. For though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers: for in Jesus Christ I have begotten you through the Gospel” (1Co 4:14-15). Paul also enjoins upon Timothy filial respect towards elders in the Church, “Rebuke not an elder, but entreat him a father” (1Ti 5:1). Few ideas are more beautiful than that of a pastor attaining parental influence over his flock, and of his people gladly according to him parental oversight of their most sacred interests.

The Greek and Roman churches apply the term pastor to all who assume the clerical office, and in so doing indicate what the office and its possessor ought to be. Yet there is reason to think that the apostolic idea of spiritual fatherhood as an attribute of the pastoral office is less comprehended in those old and spiritually dead churches than in the living churches of Protestant countries. On the part of the people there is a greater appreciation, amounting, indeed, to a superstitious reverence for the clerical office, but on the part of the clergy, priests so-called, lax views, of spiritual experience and obligation, and still looser practice. Happy would it be if the character of the true Christian father were consistently illustrated by pastors of every name and every branch of the Church.

The pastoral office has thus far been considered in the light of a personal agency, and as such alone it is sublime. But it rises to a still-grander importance when seen to be invested with organic power. Pastors die, but the Church is immortal. Nevertheless, each true pastor, by faithful service, contributes not only to the perpetuation, but to the wider extension of the Church. A Christian shepherd takes the oversight of souls. Aggregately they form a single flock. But the flock is designed to increase in numbers, and with its growth to become divisible, forming additional flocks and founding other churches, each of which will have expansive and self- multiplying power. Individuals in the original flock and in every Church that may grow out of it may, under pastoral influence, be themselves called  to the ministry, and become, in due time, the founders and pastors of other churches which shall go on multiplying to the end of time.

“So shall the bright succession run

Through all the courses of the sun.”

See what glorious results have followed from the faithful ministry of the apostles, and also from the initial labors of apostolic men in the various countries of the world — results which would have been impossible to individual and disconnected effort, but which flowed as legitimate consequences of evangelical and pastoral effort, working through the divinely appointed agency of the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. (D.P.K.)

## Pastoral Letter[[@Headword:Pastoral Letter]]

             a letter addressed either at certain stated times, or on the occurrence of some notable occasion, by a “pastor,” but especially by a bishop to the clergy under his jurisdiction, to the laity of his flock, or to both. Of the former class, in the Church of Rome, are the so-called Lenten Mandates, or Instructions, issued before the commencement of Lent, and making known the regulations enacted for the observance of the Lenten fast, the dispensations granted, and the devotions and other pious works prescribed. Such also are the letters issued by a bishop on many of the chief festivals of the year. It is usual for bishops, besides their stated letters, to address to their clergy or people instructions suited to any particular emergency which may arise, and sometimes to take occasion from the issuing of the stated pastoral letter to offer instruction on some topic of importance which may engage public attention at the time, on some prevalent abuse or scandal, or some apprehended danger to the faith or to morals. To this class belong many of the remains of the early fathers, especially in the Western Church. In some countries the government, as formerly in Austria, claimed a right to exercise a censorship over the pastoral letters to be issued by the bishops. This right, however, is regarded by churchmen as a usurpation, and, although submitted to, is admitted only under protest.

## Pastoral Staff[[@Headword:Pastoral Staff]]

             sometimes also, although not properly, called crosier (q.v.) (Lat. baculus pastoralis, cambuca, pedum, crocia, virga, ferula, cambutta in Gregory's Sacramentary), is one of the insignia of the episcopal office, sometimes  also borne by an abbot. It is a tall staff of metal, or of wood ornamented with metal, having, at least in the Western Church, the head curved in the form of a shepherd's crook, as a symbol of the pastoral office. The head of the; pastoral staff of an archbishop, instead of the crook, has a double cross, from which its name of crosier is derived. In the Greek Church the staff is much shorter, and the head is either a plain Greek cross of the form of the letter Tau, or it is a double-headed crook, which sometimes appears in the shape of the upsilon,    . It is difficult to determine the time at which the pastoral staff first came into use. The first distinct allusion to it is in St. Augustine's commentary on Psalms 124. Gregory of Tours, in his life of St. Martin, mentions the pastoral staff of St. Severinus, who was bishop of Cologne at the end of the 4th century. From an early time the pastoral staff was connected with the actual possession of the jurisdiction which it symbolizes. The giving of it was one of the ceremonies of investiture; its withdrawal was part: of the form of deprivation; its voluntary abandonment accompanied the act of resignation; its being broken was the most solemn form of degradation. So also the veiling of the crook of an abbot's pastoral staff during the episcopal visitation signified the temporary subjection of his authority to that of the bishop. An abbot being required to carry his pastoral staff with the crook turned inwards, showed that his authority was purely domestic. In the 4th century the pastoral staff resembled a simple cane with a knob, or else a crutch-like staff, like a Tau. After the 12th century the staffs increased in height and ornamentation, but the abbots, especially those of the Order of St. Anthony, long retained the Tau-shaped one. The-pope gave up the use of the staff in the middle of the 12th century, and cardinal-bishops no longer carry it. The early staffs were generally made of cypress-wood. In the later mediaeval period the material was often extremely costly, and, referring to the relaxation of the times, it was said “that formerly the Church had wooden pastoral staffs and golden bishops, but that now the staffs are of gold and the bishops of wood.” The workmanship was sometimes extremely beautiful. We annex as a specimen of the highest art the pastoral staff of William of Wykeham, now in New College, Oxford. This is a sample of the Norman pastoral staff. The Saxon was by no means so tall. The Irish pastoral staff is of a type quite peculiar, and some of the ‘sculptured specimens preserved in the British Museum, at the Royal Irish Academy, and elsewhere, are very interesting as illustrating the ecclesiastical costume of the period. SEE STAFF.

## Pastoral Theology[[@Headword:Pastoral Theology]]

             The recognition of four great divisions of the subject of theology (q.v.), viz. Exegetical. Historical, Systematic or Dogmatic, and Practical (q.v.), is now very general among theological writers and teachers. On this plan of division pastoral becomes a subdivision of practical theology. Whereas practical theology embraces whatever relates to the organization and the outward life and influence of the Church, e.g. polity, liturgies, homiletics (q.v.), and missionary agencies, foreign and domestic, pastoral theology limits itself to the personal and official duties of the pastors of churches. Even with this limitation, it covers a very wide field of study and discussion. The pastor, as the acknowledged head of a Church, not only has relations with its individual members touching their whole moral ‘and religious life, but also with whatever is done by the Church in its public capacity. Hence, though he does not form the polity of the Church to which he belongs, unless it be a single and independent congregation, yet he is expected to administer that polity, while at the same time he is the chief celebrant or director of its worship, whether with or without prescribed forms. Such duties require him to be educated in the science of theology in all its branches, and skilled in such an application of its teachings as will produce appropriate practical results.

While it is generally conceded that the character and work of pastors. should be modeled after the scriptural idea, yet there are wide variations in the development of that idea, growing out of different systems of Church polity, as well as of divergent doctrinal theories.

I. In the Roman Catholic Church, while the term “priest” has superseded that of “pastor,” yet the idea of pastoral obligation is strongly expressed in the term “curate,” which is officially given to the priest of a parish, or one to whom is committed the cure of souls. According to high Roman Catholic authority, the following are the duties of curates:

1. Instruction, including

(1) catechization;

(2) preaching.

2. The administration of the sacraments, viz. of baptism, of the Eucharist, of penance, which involves confession and absolution, of extreme unction, and of marriage. The sacraments of confirmation and of orders are  administered by bishops. The sacraments first named being regarded as essential means of salvation, curates are most solemnly charged with the obligation to administer them through whatever danger of war, pestilence, or peril of life. It is specially enjoined on curates to visit the sick, and to be constantly in a state of grace to administer the sacraments appropriately.

3. Pastoral vigilance. — Vigilance, or watch-care, is one of the most essential parts of pastoral obligation. It is not enough for the curate to preach the Word of God, to administer the sacraments, he must also be attentive to watch over the conduct of his parishioners, considering the welfare of all in general, and of each one in particular, that he may answer to God for their souls.

4. The saying of masses for their parishioners. — This duty is rigorously prescribed for Sundays and feast-days. Votive masses, masses for the dead, and private masses may be said on other days.

Besides these special duties, curates are held to certain other obligations common to all ordained ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Church, such as celibacy, the wearing of ecclesiastical dress, and the recitation of the divine offices. This latter duty consists, in the daily recitation of the prayers prescribed in the (Latin) Breviary (q.v.) for the several canonical hours, viz. matins before light, primes at sunrise, tierces at 9 A.M., sextes at mid- day, nones at 3 P.M., vespers at sunset, and compline on retiring for the night.

The minuteness of prescription in ecclesiastical law for all these duties leaves little to the discretion of the clerics who are subject to them; and had it been possible for Church law to supply right dispositions of heart corresponding to so many outward ceremonies, the system above described might be pronounced perfect, except in its departures from scriptural truth, as in the pretended veritable sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ in the mass, and in the assumption of human power to forgive sins.

II. The Reformation reacted with great force against the whole system of priestly prerogatives which had become incorporated in the Church of Rome, and especially against auricular confession. In the Protestant churches, therefore, not only was the mass rejected but all the so-called sacraments, except baptism and the Lord's Supper. Celibacy was not enjoined on the clergy, nor the ceremonious recitation of long prayers in a dead language. On the other hand, positive demands were made upon all  who proposed devoting themselves to the service of the Church that they should have a pure and established religious character, that they should lead holy lives, and give evidence not only of true faith in Christ, but of a divine call to the ministry of the Gospel. Correspondingly to this, they were required to be diligent in the reading and study of the Scriptures, and in all moral and religious duties.

Some churches, as the Lutheran and the Church of England, retained, in their ritual, forms of general confession, not for private utterance in the ear of a priest, but for the public acknowledgment of sin before Almighty God. In the High-Church or Romanistic reaction of recent times, efforts have been made in both those churches to re-establish at least a modified confessional.

In the Church of England, notwithstanding the abolition of the mass, the term priest was retained, and with it various, customs which have ever since been available to Romanizing reactionists. Hence, although the preponderating theory of that Church in reference to the ministry has been strongly Protestant, yet there have often, if not always, been those among its clergy who were not far removed from the spirit and practice of Romanism.

In all Protestant churches connected with state governments the duties and relations of pastors are modified, to a greater or less extent, by the prescriptions of civil law, whereas in voluntary churches laws and regulations are made and modified with exclusive reference to spiritual ends. As the Church of England, for example, appropriated to itself not only the colleges and churches which had previously been built, but also the foundations and benefices by which they were supported, so it received with them an entailment of modes of appointment to ecclesiastical offices quite unknown to voluntary churches. Statutes passed during the reign of Henry VIII, and ostensibly enacted to prevent persons from having pluralities of livings, provided, That all spiritual men now being, or which hereafter shall be, of the king's council, may purchase license or dispensation, and take, receive, and keep three parsonages or benefices, with cure of souls.” The same act proceeds to specify a numerous list of dignitaries whose chaplains, to the number specified, may every one in like manner purchase, “retain, and keep two benefices, with cure of souls.” The following are specimens of the parties who may each buy and hold two of the benefices in question: “Kings' chaplains not sworn of his council;  chaplains of queen, prince, or princess, or of any of the king's children, brethren, sisters, uncles, or aunts; six chaplains of every archbishop and duke; five of every marquis and earl; four of every viscount and other bishop; three of every chancellor, baron, and knight of the Garter; two of every duchess, marchioness, countess, and baroness, being widows; also all doctors and bachelors of divinity, doctors of law, and bachelors of. the law canon, and every of them which shall be admitted to any of the said degrees by any of the universities of this realm, may purchase license, and take, have, and keep two parsonages or benefices, with. cure of souls.”

Thus, for the convenience and profit of the' royal court, the aristocracy of the nation, and the scholars of the universities, a large number of benefices for the cure of souls were placed in the market like, secular property, and thus subjected to a traffic that has existed ever since. Not only so, but by long custom, sustained by legal decisions, it has been settled that the owners of estates charged with the payment of the salaries of incumbents in churches have the nomination of persons who are to receive the livings. According to a recent authority, there are now in the Church of England about 11,000 parishes. For these 952 of the pastors are chosen by the crown, 1248 by bishops and archbishops, 787 by deans and chapters, 1851 by other dignitaries, 721 by colleges, and 5996 by private patrons. When a patron presents a minister to a bishop to be settled as the pastor of a Church, the Church has no voice in the transaction, and the bishop is almost as powerless. That the nominee is offensive to the people, either from incompetence or objectionable habits, is not a legal disqualification. Unless the bishop can prove him to be heretical or immoral, he must admit him to be the pastor, or the patron may obtain damages in a temporal court, and the rejected nominee in an ecclesiastical court. It is obvious that under such laws the chances of a true pastoral relation subsisting between pastors and. their flocks are greatly diminished, if not wholly ignored. That the prevalence of this custom of patronage in England, and in other countries where Church and State are united, together with the subjection of the clergy in many spiritual matters to the mandates of civil law, has greatly and unfavorably affected the spirituality of pastoral influence, is beyond question. Nevertheless, some excellent works setting forth the nature and duties of the pastoral office. have been written, and many superior examples of pastoral zeal and success have been furnished, by clergymen of state churches.  In churches formed and governed on the voluntary principle, pastors can only assume spiritual relations to the members of their flock by consent of the latter, and when their duties are unworthily administered the pastoral relation can usually be severed without much delay, and better services secured. Thus the principle enunciated by the apostle Paul that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel is brought to bear in securing a higher grade of pastoral service than as a rule can be expected where pastors live on independent endowments. In free churches, the modes of pastoral appointment differ widely. In some, settlements, theoretically, for life prevail. In others contracts are made to last during mutual satisfaction, while still others have a system of regulated and periodical exchanges. SEE ITINERANCY.

These variations of the mode of ministerial appointment, and consequently of the tenure of the pastoral office, are not- without their influence upon minor customs connected with pastoral duty. It can hardly be questioned that the most favorable circumstances for the free and full development of pastoral character after the scriptural model are not only in voluntary churches, but in countries free from any intimate connection between Church and State. Hence it has been claimed, and not without reason, that in the United States of America, where the Christian faith has its freest and fullest development, and where the separation of Church and State is real, the Christian ministry has secured a fairer and more general development than it has ever assumed or can assume amid the repressive influences of the Old-World civilization. Certain it is that in this country whoever would cultivate and exemplify a truly apostolic character has every. advantage for so doing, and open fields of effort are before him. It is equally certain that the standard of pastoral character as demanded by universal public sentiment is higher in this than in any other country.

But in whatever mode the pastoral relation is established or maintained, it carries with it responsibilities of the gravest import, demanding on the part of the pastor a character of the highest excellence, deportment the most exemplary, diligence untiring, quenchless zeal, whole-hearted consecration to his work, discretion equal to any emergency, and the highest skill in resolving doubts, and patient perseverance in settling differences and removing difficulties. In short, he needs to be a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, possessing the mind that was also in Christ, and rightly dividing the word of truth to all with whom he may have to do.

III. To set forth these responsibilities and duties in their varied aspects and applications is the task of pastoral theology, and to this task many minds  and pens have been devoted from the apostolic age down to the present. In fact, the pastoral epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus form the inspired basis of all that can be wisely written upon the subject, unless it be founded upon other portions of the Scriptures. Nevertheless it is interesting to trace the deviations and correspondences of views that have prevailed in reference to so important a subject at different periods and in different circumstances.

Notwithstanding the very considerable number of hooks which may be enumerpted as belonging. to the literature of this subject, very few of them will be found to treat it systematically or from a strictly theological point of view. By far the greater number are simply preceptive and explanatory, addressed in didactic form to young ministers. Some embrace preaching among the pastoral duties, and give homiletical advices to a greater or less extent. Others leave the subject of pulpit address to the more full discussion of treatises on homiletics. Aside from the books to be named below, much that is valuable relating to this subject may be gleaned from clerical biography, especially from the lives of ministers who have had marked success as pastors. Summary views, often very forcibly expressed, are also to be found in many pamphlets, such as ordination and installation sermons, and' the official charges of bishops to candidates for ordination. Occasionally sermons and charges of this nature are to be found in the published works of their authors. See, for example, the works of archbishop Secker and of Rev. Robert Hall, also the Remains of Richard Cecil.

Incidental references to the subject of this article, and occasional fragments bearing upon it, may be found in patristic and mediaeval literature, representing each successive century from the first to the sixteenth. Some of the fragmentary treatises referred to are embodied in letters, some in sermons, and some in manuals relating to the moral or ceremonial obligations of the clergy of different orders. The only ancient books of any value at the present time are those by Chrysostom on the Priesthood and by Gregory of Nazianzum entitled ἀπολογητικός, especially ch. 57-65. These books, both in title and contents, prove how completely the scriptural idea of the Christian ministry had been perverted as early as the 4th century. Nevertheless a few interesting and excellent things may be gleaned from them. Between the 5th and 15th centuries inclusive the greater portion of what was written on the subject related to the mysteries, the sacraments, the vestments, and the ceremonies of the Church. Another  considerable portion of the writings in question was of a melancholy type, indicating the low and declining condition of ministerial character. In the 5th century, Salvianus of Marseilles inveighed against the avarice of priests, and Gildas the Wise wrote against the vices of the clergy. In the 8th century John Damascenus contrasted the good and the bad bishop. The Roman Catholic Church relies mainly on the Offices by Ambrose, the De pastorali cura of pope Leo the Great, and especially on the Cura pastoralis of Gregory the Great. With the opening of the second chiliad (i.e. the 11th century) better and more numerous productions in pastoral theology appeared — Bernard's Libri v de consideratione, his works De moribus et officio episcoporum and De vita et moribus clericorum. But pastoral theology then ran in a narrow groove — that of confession; all pastoral works were guides for the confessors (materials of this class of literature in the German are given by Geffcken, Bilder-Katechismus des 15. Jahrh. vol. i). The reformatory tendencies of the Middle Ages found expression in works which pointed out the pastoral neglect. Thus in the 14th century Alvarus Pelagii produced a work on the Grief of the Church, describing the depraved manners and vices of ecclesiastics. Others subsequently wrote on the Wounds of the Church and the Vices of the Clergy. A more cheerful book was that of Thomas Cantimpratensis of the 15th century, who wrote on the Proprieties of the Bees, describing under that figure the office and endowment of prelates. From and after the period of the Reformation this class of writings appeared much more numerously, and now the literary, more or less systematic, treatment became a distinguishing feature. At the beginning of the 16th century Erasmus published his Enchiridion Militis Christiani, in which he described and satirized the loose habits and vices of the monks and clergy. In 1535 he issued his Ecclesiastes sive Concionator Evangelicus. Luther in 1523 wrote a tract entitled De Instituendis Ministris Ecclesiae. Bucer wrote De animarum curd. Melancthon, besides his Ratio brevissima Concionandi published a small work entitled De Officis Concionatoris. Zwingli also published a tract entitled Pastor, quo docetur quibus notis veri pastores a falsis discerni possint. In fact, most of the Reformers treated the subject of ministerial life and duties to a greater or less extent in some form, most frequently, however, in sermons and comments on the Scriptures, as did Wickliffe and Latimer.

At a later period more formal works began to appear, of which the following are the principal, as published in the English language, arranged  in chronological order: Herbert, A Priest to the Temple, or the Country Parson's Character and Rule of Holy Life (1632); Bowles, Pastor Evangelicus (1649); Baxter, Gildas Salvianus, or the Reformed Pastor (1656); Bp. Edward Stillingfleet, Duties and Rights of the Parochial Clergy (1689); Bp. Gilbert Burnet, A Discourse of the Pastoral Care (1692); Edwards, The Preacher and tthe Hearer (1705-9, 3 vols.); Watts, An Exhortation to Ministers (1728); Mason, The Student and Pastor (1755); Fletcher of Madeley, The Portrait of St. Paul (1786); Eades, The Gospel Ministry (1787); Orton, Letters to a Young Clergyman (1791); Smith, Lectures on the Sacred Office (1798); Gerard, Pastoral Care (1799); Erskine, Sermons on the Pastoral Character and Office (1800); Bp. Thomas Coke, Discourses on the Duties of a A Minister of the Gospel (1810); Campbell, Lectures on the Pastoral Character (1811); Brown, Christian Pastor's Manual (Edinb. 1826, 12mo); Edmondson, The Christian Ministry (1828); Jerram, The Christians Minister (1829); Adam Clarke, Letter to a Preacher (1830); Bp. R. Mant, The Clergyman's Obligations (1830); Morrison, The Christian Pastor (1832); Thompson, Pastoralia (1832); J. D. Coleridge, Practical Advice to the Young Parish Priest (1834); Dale, The Young Pastor's Guide (1835); Barrett, Essay on the Pastoral Office (1839); Pike, The Christian Ministry (1839); Simpson, Clergyman's Manual (1842); Henderson, Pastoral Vigilance (1843); Pond, The YoungPastor's Guide (1844); Bridges, The Christian Ministry (1844); Humphrey, Letters to a Son in the Ministry (1845); Leifchild, Counsels to a Young Minister (1846); Sawbridge, Manualfor the Parish Priest (1846); Bp. Meade, Lectures on the Pastoral Office (1849); John Angell James, An Earnest Ministry (1849); Wallace, A Guide to the Christian Ministry (1849); Cannon, Lectures on Pastoral Theology (1853); J. J. Blunt, Obligations and Duties of the Parish Priest (1856); Oxenden, The Pastoral Office (1859); Archbp. Whateley, The Parish Pastor (1860); Wayland, Letters on the Ministry of the Gospel (1863); Burgon, The Pastoral Office (1864); J. H. Blunt, Directorium Pastorale (1865); Hoppin, Office and Work of the Christian Ministry (1869); Kidder, The Christian Pastorate (1871); Tyng, The Office and Duty of a Christian Pastor (1874); Plumer, Hints and Helps in Pastoral Theology (1874).

Protestant French writers on this subject have riot been numerous. Those whose works are best known are Ostervald (1781) and Vinet (1850); but  the most important is Matter, Le Ministere ecclesiastique et sa Mission speciale dans ce siecle (Paris. 1852). (D.P.K.)

We append the leading modern German writers on pastoral theology. The stagnation of Protestant life in the 16th and 17th centuries prevented a lively activity in this line of theological thought. One of the most important productions of this period is Valentin Andrea's Das gute Leben eines rechtschaffenen Dieners Gottes (Hamb. 1619), and his Parcenesis ad ecclesice ministros. In Spener's day pastoral theology first came to reassert its sway as in the period of the Reformation. His Desiderienu Bedenken opens the list. It was succeeded by Hartmann's Pastorale evangelicum (1678), which divides the whole material into four rubrics: (1) De pastoris persona; (2) vita; (3) sparta; (4) fortuna; and was brought out in enlarged form by Francke, who in 1723 himself published Idea studiosi theologice et monita pastoralia theologica. Other important contributions of this period are: Quenstedt's Ethicapastoralis; Mayer's Museum ministri ecclesice (1690); Kortholt's Pastor fidelis (1696); Deyling, Institutiones (1734); Fecht, Instructio pastoralis (1717); Mieg's Meletemata sacra de officio pastoris, etc. (Frankf. 1747); Baumgarten-Crusius, Casuistische Past.- Theol. (2d ed. by Hasselberg, 1752); Jakobi, Beitrage (2d ed. 1768). The orthodox and pietistic theologians vied with each other to give prominence to the pastoral office, and however great the chasmsbetween Gottfried Arnold and an orthodox Lutheran pastor, in the Geistliche Gestalt eines evangelischen Lehrers (1723), as the former depicted it, the latter was obliged in so far as it concerned only the pastoral and not the dogmatical and liturgical — to recognize its services to Christian truth. Quite a different atmosphere greets us in the works of the rationalistic period, even when the authors have not exchanged the evangelical fundamental principles for the current and popular neology. Of the latter, Peter Miller's Anleit. zur weisen u. gewissenhaften Verwaltung (1777) is an interesting example. The pastors of this period saw their avocation principally in public enlightenment, as seen in Nikolai's Sebaldus Nothanker (1773); Achatius Nitzsch's Anweisung zur Pastor'alklugheit (1791). But a better and higher view of the office was taken by Spalding, Nutzbarkeit des Predigtamtes (1772); Seiler, Grundsatze zur Bildung kiunftiger Volkslehrer (1783), and especially Ro. senmuller, Anleit. f...angehende Geistliche (1792), and Niemeyer, Handbuch f. christl. Religionslehrer (1790); also Oemler, Repertorium (1796-1800). Still higher ground is taken by Griffe, Die Past. — Theol. in ihrem ganzen Usnjange (1803);  Schwarz, Der christl. Religionslehrer (1800); Kaiser, System der Past. — Theol. (1816); Hiffell, Wesen u. Beruf des evangel. Geistlichen (1822; and often); Haas, Wissensch. Darstellung des geistl. Berufes (1834). Herder was the first to recognize in the minister the priest and prophet, and not simply the useful servant of the public (see his Briefe. ii. das Studium der Theologie). But it took fifty years before Herders ideas were appreciated. The first to so treat the pastor was Harms, Past.-Theol. (1830-31), and he may be denominated the father of the modern German idea of the pastoral office. Excellent and more recent productions are Lohe's Evangel. Geistlich. (1852, etc.); Nitzsch, Praktische Theologie, vol. 3, pt. 1; also under the special title, Die eigenthuimliche. Seelenpfiege des-evangel. Hirtenamtes (Bonn, 1857); Zimmermann, Des Amtes Wiurde u. Bii'de (Zurich, 1859); Palmer, Evangel. Pastoral-Theol. (Stuttg. 1860; 2d ed. 1863). There are besides some periodicals devoted specially to this subject; as Vilmar u. Muller, Pastoraltheol. Blatter, since 1861. To the pastoral- theology literature of Germany belong also some biographical works: the life of Oberlin, Hofacker, Flattich, etc. Burk's Past. — Theol. in Beispielen (1838), and his Spiegel edler Pfarrfrauen (1842), bring together rich biographical matter under the rubrics of pastoral theology. What has been done for certain departments of pastoral theology we have not space to enumerate here. Yet reference might be made to Kiindig, Erfahrungen am Kranken u. Sterbebette. (1856r 2d ed. 1859); Hase, Gesch. der christl. Krankenpflege (1857); also Wyss, Etwas vom Kern u. Stoff der Seelsorge (Basle, 1858); Beck, Das christl. Leben u. geistl. Amt (1859). The Roman Catholic Church possesses in the works of Powandra, Liipschitz, Hinterberger, and especially Sailer's Past.-Theol. (1788, 1820, 1835), and in the more recent productions by Vogl and Amberger, most important works. A critique of pastoraltheology literature from a scientific standpoint has been-furnished by Graf in his Krit. Darstellung, vol. 1 (1841). See also Hagenbach, Encykl. u; Methodol. p. 109-111; Stud. u. Krit. 1838, 1:753.

## Pastorate[[@Headword:Pastorate]]

             is the state or relation of being a pastor (q.v.). In the Roman Catholic Church this depends upon the will of the bishop, who appoints, removes, and transfers priests at pleasure. In those Protestant countries where the Church is established by the State, the incumbency and term of office are regulated by statute. SEE PATRONAGE. In the non-Catholic churches of this. country the pastoral relation is formed or dissolved by various processes, all substantially consisting of an express or implied assent or  compact between the pastor and the flock. Among Congregationalists and Baptists this agreement is direct and formal; in the Presbyterian, Reformed, and several other churches, it is effected through the cooperation or sanction of certain ministerial bodies; and among Protestant Episcopalians, Methodists, and some others, through the intervention of bishops. In the Methodist Episcopal Church the term is limited to three years. SEE ITINERANCY.

## Pastorelli[[@Headword:Pastorelli]]

             SEE PASTOUREAUX.

## Pastos[[@Headword:Pastos]]

             (παστός) is the word designating a shawl frequently used in the religious ceremonies of the ancient Egyptians as well as the heathens of Greece and Rome. It was generally figured with various symbolical representations corresponding to the particular rites in which it was used. The word pastos was also used to denote a small shrine or chapel in which a god was contained.

## Pastoureaux Or Pastorells[[@Headword:Pastoureaux Or Pastorells]]

             the name assumed by the fanatical hordes of peasants and vulgar classes who appeared in the north of France about A.D. 1251, and devastated France, ostensibly moved by. loyal motives, but really actuated by blind religious zeal and hatred of priest and monk and Jew. They were specially animated by a thorough hatred of the clergy, who already in the 13th century were, in the minds of the peasants, associated with the tyrannous lay proprietary. Partly also they were called out by the crusading frenzy to which the piety of St. Louis had given a marked impetus. They expressed, in an irrational way, the peasants' genuine loyalty to their king, whose absence in Egypt served to aggravate their misery. Their name originated in the fact that most of them were shepherds. The movement commenced in Flanders. Suddenly a mysterious personage, who bore the name of “the Master of Hungary,” appeared in the villages, inviting all shepherds, herdsmen, and laborers to join in the work of the rescue of the king and the recovery of the Holy Sepulchre. He was an aged man, with a long beard, and pale, emaciated face, who, it was said, spoke all languages by miracle, and claimed to act by direct authority of the Virgin. When he preached. the divine letter containing his instructions was kept clasped in one of his  hands, the fingers of which were never even for a moment unclosed, lest he should lose the supernatural commission. This conduct readily imposed on the credulous multitude, while terror among the higher orders spread the wildest rumors as to his origin and character. He was said to be an apostate Cistercian monk; in his youth he had denied Jesus Christ; he had been nay, was a Mohammedan; he it was that, in his youth, had led the crusade of children, who had plunged by thousands into the sea, or been sold into slavery to the Saracens; finally, he was an emissary of the Soldan of Egypt. Most of this is manifest fable; but this person's faculty for preaching makes it probable that he was really amnk, while his title, the Master of Hungary,” leads to the suspicion that he was in some way connected with the Bulgarian Manichees. He certainly had great powers of organization; for, as he proceeded through France, and as his retinue of credulous boors was augmented by numbers of profligate desperadoes, he appears to have instituted and maintained a tolerable discipline. Two lieutenants, who bore the title of masters, and numerous captains of thousands, received his orders and transmitted them to the obedient multitude. Marching through Flanders and Picardy, he entered Amiens at the head of thirty thousand men; thence he passed to the Isle of France, gathering the whole laboring population in his wake.

None of the cities dared to close their gates against him; the horde of shepherds had become an army. On their banners were emblazoned the Lamb and the Cross, the Virgin with her angels appearing to the “master.” In battle array they reached Paris to the number of one hundred thousand men. Blanche, the queen-regent, in some wild hope that these fierce peasants might themselves aid in achieving or compel others to achieve the deliverance of her son, suffered them to be admitted into the capital. But now their hostility to the Church became apparent. They not only usurped all the priestly functions, performed marriages, distributed crosses, offered absolution to those who joined their crusade, but they inveighed against the vices of the priesthood. “They taunted,” says Matthew Paris, “the Minorites and the friar-preachers as vagabonds and hypocrites; the white monks” (the Cistercians) “as covetous of lands, and the robbers of flocks; the black monks” (the Benedictines) “as proud and gluttonous; the canons as half-laymen, given to all manner of luxury; the bishops as hunters, hawkers, and voluptuaries.” It is noteworthy that the popularity of the Pastoureaux, at least in the cities, was won by thus heaping reproaches on the medieval clergy. The master, emboldened by impunity (he had actually been admitted into the presence of the queen), now worked his way to Paris. Mounted in the pulpit of the church of St.  Eustache, wearing a bishop's mitre, he preached and blessed and consecrated, married and granted divorces, while his swarming followers mercilessly slew the priests who endeavored to oppose them. After a short stay they quitted the city. The unwieldy host divided into three bodies. One went towards Orleans and Bourges; one towards Bordeaux; one to the Mediterranean coast. The first troop, led by the master in person, entered Orleans, notwithstanding the resistance of the bishop and clergy. Finding the populace favorable to the insurgents, the bishop issued his inhibition to all clerks, ordering them to keep aloof from the profane assembly. Unfortunately, the command was not obeyed. Some of the younger scholars were induced to attend the preaching which had awed Paris and her university. One of them foolishly interrupted the preacher; he was immediately struck down; the scholars were pursued; many were killed. The bishop laid the city under an interdict and fled. Leaving Orleans they shortly reached Bourges, where, penetrating into the Jewish quarter, they plundered the houses and massacred the inhabitants. Here the executive, at length convinced of their danger, decided to act. The moment selected was judicious, for the Pastoureaux were not expecting opposition. The master was about to or had failed to perform some pretended miracle, when the assault was commenced. A soldier rushed forth and clove the head of the master; the royal bailiff and his men-at-arms fell on the panicstricken followers; the excommunion was read; such of the shepherds as were not massacred were hanged. Simon de Montfort at Bordeaux adopted similar measures with the second division. The leader was seized and thrown into the Garonne, and his followers cut down by the soldiery or hanged by the magistrates. The third division, which reached Marseilles about the same time, met with a similar fate.

Seventy years later, in the time of Philip V, this spasm of fanaticism was repeated. This rising, which was almost identical in character with that already described, took place under the pretense of a crusade, though under a very different king. Again the leader was a priest and monk who claimed supernatural gifts; again the disciples were found among the miserable peasants. The insurrection, perhaps more extended in scope, meeting with no encouragement, was less terrible in result. These enthusiasts commenced their career as mere mendicants, and it was not until many of them had been hanged that, in self-defense, they displayed any violence. It was with this object that the large body which reached Paris in the spring of A.D. 1320 commenced hostilities. Encamping in the  Prd-aux-Clercs, they claimed the release of their imprisoned brothers, and, in default, they forced the prison of St. Martin, St. Germain, and the Chatalet, and set at liberty the inmates. Having succeeded in this rescue, they set off southward. This time they appear to have passed by the great cities of Central France; about 40,000 entered Languedoc and commenced a massacre of the Jews. At Verdun, on the Garonne, a royal castle, whither the Jews had fled for protection, a frightful butchery took place. At Auch, Gimont, Castel Sarrasin, Toulouse, and Gaillac similar. cruelties .were perpetrated. They then hurried to Avignon, but failed to enlist the sympathies of the pope. John XXII excommunicated them, alleging as the ground of this measure that they had taken the cross without papal authority. Further, he invoked the civil power, and found the seneschal of Carcassonne only too obedient. By his orders all the roads in the district were rendered impassable, and all the supplies of provisions stopped. Thus hemmed in on all sides in a malarious and barren country, the greater part of the Pastoureaux perished of famine and disease, and the survivors were put to death. So suddenly began and ended these two outbreaks of religious Jacquerie. The original authorities as to the early fanatics are Matthew Paris and William of Nangis, of the latter, the Continuator Nangii. Of modern accounts, the most valuable are, Sismondi's History of France, vol. 7 and 9; Ducange, s.v. Pastorelli; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 6:57-63; 7:64 sq.

## Pasture[[@Headword:Pasture]]

             (prop. מִרֵעֶהor מִרְעַית, from רָעָה, to feed, νομή). In the first period of their history the Hebrews led an unsettled pastoral life, such as we still find among many Oriental tribes. One great object of the Mosaical polity was to turn them from this condition into that of fixed cultivators of the soil. Pasturage was, however, only discouraged as a pursuit unfriendly to settled habits and institutions, and not as connected with agriculture. Hence, although in later times the principal attention of the Hebrews was given to agriculture, the tending of sheep and cattle was not at any time neglected. SEE CATTLE.

The shepherds who move about with their flocks from one pasture-ground to another, according to the demands of the season, the state of the herbage, and the supply of water, are called nomands — that is, not merely shepherds, but wandering shepherds. They feed their flocks on the “commons,” or the deserts and wildernesses, which no settled or  cultivating people have appropriated. At first no pastoral tribe can have any particular property in such tracts of ground in preference to another tribe; but in the end a particular tract becomes appropriated to some one tribe, or section of a tribe, either from long occupation, or from digging wells therein. According to the ideas of the East, the digging of a well is so meritorious an act that he who performs it acquires a property in the waste lands around. In the time of the patriarchs Palestine was but thinly peopled by the Canaanites, and offered many such tracts of unappropriated grounds fit for pasturage. In these they fed their flocks, without establishing any exclusive claims to the soil, until they proceeded to dig wells, which, being considered as an act of appropriation, was opposed by some of the inhabitants (Gen 21:25-26). After the conquest of Canaan, those Israelites who possessed large flocks and herds sent them out, under the care of shepherds, into the “wildernesses,” or commons, of the east and south, where there are rich and juicy pasturages during the moist seasons of the year (1Sa 17:28; 1Sa 25:4-15; 1Ch 27:29-31; Isa 65:10; Jeremiah 1:39). The nomads occupy, successively, the same stations in the deserts every year. In summer, when the plains are parched with drought, and every green herb is dried up, they proceed northwards, or into the mountains, or to the banks of rivers; and in winter and spring, when the rains have reclothed the plains with verdure, and filled the watercourses, they return. When these pastors remove, they strike their tents, pack them up, and convey them on camels to the next station. Nearly all the pastoral usages were the same anciently as now. The sheep were constantly kept in the open air, and guarded by hired servants, and by the sons and daughters of the owners. Even the daughters of emirs, or chiefs, did not disdain to tend the sheep (Gen 24:17-20; Gen 29:9; Exo 2:16). The principal shepherd was responsible for the sheep entrusted to his care, and if any were lost he had to make them good, except in certain cases (Gen 31:39; Exo 22:12; Amo 3:12). Their services were often paid by a certain proportion of the young of the flock (Gen 30:30). On the more dangerous stations towers were erected, from which the approach of enemies might be discovered. These were called the Towers of the Flock (Gen 25:21; 2Ch 26:10; Mic 4:8). SEE SHEPHERD.

## Pastushkoe Soglasia[[@Headword:Pastushkoe Soglasia]]

             is the name of a Russian sect of Dissenters. They were founded by a shepherd, and their chief peculiarities were that they held the marriage tie  to be indissoluble by any human power, and that it is sinful to carry fasting so far as to injure health or destroy life.

## Pataeci[[@Headword:Pataeci]]

             Phoenician gods, whose images were used as ornaments to their ships.

## Patagonia[[@Headword:Patagonia]]

             the most southern country of South America, in lat. 38°-53° S., and in long. 62° 40'-75° 40' W., bounded on the north by the Argentine Republic and the Rio Negro, which separates it from the Pampas; on the north-west by the Chilian territories; on the west by the Pacific; on the south by the Strait of Magellan, which separates it from Tierra del Fuego; and on the east by the Atlantic; has an area of about 350,000 square miles, and a population estimated at about 100,000. The coast of the Atlantic is much broken by extensive bays and inlets, none of which, however, are of much importance or advantage in a commercial point of view. Along the western coast, and stretching from 42° S. to the Strait of Magellan, are numerous islands, of which the principal are Chilod, the Chonos Archipelago, Wellington Island, the Archipelago of Madre de Dios, Queen Adelaide's Archipelago, and Desolation Island. These islands — which, together with several peninsulas, form a coast almost as rugged as that of Norway — are mountainous; but in none of them, except in Desolation Island, do the mountains rise to the snow-line.

Surface, Soil, etc. — The country is divided by the great mountain-range of the Andes into Eastern and Western Patagonia. The latter, comprising the coast districts and the islands, is rugged and mountainous. Opposite the island of Chiloe are two active volcanoes, one of which, Minchinmavida, is 8000 feet high. The slope of the country from the Andes to the Pacific is so steep, and the strip of shore so narrow, that the largest river of this district has its origin only about thirteen miles from its embouchure on the coast. In the island of Chiloe, in the north of Western Patagonia, the mean temperature of winter is about 40°, that of summer rather above 50°; while at Port Famine, in the extreme south of this region, and 800 miles nearer antarctic latitudes than Chilod, the mean temperature is not much lower, being in winter about 33°, and in summer about 50°. This unusually small difference in the mean temperature of the extremes of Western Patagonia, which extends over about 14° of latitude, is due to the great dampness of the atmosphere all along the coast. The prevailing winds of this region  blow from the west; and, heavily surcharged with the moisture they have drawn from the immense wastes of the Pacific Ocean, they strike against the Andes, are thoroughly condensed by the cold high mountains, and fall in rains that are almost perpetual from Chiloe to the Strait of Magellan. South of 47° S. latitude hardly a day passes without a fall of rain, snow, or sleet. This continual dampness has produced forests of almost tropical luxuriance. A kind of deer wanders on the east side of the mountains; pumas and water-fowl are met with; and, along the coast, seals, otters, sea- elephants, fish, and shell-fish are found.

Eastern Patagonia, called the plains, comprises by far the larger portion of Patagonia, and extends eastward from the Andes to the Atlantic. Its surface has not yet been thoroughly explored, and is described only in the most general terms. According to these accounts Eastern Patagonia, from its northern to its southern limits, is an immense stony, shingly waste, generally level, but gradually rising in terraced steppes from the Atlantic to the Cordilleras. The elevation of the highest of these terraces is about 3000 feet. The surface is covered with stones and pebbles, mixed with earth of a whitish color, overlying great masses of porphyry, and strewn with immense boulders. Thorny brushwood, tufts of coarse brown grass, and towards the west basaltic ridges, break the dead level of the dreary landscape. The soil is strongly impregnated with saltpetre. Salt lakes of every variety of extent and level abound. Many of these lakes are surrounded by a brilliant snow-white crust; the waters of some of them are cold in summer and hot in winter, while in others the waters are poisonous. Extending along the south coast for several hundred miles there is a great deposit of tertiary strata, underlying a stratum of a white pumaceous substance, a tenth part of which is marine infusoria. Sea-shells are scattered everywhere across the country, and salt is everywhere abundant, from which circumstance it has been inferred that this tract was once a sea- bottom. The air of Eastern Patagonia is generally dry and hot, deriving no moisture from the prevailing west winds, which pass over the plains after having been drained by the Andes. Hurricanes, however, cutting and frigid, sweep over the plains with great fury, stripping the hides from the roofs of the roukahs or huts, and paralyzing the inhabitants with cold and fear. The above account, though in general correct, must be supplemented as well as modified by a few facts as to the surface from one who recently lived for three years in Patagonia and its vicinity. According. to M. Guinnard, the country along the banks of the Rio Negro is for the most part  mountainous, and is intersected by deep ravines; but it is not, as has hitherto been believed, completely sterile, for, on the contrary, the escaped banks of the river are sometimes abundantly fertile. The same traveler further estimates that one third of the entire area of this country — which has hitherto been described as barren — is of great fertility, especially the regions on the east coast and on the Strait of Magellan in the south. Along the eastern base of the Andes also, the great tract of territory called Los Serranos is astonishingly picturesque and fertile.. Here great forests abound, to which the Indians retire for shelter from the freezing winds of winter. There are also deep valleys furrowed by mountain torrents; and numerous lakes the haunts of wild duck and other water-fowl, which would delight the European sportsman, but which are never disturbed by the Indians, and are almost as tame as barn-yard fowls. Except pasture, Eastern Patagonia has no productions. However fertile the soil in some places may be, it is nowhere cultivated. The Indians live upon the produce of the chase alone, and seem to desire no better sustenance. The principal rivers are the Rio Negro; the Chupat, which flows through a good soil, producing excellent pasture and good firewood; and the Santa Cruz, which flows through a barren district, in a valley from one to five miles wide, and 1400 feet below the level of the plain. All these rivers rise in the Andes; the Chupat flows east, and the others south-east.Herds of horses are reared, dogs abound, and in the more favored regions cattle are bred; pumas and foxes are met with, as well as condors, hawks, partridges, and water-fowl in Los Serranos. But by far the most important animals are the guanaco (wild hama), the nandou, (Patagonian ostrich), and the gama, a kind of deer.

Inhabitants. — The Patagonians have hitherto been described only in the most general terms, and in many cases very inaccurately. Patagonia was visited at an early period by captains Byron, Wallis, and Cook in succession, and the accounts Which they brought to Europe of the appearance, habits, and manners of the natives of Patagonia were of a marvelous character. Later accounts, however, greatly modify these extravagant statements. Captain Wallis, who went out after Byron's return, has been much more judicious and careful in his inquiries. So also Bougainville, who sailed along the coast in 1767. The next to enrich our knowledge of Patagonia was captain Falkner, and by this information we are enabled to definitively class the Patagonian monster of the early voyagers with Gulliver's giants. The tallest of the tribes are composed of  men who, on an average, are nearly six feet in height; while in other tribes the average height is an inch or two less. There is reason to believe, however, that instances of unusual height are as rare in Patagonia as in Europe. The peculiar costume of the Patagonians, which in most instances consists of a long mantle of hide, drooping with unbroken outline from their shoulders almost to the ground, gives them the appearance of extraordinary height. Many of the tribes also are large in body, while they have comparatively short extremities; and these, when seen on horseback, covered with their long mantles, seem almost gigantic in stature. Their color is a reddish brown. Their shoulders are large, and well thrown back; the chest is well expanded; the head large, the forehead open and prominent; the mouth large; the eyes black, and generally large; the nose frequently hooked, long, and thin, though among some tribes it is, as a rule, broad at the nostrils; the ears are large, and elongated by the heavy ornaments of their own manufacture which they wear in them, and which are so large that they often rest on the shoulders. The hair, generally black, coarse, and lank, is sometimes rolled together on the top of the head. Their houses, called roukahs, are formed of three rows of stakes driven into the ground. The middle row is higher than the others, and the three rows are tied together with strings of hide, and so kept in their place. This frail framework is covered with hides which reach the ground on all sides, and are fastened to it by small stakes of bone. At nightfall guanaco hides are spread on the ground within the tents, and the men and women, laying aside their mantle, their only garment, and which sometimes serves as a blanket, go to sleep under the same roof and in the same apartment. Bathing in cold water every morning, throughout the whole year, is a custom to which men, women, and children conform; and although the morning bath may not free them from vermin — a national characteristic — yet it has the effect of preventing disease, and of enabling them the more easily to endure the severities of winter. The men, when out on the hunt, show wonderful courage and adroitness; when not so engaged they live in perfect idleness. They are incredibly greedy and voracious. They deck their heads, and ornament them into the perfection of ugliness, greasing their hair with the fat of the horse. They pull out the hair of the eyebrows and beard, and paint their bodies with black, red, and other colors. The Patagonians are nomads; some of the tribes, however, as the Puelches, are nomads from choice, not from necessity, for their district or headquarters is abundantly fertile. The more important tribes are nine in number; and each tribe is led and governed by a cacique, whose power  extends also to numerous sub-tribes. Each family and each man, however, is entirely free, and can remain attached to a certain tribe or separate from it at pleasure. The Patagonians form themselves into these communities for the purpose of self-defense. Wars are so frequent that security is found only in union. The chiefs are considered as the fathers, the leaders, and the rulers of the tribe; and are selected chiefly on account of their bravery in battle. The more powerful tribes frequently make raids upon settlements, and carry off great numbers of horses and cattle. They subsist upon the flesh of horses, nandous, gamas, and guanacos; the flesh they eat is generally raw. Their choice morsels are the liver, the lungs, and the raw kidneys, which they prefer to eat dished in the warm blood of the animal, or in curdled milk seasoned with salt. Roots and fishes are also eaten, but raw flesh is the staple. They are hospitable among themselves, though bitterly hostile to Christians. Their only manufactures are mantles of guanaco hide, and saddles, bridles, stirrups, and lassos. The lassos and the articles of harness are chiefly plaited, and evince wonderful ingenuity and nicety of execution. The mantles are made for the most part by a tribe called the Cheouelches. They are mainly made by women, who first in a rude and primitive manner tan the leather, then put the hides together, and sew them with the small sinews of the animal itself. Afterwards the men rub them with a stone for the purpose of supplying them and flattening the seams, and then ornament them with capricious designs in red and black paint. The Indians obtain a few cattle and horses in exchange for these mantles, which are no less prized by neighboring tribes than they are by Hispano-Americans. Clothed in one of them, the natives expose themselves to the most intense cold without receiving any injury.

The religion of the Patagonians is dualistic. They believe in two gods or superior beings — the God of Good and the God of Evil; or, in their own language, Vitauentru — the Great Man, and Huacuvu or Gualichu — the Cause of Evils. The former they consider the creator of all things, and they believe that he sends the sun to them as his representative, as much to examine what takes place among them, as to warm their bodies and renew the brief spring verdure. The moon is another representative, whose office it is to watch them and give them light. Believing that they themselves require a great deal of “watching,” they further imagine that every country on the globe has its own sun and moon, or special watchers. They have no idols. Their faith is transmitted from father to son, and its observances are strictly attended to. They are full of strange superstitions. They dread the  north and the south, believing that from the south come evil spirits, who take possession of the souls of the dying, and bear them off to the north. They fancy that the best means of ensuring a long life is to go to sleep with the head lying either to the east or to the west. They also regard all natural phenomena as being caused by their own conduct, and all misfortunes as sent in punishment for moral delinquencies. Thus the fearful tempests that sweep over their plains inspire them with the: greatest dread. During the prevalence of the hurricane they crouch together in their huts; fear makes them inactive, and they do not stir from their groveling position even to cover themselves with the hide. which the tempest strips from their huts. The Patagonian never eats or drinks without turning to the sun, and throwing down before him a scrap of meat or a few drops of water, and using a form of invocation. This form of invocation is not fixed, but it hardly ever varies, and is to the following effect: “O Father, Great Man, King of this earth! give me favor, dear friend, day by day; good food, good drink, good sleep. I am poor myself; are you hungry? Here is a poor scrap; eat if you wish.” The Patagonians observe two great religious fetes — one in summer, in honor of the Benevolent Deity; and another in autumn, in honor of the God of Evil. On the occasion of these fetes the Indians assemble on horseback, dressed in the most ceremonious manner, with their hair newly greased, and their bodies freshly painted. On such occasions it is customary to wear whatever vestments they may have obtained either in war or by stealth from civilized men; and a Patagonian chief may be seen wearing above his mantle of hide the shirt of the European, or casing his legs in a pair of pantaloons. The Patagonians are much given to gambling and to drinking. They make intoxicating beverages from the berries which they find in their woods, and they obtain liquor from the Hispano-Americans in exchange for mantles. See Trois Ans d'Esclavage chez les Patagons, by A. Guinnard.

Missionary Labors in Patagonia, etc. — In 1844 a society was organized in Great Britain (at Brighton), mainly by the exertions of captain A. F. Gardiner, R.N., an eccentric but pious and upright Christian man for the prosecution of mission work in Patagonia. Captain Gardiner had spent some time in the Zulu country, south-eastern Africa, and had zealously attempted to engage in missionary work there, but had been compelled to leave the country along with some other missionaries by the treachery of the notorious chief Dingaam, who, on giving a large party of Dutch boers an entertainment, ostensibly for concluding arrangements for their settling  in the country, suddenly fell upon and murdered his guests. The captain had made two exploratory tours along the coast, but did not succeed in finding a suitable opening for missionary enterprise. On returning to England he unsuccessfully applied to the Church, the London, the Wesleyan, and the Moravian societies, the directors of which he failed to bring over to his views. He therefore formed an independent association for the benefit of the Indian tribes of South America generally. A clergyman could not be found to go forth on the perilous enterprise, but a catechist was at length secured, and captain Gardiner defrayed his own expenses. They were not above a month in the field, however, before they hailed a vessel on her homeward course, and gladly made their escape, having been in constant alarm for their lives from the warlike attitude of the natives. In January, 1848, captain Gardiner sailed from England to plant a mission among the wild Patagonians inhabiting the extreme part of the continent of South America, called Tierra del Fuego. He took with him four seamen, a carpenter, and provisions for seven months. They had no sooner landed than the savage natives set themselves to the work of plunder, and robbed them of nearly all that they possessed. Feeling that there was no security for either life or property, and seeing no probability of doing any good, captain Gardiner and his companions again fled from the inhospitable shores of South America, where their sojourn had extended over little more than a week. Nothing daunted by previous reverses, captain Gardiner again organized a missionary expedition to Patagonia. This time he took with him four seamen and two catechists. They sailed from England in the month of September, 1850. On reaching their destination, it is said that the sight of the savage natives struck the whole party with absolute terror. In attempting to explore the coast in search of the most eligible site for a mission station, they endured many hardships both from the rigor of the climate and the unfriendly disposition of the natives who were ever ready to pilfer their property, but who refused to supply them with provisions, or to assist them in any way whatever. When at length they ventured on shore; they were driven to the greatest extremities for want of food, which soon brought on disease, and death laid his icy hand on three of their number in the course of five days. The efforts of one of the survivors to inter the remains of his departed comrades exhausted his little strength, and he lay upon the ground as helpless as a child. At length, one after another, the whole party perished from starvation. Several entries in captain Gardiner's journal, which was recovered, witness to the personal piety and singular devotedness of the  little band of sufferers. One of the catechists, Mr. Richard Williams, was a Wesleyan local preacher and a man of remarkable zeal and devotedness to God. He went out as .surgeon to the mission, and Dr. James Hamilton published a beautiful memorial of his sufferings and death. Thus mournfully ended the Patagonian mission; and thus also ended the remarkable career of captain Gardiner. After the death of this good man and his companions, the friends of the Patagonian mission reorganized the society as “the South American Missionary Society,” and stations were established at Keppel Island (one of the Falkland Isles), Patagones, Lota, Callao, and Panama, and laborers sent to those places. Laborers were also sent to the Chincha Islands. This society is now in successful operation, and hopes are entertained for good results from its fields. At first the Patagonians were reached indirectly. Natives were induced to go over to Keppel Island, and there taught. Gradually the influence of the civilized natives made its way, until now a station is maintained on Navarin Island. The missionaries minister not only to the Patagonians, but also to the European Protestants and the Roman Catholics. See Grundemann, Missions-Atlas, No. 9, pt. 4; Brown, Hist. of Missions, 3:458 sq.; Missionary World, p. 115 sq.; Wappaeus, Patagonia, geographisch u. statistisch (Leips. 1871, 4to); Littell, Living Age, June 19, 1852, art. 4.

## Patala[[@Headword:Patala]]

             (from pat, “fall”), is, in Hindû mythology, the name of those inferior regions which have seven, or, according to some, eight divisions, each extending downwards ten thousand yojanas, or miles. The soil of these regions, as the Vishnu-Purana relates, is severally white, black, purple, yellow, sandy, stony, and of gold; they are embellished with magnificent palaces, in which dwell numerous Danavas, Daityas, Yakshas, and great snake-gods, decorated with brilliant jewels, and happy in the enjoyment of delicious viands and strong wines. There are in these regions beautiful groves and streams and lakes, where the lotus blows, and the skies are resonant with the kokila's songs. They are, in short, so delightful that the saint Narada, after his return from them to heaven, declared among the celestials that Patala was much more delightful than Indra's heaven. Prof. Wilson, in his Vishu-Purdna, says “that there is no very copious description of Patala in any of the Puranas; that the most circumstantial are those of the Vaiyu and Bhagavata Puranas; and that the Mahabharata and these two Paranas assign different divisions to the Danavas, Daityas, and Nagas.... The regions of the Patala and their inhabitants are oftener the  subjects of profane than of sacred fiction, in consequence of the frequent intercourse between mortal heroes and the serpent-maids. A considerable section of the Vrilhlt-Kathua consists of adventures and events in this subterraineous world.” For inferior regions of a different description, SEE NARAKA.

## Patanjali[[@Headword:Patanjali]]

             is the name of two celebrated authors of ancient India, who are generally looked upon as the same personage, but apparently for no other reason than that they bear the same name. The one is the author of the system of philosophy called Yoga (q.v.), the other the great critic of Katyayana (q.v.) and Panini (q.v.). Of the former, nothing is known beyond his work-for which see the article YOGA SEE YOGA . The few historical facts relating to the latter, as at present ascertained, may be gathered from his great work, the Mahabhdshya, or “the great commentary.” The name of his mother was Gonik; his birthplace was Gonarda, situated in the east of India, and he resided temporarily in Cashmere; where his work was especially patronized. From circumstantial evidence, Prof. Goldsticker has, moreover, proved that he wrote between B.C. 140 and 120 (Panini, his Place in Sanscrit Literature, p. 235 sq.). The Mabhbhashya of Patanjali is not a full commentary on Panini, but, with a few exceptions, only a commentary on the Vartikas, or critical remarks of Katyayana on Panini. “Its method is analogous to that of other classical commentaries: it establishes, usually by repetition, the correct reading of the text, in explaining every important or doubtful word, in showing the connection of the principal parts of the sentence, and in adding such observations as may be required for a better understanding of the author. But frequently Patanjali also attaches his own critical remarks to the emendations of Katyayana, often in support of the views of the latter, but not seldom, too, in order to refute his criticisms, and to defend Panini; while again, at other times, he completes the statement of one of them by his own additional rules.” Patanjali being the third of the grammatical triad of India, SEE PANINI, and his work, therefore, having the advantage of profiting by the scholarship of his predecessors, he is looked upon as a paramount authority in all matters relating to classical Sanscrit grammar; and very justly so, for, as to learning, ingenuity, and conscientiousness, there is no grammatical author of India who can be held superior to him. The Mahabhashya has been commented upon by Kaiyyata, in a work called the Bhashya-Pradipa; and the latter has been annotated by Nagojibhatta, in a work called the  Bhashya-Pradipodyota. So much of these three latter works as relates to the first chapter of the first book of Panini, together with the Vartikas connected with them, has been edited at Mirzapore (1856) by the late. Dr. J. R. Ballantyne, who also gave a valuable literal translation of the first forty pages of the text.

## Patara[[@Headword:Patara]]

             (Πάταρα, neut. plur.), a considerable town of Lycia, in Asia Minor, opposite the island of Rhodes. Patara was a very ancient city, and is said to have been founded by Patarus (Strabo, 14:3, p. 665), a son of Apollo (Steph. Byz. s.v.). It was already celebrated in the time of Herodotus for a temple and oracle of this deity (1:182), who is called by Horace on this account Patareus (lib. 3, ode 4:1. 64), and the coins of Patara bear the representation of his temple. In fact, the worship of this divinity prevailed in Lycia to an extent nearly equal to that of Diana in the neighboring province of Lydia. It appears to have been colonized by the Dorians. Strabo tells us that Ptolemy Philadelphus repaired it, and called it the Lycian Arsinoi, but its old name was retained (l.c.). Patara was situated on the south-western shore of Lycia, not far from the left bank of the river Xanthus. The coast here is very mountainous and bold. Patara was practically the seaport of the city of Xanthus, which was ten miles distant (Appian, B.C. 4:81). Its inhabitants availed themselves. of the great commercial advantages of their situation, and carried on an extensive trade with Egypt, Syria, and Cyprus. The river Xanthus was navigable beyond the city of that name for vessels of large tonnage, and the whole valley was thickly peopled by a cultivated and luxurious race. The beauty of the scenery, the fertility of the soil, and the healthiness of the climate, all tended to make the valley of the Xanthus a favorite residence, and the magnificent ideas and taste of its inhabitants are proved by the extensive remains of antiquity found along the whole course of the river. Patara derived great benefit from the independence of the country of which it was the chief seaport, and it was not reduced to the ordinary condition of a Roman province till the reign of the emperor Claudius. The coast of Lycia about this city is rocky and picturesque, and the rugged spurs of the Taurian chain terminate here in the abrupt promontories of Cragus and  Anticragus, the one on the east and the other on the west of the river Xanthus. Patara preserved its importance as a seaport through all the revolutions which affected Lycia. It furnished a considerable fleet in that memorable war waged against the Greeks by Persia, of which empire Lycia formed a part. In later and more anarchical times its inhabitants addicted themselves to piracy, and acquired an unenviable reputation by their depredations. These notices of its position and maritime importance introduce us to the single mention of the place in the Bible (Act 21:1-2). Paul was on his way to Jerusalem at the close of his third missionary journey. He had just come from Rhodes (Act 21:1); and at Patara hefound a ship, Which was on the point of going to Phoenicia (Act 21:2), and in which he completed his voyage (Act 21:3). This illustrates the mercantile connection of Patara with both the eastern and western parts of the Levant. A good parallel to the apostle's voyage is to be found in Livy (Livy 37:16). The commercial dealings of Lycia and Phaenicia made it extremely probable that Patara would be the place from whence such a passage could be made with the most certainty, and from hence the apostle sailed to Tyre. At the time of Paul's visit it must have been a splendid as well as an influential and populous city. Some of its ruins are of great extent and beauty; and Livy, speaking of Lycia, calls Patara “caput gentis” (37:15; comp. Pomp. Mela, 1:15; Polyb. 22:26). In sailing from Rhodes to Patara, Paul had before him some of the grandest scenery in the East. Crossing the channel from the little harbor of Rhodes, the vessel would skirt for a time the bold coast, and then, passing a noble headland, it would open up the rich valley of the Xanthus, and the little plain at its mouth, which extends some eight miles along the shore, and six or seven inland. Near the eastern extremity of this plain stood Patara, close upon the beach, separated from the river Xanthus by a broad belt of loose sand, which the wind and waves have drifted up into bare mounds and hills. The site of the city is now a desert; many of its principal buildings are almost covered with sand; and its harbor, into which Paul sailed, is now a dismal, pestilential marsh. The walls of Patara can still be traced. The triple arch of one of its gates is standing; so also are the remains of a theater scooped out in the side of a hill (Leake, Asia Minor, p. 320); of baths near the sea; of an old castle commanding the harbor; and. of temples, altars, columns, and houses, now ruined and mutilated. A Greek inscription over the great city gateway mentions, “Patara the metropolis of the Lycians” (Fellows, Lycia, p. 222 sq.; Beaufort, Karmania, p. 2 sq.; Spratt and Forbes, Travels in Lycia, i, p. 30 sq.; 2:189). The desolate ruins now bear the same name. Paul did not remain  long at Patara; he probably left a few hours after his arrival; yet Christianity obtained a footing in the city, and it subsequently became the seat of a bishop, and was represented in the Council of Nice (Hierocl. p. 684). See in addition to the works above cited, Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 2:226; Lewin, St. Paul, 2:99; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v. SEE LYCIA.

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

             SEE ALMS-BOWL.

## Patarenes Or Patareni[[@Headword:Patarenes Or Patareni]]

             a name used in Italy during the 12th and 13th centuries as a general appellation to denote sects contending against the dominant Church and clergy. Different opinions have been entertained in regard to the origin of the name, some believing that it is derived from a certain place called Patara, where the heretics, as they were considered, held their meetings. The word Pataria (q.v.), however, in the dialect of Milan, signified a popular faction; and as the sects in question were generally held in favor with the common people, it must be that the name was applied in derision by the aristocracy. It may also have been used because, after the contest between the Pataria at Milan and the clergy, the term implied in general a spirit of hostility to the priesthood. The name of Tisserands originated from the circumstance that many of their adherents were weavers by trade. The common characteristic of all these sects was opposition to the clergy ‘and the hierarchy. They differed in the extent to which, and the grounds on which, they opposed the prevailing ecclesiasticism and attempted to set up a Church of their own. The Patareni should be especially recognized as the Italian Manichaeans, who were condemned by the Lateran Council of A.D. 1179. As in the East, so in the West, Gnostic speculations had in all probability continued to exist, though by secret tradition. In point of fact, we know that the Vandals had transported shiploads of Manichaeans to the shores of Italy, while the Priscillianists openly avowed their tenets in Spain as late as the 7th century. Probably, however, the movement issued again from the East, in all likelihood from Bulgaria, where, since the time when the Paulicians had settled in that district, Gnostic and Manichaean views were widely entertained and zealously propagated. Even the names of these sects prove the correctness of this assertion. The most general designation was that of Cathari (καθαροί); but they were also called Bulgari (whence,  in popular parlance, the opprobrious name Bougre) or Gazari, perhaps after the inhabitants of the Crimea (the Chazars), or else a different mode of pronouncing the word καθαροί, and Publicani, probably a transposition by which the foreign term of Paulicians was converted into a well-known term of reproach. The Duchobortzi (q.v.) of Russia are by Krasinski conjecturally referred to the Patarenes, who existed in Russia also to the middle of the 18th century. See Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 2:33; Neander, Ch. Hist. vol. 5; Hardouin, Concilia, 7:163; Hardwick, Church Hist. of the Middle Ages, p. 204, 305.

## Patareus[[@Headword:Patareus]]

             a surname of Apollo, derived from the town of Patara, in Lycia, where he had an oracle.

## Pataria Of Milan[[@Headword:Pataria Of Milan]]

             Among the Lombard clergy simony, concubinage, and marriage of priests were very common. Accordingly the changes introduced by Hildebrand met with most strenuous resistance from them. The opposition was headed by archbishop Guido of Milan, whom Henry III had, in 1046, appointed to that diocese. Guido was supported by the nobility and clergy. But two deacons, Ariald and Landulf Cotta, organized a conspiracy among the common people, which their opponents, by way of derision, designated pataria, paterini (i.e. blackguards). The papal party adopted this name, and began a warfare against married priests, which for thirty years led to continual scenes of violence and bloodshed. See Giesebrecht, Deutsche Gesch. vol. 3, pt. i; Hefele, Conciliengesch. vol. 4 and 5; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy; Alzog (Romans Cath.), Kirchengesch. Baxmann, Gesch. der Politik der Papste, vol. 2.

## Patch[[@Headword:Patch]]

             (ἐπίβλημα,- something put on, piece,” Mat 9:16; Mar 2:21; Luk 5:36), taken (torn off from ῥήγνυμι) from a fragment or remnant (ῥάκος, literally rag, “cloth'“) of new material, to mend a rent in a garment. SEE SEW.

## Patella[[@Headword:Patella]]

             a surname of Ops (Plenty), as opening the stems of the corn-plant, that the ears might sprout out.

## Patellarii Dii[[@Headword:Patellarii Dii]]

             a name sometimes given among the ancient Romans to the Lares, because offerings were made to them in patelae, or dishes.

## Paten[[@Headword:Paten]]

             (Lat. patina, “a dish”) is the name of a small plate, or salver, used for the elements of the bread in the celebration of the Eucharist. It was so formed in ancient times as to fit the chalice (q.v.) or cup as a cover, and was invented by pope Zephyrinus. While the practice of the Offertory (q.v.) continued, there was a special paten for the bread-offering. In the Roman Catholic Church, in which the unleavened wafer-bread is used, and the communion is distributed from a distinct vessel called Pyx (q.v.), the paten is a small circular plate, always of the same material with the chalice. It is most commonly made of gold or silver, and is often richly chased or carved, and studded with precious stones. In some places the deacon, after the Lord's Prayer, having received the paten from the subdeacon, lifts it up so as to be seen by the people, in order to notify the congregation that the communion is about to commence. In the Greek Church it stands on the left of the chalice. Besides the altar-patens, there were

(1) ministerial, of larger size, for containing the bread given to the people;

(2) chrismal, hollow in shape, and used for containing chrism for baptismal confirmation;

(3) ornamental, with carvings and symbolical images, set on altars as decorations.

The word is retained in the Prayerbook of the English Episcopal Church, the (American) Protestant Episcopal Church, and the Reformed Episcopal Church. The Lutherans also retain the name.

## Pater-Noster[[@Headword:Pater-Noster]]

             (Lat. for Our Father), the name among the Romanists for the LORDS PRAYER SEE LORDS PRAYER (q.v.). It is claimed by many Protestants that this prayer was not intended by Christ as a formula of Christian prayer, because it contains no allusion to his atonement, nor recognizes the offices of the Holy Ghost. It has nevertheless been generally adopted by the Protestant churches in worship on account of its beauty and terseness, and because Christ gave it in illustration of the simplicity of Christian prayer. But Protestants condemn the too general use made of it by the Romanists. Since the 13th century they have used it in the opening of divine service, and by the Council of Trent a catechism was published which contains a detailed exposition and commentary of it; and in all the services not only of the Roman Missal, Breviary, Ritual, Processional, and Ordinal, but in all the occasional services prescribed from time to time, it is invariably introduced. In the Rosary (q.v.) of the Virgin Mary it is combined with the Hail Mary, the prayer addressed to the Virgin (whence the larger beads of the “Rosary” are sometimes called Pater-Nosters), and perhaps the most usual of all the formal shorter devotions among Roman Catholics is the recitation a stated number of times of the “Pater,” with one or more Ave Marias,” generally concluding with the Doxology. The Roman Catholics do not use the concluding form of this prayer as commonly used by Protestants, “For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.”

## Paterini[[@Headword:Paterini]]

             SEE PATARENES.

## Paterniani[[@Headword:Paterniani]]

             is the name of Manichaean heretics mentioned by St. Augustine and Preedestinatus as believing that the upper and intellectual part of the body was created by God, and the lower or sensual part by the evil one. They were also called Venustians (from Venus, the heathen goddess, who patronized unchastity), and were condemned for their immorality as well as their heresy by Damasus in a council held at Rome in A.D. 367. See Augustine, Haeres. 85; Praedegt. Haeres. 75; Labbe, Concilia, 2:1038.

## Paternus St[[@Headword:Paternus St]]

             (1), a French prelate of the early mediaeval period, was born about 365. He was the founder of the Church of Vannes, and was taken from the solitude in which he lived to ascend the episcopal chair, then but recently established by king Meriadec. Constrained by persecution to leave his  church, Paternus returned to his hermitage, where he died about 448. His remains were successively carried to Marmontier, Issoudun, and to the church of his own name at Vannes. He is honored by the Roman Catholic Church on April 13.

## Paternus St (2)[[@Headword:Paternus St (2)]]

             (2), flourished in the second half of the 5th century. He was consecrated, in 461, in his own church by St. Perpet, archbishop of Tours. The bishops assembled for this ceremony dressed according to the discipline of the sixteenth canon published by the Council of Vannes. Paternus died towards the close of the 5th century, after having experienced great annoyances from the people of his diocese.

## Paternus St (3)[[@Headword:Paternus St (3)]]

             (3), called also ST. PAIR, or PAER, or POIS, was born at Poitiers about the year 482. His father, Patranus, with the consent of his wife, went to Ireland, where he ended his days in holy solitude. Paternus, fired by this pious example, early embraced a monastic life in the abbey of Ansion, called in succeeding ages Marnes, and at present, after the name of a holy abbot of that house, St. Jovin des Marnes, in the diocese of Poitiers. After some time, burning with a desire to extend the monastic influence, he passed over to Wales, and in Cardiganshire founded a convent called Llan- patern-vaur. He made a visit to his father in Ireland, but was soon recalled to the monastery. Shortly afterwards he retired with St. Scubilion, and embraced an austere anchoretical life in the forest of Sciey, in the diocese of Coutances, near the sea. This desert, which was then of great extent but has since been gradually gained upon by the sea, was anciently a favorite resort of the Druids. St. Paternus converted to the faith the idolaters of that and many neighboring parts, as far as Bayeux, and prevailed upon them to demolish a pagan temple in this desert which was held in great veneration: by the ancient Gauls. St. Senier, St. Gaud, and St. Aroastes, holy priests, were his fellow-hermits in this wilderness, and his fellow-laborers in these missions. Paternus assisted in 557 at the third Council of Paris. He was consecrated bishop of Avranches by Germanus, bishop of Rouen. The Church of Avranches prospered greatly under his administration, and became noted. Paternus occupied the episcopal chair of Avranches for thirteen years, and died April 16, 565, on the same day with St. Scubilion.. Both were buried at the same place, in the oratory of Sciey, now the parish  church of St. Pair, a village much frequented by pilgrims, near Granville, on the sea-coast. Paternus is titular saint of a great number of churches in those parts of France. He is commemorated by the Roman Catholic Church on April 16. See Gallia Christiana, vol. 11; Abbe Tresvau, L'Eglise de Bretgne; Bolland, Acta Sanctorum, April 15 and 16; Butler, Lives of the Fathers, Martyrs, and Saints, April 16.

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

             a Scotch Baptist minister, was born at Dumbarton, on the Clyde, in 1801. His early education was obtained at the burgh school of his native town; and he began life as a school-teacher. He entered the University of Glasgow with the idea of becoming a physician, but never took his degree. During his course there he labored as an evangelist with the Glasgow City Mission. He was invited by Dr. Marshman to become a missionary to Serampore, but declined the invitation. In 1829 he hired a small room in Glasgow, fitted it up with forms, and began preaching to a congregation of  very poor persons. Here a Church was organized, and removals were made from time to time to better quarters. In 1850 he undertook the editorship of the Scottish Temperance Review, and subsequently of the Scottish Review. He was one of the originators (in 1846) of the Glasgow Commercial College, and long one of the instructors. He died January 29, 1880. See (Lond.) Bapt. Hand-book, 1881, page 334.

## Paterson, John (1)[[@Headword:Paterson, John (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first minister at Foveran, and next at Aberdeen. He was advanced to the see of Ross, January 18, 1662, where he remained until his death in 1679. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 203.

## Paterson, John (2)[[@Headword:Paterson, John (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first minister at Ellon, Abeirdeenshire, and afterwards at the Tron Church, and dean of the city of Edinburgh. He was preferred by the interest of the duke of Lauderdale to the see of Galloway, October 23, 1674, where he continued until March 29, 1679, when he was translated to Edinburgh. In 1687 he was put into the see of Glasgow, where he continued until the revolution in 1688. He died at. Edinburgh, December 8, 1708. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, pages 64, 270, 282.

## Path[[@Headword:Path]]

             the general course of any moving body. So we say the path of the sun in the heavens; and to this the wise man compares the path of the just, which is, he says, like daybreak; it increases in light and splendor till perfect day. It may be obscure, feeble, dim, at first, but afterwards it shines in full brilliancy (Pro 4:18). The course of a man's conduct and general behavior is called the path in which he walks, by a very easy metaphor; and as when a man walks from place to place in the dark, he may be glad of a light to assist in directing his steps, so the Word of God is a light to guide those in their course of piety and duty who otherwise might wander or be at a loss for direction. Wicked men and wicked women are said to have paths full of snares. The dispensations of God are his paths (Psa 25:10). The precepts of God are paths (Psa 17:5; Psa 65:4). The phenomena of nature are paths of God (Psa 77:19; Isa 43:16), and to those depths which are beyond human inspection the course of God in his providence is likened. If his paths are obscure in nature, so they may be in providence, and in grace too. SEE CAUSEWAY.

## Pathaeus[[@Headword:Pathaeus]]

             (Παθαῖος ᾷ.ρ. Φαθαῖος), a Graecized form (1Es 9:23) of PETHAHIAH SEE PETHAHIAH (q.v.) the Levite (Ezr 10:23).

## Pathros[[@Headword:Pathros]]

             [some Pathros] (Heb. Pathros, פִּתְרוֹס, prob. Egyptian [see below]; Sept. Παθούρης, but in Ezekiel Φαθωρῆς, in Isa 11:11, Βαβυλωνία; Vulg. Phetros, Phatures, Phathures), a district of Egypt, mentioned by the prophets Jeremiah (Jer 44:1; Jer 44:15) and Ezekiel (Eze 29:14; Eze 30:14), is supposed to be the same as was afterwards called by the Greeks Thebais, and is now known as Sais, or Upper Egypt. It gave its name to Pathrusim, descendants of lizraim, who peopled it (Gen 10:14). From Pathros it is said God would recall the Jews to their own land  (Isa 11:11), the expression here denoting the whole of Egypt (see Jour. Sac. Lit., Oct. 1851, p. 161). The following account of the country combines the Scriptural and the tprofane notices.

That Pathros was in Egypt admits of no question: we have to attempt to decide its position more nearly. In the list of the Mizraites, the Pathrusim occur after the Naphtuhim, and before the Casluhim; the latter being followed by the notice of the Philistines, and by the Caphtorim (Gen 10:13-14; 1Ch 1:12) . Isaiah prophesies the return of the Jews “from Mizraim, and from Pathros, and from Cush” (Isa 11:11). Jeremiah predicts the ruin of “all the Jews which dwell in the land of Egypt, which dwell at Migdol, and at Tahpanhes, and at Noph, and in the country of Pathros” (Jer 44:1), and their reply is given, after this introduction, “Then all the men which knew that their wives had burned incense unto other gods, and all the women that stood by, a great multitude, even all the people that dwelt in the land of Egypt, in Pathros, answered Jeremiah” (Jer 44:15). — Ezekiel speaks of the return of the captive Egyptians to “the land of Pathros, into the land of their habitation” (Eze 29:14), and mentions it with Egyptian cities, Noph preceding it, and Zoan, No, Sin, Noph again, Aven (On), Pi-beseth, and Tehaphnehes following it (Eze 30:13-18). From the place -f the Pathrusim in the list of the Mizraites, they might be supposed to have settled in Lower Egypt, or the more northern part of Upper Egypt. Four only of the Mizraitish tribes or peoples can probably be assigned to Egypt, the last four, the Philistines being considered not to be one of these, but merely a colony: these are the Naphtuhim, Pathrusim, Casluhim, and Caphtorim.

The first were either settled in Lower Egypt or just beyond its western border; and the last in Upper Egypt, about Coptos. It seems, if the order be geographical, as there is reason to suppose, that it is to be inferred that the Pathrusim were seated in Lower Egypt, or not much above it, unless there be a transposition; but that some change has been; made is probable from the parenthetic notice of the Philistines following the Casluhim, whereas it appears from other passages that it' should rather follow the Caphtorim. If the original order were Pathrusim, Caphtorim, Casiuhim, then the first might have settled in the highest part of Upper Egypt, and the other two below them. The mention .in Isaiah ‘would lead us to suppose that Pathros was Upper Egypt, if there were any sound reason for the ideas that Mizraim or Mazor is ever used for Lower Egypt, which we think there is not. Rodiger's conjecture that Pathros included  part of Nubiais too daring to be followed (Encyclop. Germ. § 3, vol. 13, p. 312), although there is some slender support for it. The occurrences in Jeremiah seem to favor the idea that Pathros was part of Lower Egypt, or the whole of that region; for although it is mentioned in the prophecy against the Jews as a region where they dwelt after Migdol, Tahpanhes, and Noph, as if to the south, yet we are told that the prophet was answered by the Jews “that dwelt in the land of Egypt, in Pathros,” as if Pathros were the region in which these cities were. We have, moreover, no distinct evidence that Jeremiah ever went into Upper Egypt. On the other hand, it may be replied that the cities mentioned are so far apart that either the prophet must have preached to the Jews in them in succession, or else have addressed letters or messages to them (comp. Ezekiel 29). The notice by Ezekiel of Pathros as the land of the birth of the Egyptians seems to favor the idea that it was part or all of Upper Egypt, as the Thebais was probably inhabited before the rest of the country (comp. Herodot. 2:15); an opinion supported by the tradition that the people of Egypt, came from Ethiopia, and by the first dynasty's being of Thinite kings.

Pathros has been connected with the Pathyritic name, the Phaturite of Pliny (Hist. Nat. 9:47), in which Thebes was situated. The first form occurs in a Greek papyrus written in Egypt (Παθυρίτης τῆς θηβαϊvδος, Papyr. Anast. vid. Reuvens, Lettres M. Letronne, 3 let. p. 4, 30, ap. Parthey, Vocab. s.v.). This identification may be as old as the Sept.; and the Coptic version, which reads Papithoures, Papiptoures, does not contradict it. The discovery of the Egyptian name of the town after which the nome was called puts the inquiry on a safer basis. It is written HA-HAT-HER, “The Abode of Hat-her,” the Egyptian Venus. It may perhaps have sometimes been written P-HA-HAT-HER, in which case the P-H and T-H would have coalesced in the Hebrew form, as did T-H in Caphtor. SEE CAPHTOR. Such etymologies for the word Pathros as P-et-res, “that which is southern,” and for the form in the Sept. Patoures (Gesen. Thes. s.v.), must be abandoned.

On the evidence here brought forward, it seems reasonable to consider Pathros to be part of Upper Egypt, and to trace its name in that of the Pathyritic nome. But this is only a very conjectural identification, which future discoveries may overthrow. It is spoken of with cities in such a manner that we may suppose it was but a small district, and (if we have rightly identified it) that when it occurs Thebes is especially intended. This would account for its distinctive mention. SEE EGYPT.

## Pathrusim[[@Headword:Pathrusim]]

             (Heb. Pathrusim, פִּתְרֻסַים, plur. of Pathros; Sept. Παθρωσανιείμ; in Chron. Πατροσωνιείμ v.. r. Φαθερωείμ, Πετροσωνιείμ; Vulg. Phetrusinz), given in Gen 10:14; 1Ch 1:50, as the fifth in order of the sons (i.e. descended tribes) of Mizraim, who founded Egypt. SEE PATHROS.

## Paths, The Four[[@Headword:Paths, The Four]]

             SEE NIRVANA.

## Paticchi, Antonio[[@Headword:Paticchi, Antonio]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Rome in 1762. He acquired the elements of design from his father, and made such rapid progress that at the age of twenty he was commissioned to execute the painting in the Refectory of the Carnes at Veletri. On one of. the walls he painted The Last Supper; on another, The Virgin, surrounded by Saints; and in the vault, Elijah ascending to Heaven on a Chariot of Fire. This great work gained for Paticchi so high a reputation that count Toruzzi, of Veletri, immediately commissioned him to paint the gallery of his palace, where he represented the Car of Night, and. several fabulous subjects. He wrought with wonderful rapidity; and perceiving that his facility of execution had led him to neglect excellence of coloring, he devoted his energies partially to this branch of art. He died in 1788. Paticchi possessed a great talent for imitating the ‘designs of great masters; and he executed very many in the style of Polidoro da. Caravaggio, which, according to the Biographie Universelle, are attributed to that master by the best judges, and have a place in many fine collections.

## Patience[[@Headword:Patience]]

             is that calm and unruffled temper with which a good man bears the evils of life. We have set before us in the Scriptures the most powerful motives to excite us to the attainment of this grace:

(1) God is a God of patience (Rom 15:5).

(2) It is enjoined by the Gospel (Rom 12:12).

(3) The present state of man renders the practice of it absolutely necessary (Heb 10:36).

(4) Eminent examples of it are presented for our encouragement (Job 1:22; Heb 12:2).

(5) Lastly, we are to remember that all our trials.borne with patience will terminate in, triumph (Rom 2:7; Jam 5:7-8).

## Patience Of God[[@Headword:Patience Of God]]

             Thus may be considered the divine long-suffering or forbearance with sinners. The Lord is called the God of patience, not only because he is the author and object of the grace of patience, but because he is patient or long-suffering in himself, and towards his creatures. It is not, however, to be considered as a quality, accident, passion, or affection in God, as in creatures, but belongs to the very nature and essence of God, and springs from his goodness and mercy (Rom 2:4). It is said to be exercised towards his chosen people (Isa 30:18; Rom 3:25; 2Pe 3:9). The end of his forbearance to the wicked is that they may be without excuse, to make his power and goodness visible (Gen 18:32; 2Pe 3:9). His patience is manifested by giving warnings of judgments before he executes them (Hos 6:5; Amo 1:1; 2Pe 2:5); in long delaying his judgments (Ecc 8:11); in often mixing mercy with them. There are many instances of this patience recorded in the Scriptures, as with the old world (Gen 6:3); the inhabitants of Sodom (Genesis 18); with Pharaoh (Exodus 5); with the people of Israel in the wilderness (Act 13:18); with the Gentile world (Act 17:30); with fruitless professors (Luk 13:6; Luk 13:9); with Antichrist (Rev 2:21).

## Patmos[[@Headword:Patmos]]

             (Πάτμος, etymology unknown), a rocky and bare island in that part of the AEgean called the Icarian Sea, about twenty miles south of Samos, and about twenty-four west of the coast of Asia Minor, near Miletus, reckoned as one of the Sporades (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 4:23; Strabo, 10:480). On account of its isolation the island was used, under- the Roman empire, as a place of banishment, which accounts for the exile of the apostle John thither “for  the testimony of Jesus” (Rev 1:9). SEE JOHN. He was here favored with those visions which are contained in the Apocalypse, and to which the place owes its scriptural interest. We may add that Patmos must have been conspicuous on the right when St. Paul was sailing (Act 20:15; Act 21:1) from Samos to Cos.

The island is about twenty-five miles in circumference, has a deeply indented sea-line, and possesses one of the best harbors in the archipelago; lat. 37° 17' N., long. 26° 35' E. On the north-eastern side of the island was a town of the same name with the harbor, and the southernmost point formed the promontory Amazoniun. It is deficient in trees, but abounds in flowering plants and shrubs. Walnuts and other fruit-trees are grown in the orchards; and the wine of Patmos is the strongest and best flavored of any in the Greek islands. Maize and barley are cultivated, but not in a quantity sufficient: for. the use of the. inhabitants, and for the supply of their own vessels and others which often put in at the great harbor for provisions. On the ridge of a hill overlooking the harbor of La Scala stand the ruins of the ancient acropolis, and round its base lies the town, which contains more than half the population of the island. Its inhabitants are about six hundred in number, and between three and four hundred are scattered about the island besides. They subsist by fishing and the poor harvest their fields afford them. They wander away in the autumn months to richer soils, and work as agricultural laborers; or carry on a small commerce, leaving their homes to the care of the women; but this migration has diminished of late years. The educational state of the island is anomalous; the inhabitants are, as they ever have been, ignorant and superstitious, although quiet and peaceable; but the monastery in which Sonnini found eighty monks, only three of whom could read, has now a staff of teachers, who afford their pupils a course of instruction comprising classic Greek, Italian, general literature, and logic. They have a considerable class from the neighboring islands, and even a few from the mainland. Patnpos has been in one respect singularly favored. The Turks have never visited it, none dwell on the island; and the moderate tribute which they exact has been punctually paid, and sent by the islanders themselves to Smyrna. No mosque has ever been erected on the spot rendered sacred by the vision of the Apocalypse. Slavery has been unknown, piracy has never been practiced, and the orderly life of the inhabitants has rendered unnecessary the interference of any other police than that which they supply themselves: their poverty has  stood them in good stead. The air of Patmos is pure and wholesome; and the plague, so fatal in the islands round about, has never been known there.

The aspect of the island is peculiarly rugged and bare. Such a scene of banishment for St. John in the reign of Domitian is quite in harmony with what we read of the custom of the period. It was the common practice to send exiles to the most rocky and desolate islands (“in asperrimas insularum”). See Sueton. Titus 8; Juven. Sat. 1:73. Such a scene, too, was suitable (if we may presume to say so) to the sublime and awful revelation which the apostle received there. It is possible indeed that there was more greenness in Patmos formerly than now. Its name in the Middle Ages was Palmosa. But this has now almost entirely given place to the old classical name in the form Patmo; and there is just one palm tree in the island, in a valley which is called “the Saint's Garden” (ὁ κῆπος τοῦ ῾Οσίου). Here and there are a few poor olives, about a score of cypresses, and other trees in the same scanty proportion.

Patmos is divided into two nearly equal parts, a northern and a southern, by a very narrow isthmus, where, on the east side, are the harbor and the town, On the hill to the south, crowning a commanding height, is the celebrated monastery which bears the name of “John the Divine.” It was built by Alexius Comnenus, and in the library are a great many printed books. There were in it formerly also 600 MSS.; there are now 240. Two ought to be mentioned here, which profess to furnish, under the title of αἱ περίοδοι τοῦ θεολόγου, an account of St. John after the ascension of our Lord. One of them is attributed to Prochorus, an alleged disciple of St. John; the other is an abridgment of the same by Nicetas, archbishop of Thessalonica. Various places in the island are incorporated in the legend, and this is one of its chief points of interest. There is a published Latin translation in the Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum (1677, tom. 2), but with curious modifications, one great object of which is to disengage St. John's martyrdom from Ephesus (where the legend places it), and to fix it in Rome. Half-way up the ascent of the mountain on which the monastery stands is the cave or grotto where tradition says that St. John received the revelation, and which is still called τὸ σπήλαιον τῆς Α᾿ποκαλύψεως. A view of it (said to be not very accurate) will be found in Choiseul-Gouffier (1, pl. 57). In and around it is a small church, connected with which is a school or college, where the ancient Greek literature is said to be well taught and understood.  Among the older travelers who have visited Patmos we may especially mention Tournefort and Pococke, and later Dr. Clarke and Prof. Carlisle. See also Turner, Journal of a Tour, 3:98-101; Schubert, Reise ins Morgenland, 1:424-434; Walpole, Turkey, 2:43; and Stanley, Sermons in the East, p. 225. Ross visited it in 1841, and describes it at length (Reisen auf den griechischen Inseln des agaischen Meeres, 2:123-139). Guerin, some years later, spent a month there, and enters into more detail, especially as regards ecclesiastical antiquities and traditions (Description de I'le de Patmos et de l' Ile de Samos [Paris, 1856], p, 1-120).

## Paton, James[[@Headword:Paton, James]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected bishop of Dunkeld in February, 1571. He was deprived in 1575, and died July 20, l596. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 96.

## Patornay, Leonard[[@Headword:Patornay, Leonard]]

             a French Jesuit, was born in Salins in 1569. He joined the Jesuits at the age of seventeen, and for several years taught theology and the Holy Scriptures in different houses of his order. A skillful controvertist, he opposed the Lutheran heresy, and cardinal Richelieu, who esteemed his talent, several times employed him to reply to the ministers of the Reformed doctrine. Patornay died at Besancon in 1639. He published, under a fictitious name, Declarationes aliquce multorum deductorum ad Ecclesice casira. See Backer, Biblioth. des Ecriv. de la Comp. de Jesus, s.v.

## Patornay, Philippe[[@Headword:Patornay, Philippe]]

             a French prelate, was born at Salins in 1593. He joined the Order of Minims in 1611, and, after having taught philosophy and theology, devoted himself to preaching. His success in the pulpit caused him to be chosen by Ferdinand de Rye, archbishop of Besanaon, for one of his suffragans, who consecrated him in 1632, under the title of Bishop of Nicopolis. He continued the same duties under the archbishops Francis de Rye and Claude d'Achery. He died at Besancon Aug. 1, 1639. This prelate, versed in ancient languages. only published some Theses upon theology, and left in manuscript several Sermons and an Abrige des Controverses of cardinal Bellarmine. See Dunod, Hist. de ‘Eglise de Besancon.

## Patouillet, Louis[[@Headword:Patouillet, Louis]]

             a French Jesuit, was born at Dijon, March 31, 1699. His studies were finished in the College of Dijon, where he had father Oudin among his teachers. He was admitted into the Order of the Jesuits, taught philosophy at Laon, and devoted himself at the same time to preaching. After several years, being recalled to Paris, he retired to the monastery, and took an  active part in the religious quarrels of the time. From 1734 to 1748 he was one of the principal editors of the Supplement aux Nouvelles ecclesiastiques, which the Jesuits opposed to the publication of the Gazette Janseniste. The most of the articles written by him upon the refusal of the sacraments or for the defense of his order appeared anonymously, and it is difficult to distinguish exactly those that belong to him. The ardor with which he espoused the cause of M. de Beaumont against the parliaments drew upon himself, in 1756, the order to leave Paris. He lived some time with M. de la Mothe, bishop of Amiens, then with M. Banyn, bishop of Usez, both strongly attached to his society, and finally retired to Avignon. Patouillet was, as well as father Nounotte, a butt to the continual sarcasms of Voltaire, which he had provoked by the unskillfulness and virulence of his attacks against the philosophers. He died at Avignon in 1779. We have of his works, Poesies sur le mariage du Roi (1725):Cartouche, ou le sceleratjustifie par la grace du P. Quesnel (La Haye, 1731, 8vo): — Vie de Pelage (1551, 12mo): — Dictionnaire des livres Jansenistes (by P. de Colonia), a new and enlarged edition (Antwerp, 1752, 4 vols. 12mo); this work, in which the accusation of Jansenism is carried to excess, was forbidden at Rome in 1754; father Rule has given a refutation of it: — La progres du Jansenisme (Quilva, 1753,. 12mo): — Histoire du Pelagianisme (Avignon, 1763 or 1767, 2 vols. 12mo), dedicated to pope Clement XIII. This Jesuit, charged with continuing the collection of Lettres edifiantes after the death of father Halde, published vols. 23, 24, 27, and 28; vol. 31, which he had prepared, was published by father Marchal.

Two brothers of the same name, natives of Salins, and also Jesuits, have distinguished themselves in the pulpit. The older, NICOLAS PATOUILLET, born in 1622, was for a long time superior of the French mission to London, and died at Besangon Nov. 1, 1710. He has left Sentiments d'une ame pour se recueillir a Dieu (1700, 12mo). The younger, ETIENNE PATOUILLET, was born in 1634, and became abbe of Acey (diocese of Besanion). See Lettres edifiantes, tom. vi (ed. Du J. Quesbeuf); Feller, Dict. Hist.; De Backer freres, Bibl. des Ecsriv. de la Coup. de Jesus.

## Patres[[@Headword:Patres]]

             (Lat. for fathers) is a transfer of the Oriental idiom by which every teacher or governor is respectfully entitled abba, father. The officers of the early Church were termed Patres Ecclesiae or Patres Clericorum. Presbyters were called Patres Laicorum, and simply patres. Thus the name papa,  pope, is a term of reverence and affection, corresponding to ἀββᾶ, πάππας. This title of papa was first given to the bishop of Alexandria, and the first bishop of Rome who assumed it in any public document was Siricius, A.D. 384. It was not, however, employed officially until the time of Leo the Great; and it was afterwards applied exclusively to the bishop of Rome, according to an order of Gregory the Great. This ancient title was attributed to all bishops alike until about the 6th century. Jerome, for example, in writing to Augustine, salutes him as Domine vere sancte et beatissime (Ep. 94); and he gives the same title to other bishops. The bishop of Constantinople was anciently called urbis papa; and the bishop of Rome, in like manner, urbis papa, or Romance urbis papa, and simply papa. The title continued in general use through the 5th and 6th centuries. It was also frequently applied to the primates (q.v.) of the Christian Church in Africa; and there was a peculiar reason for giving them this name, as the primacy in the African churches was not attached, as in other places, to the civil metropolis, but went along with the oldest bishop of the province, who succeeded to this dignity by virtue of his seniority, in whatever place be lived. The only exception to this was the Church at Carthage, where the bishop was a fixed and standing metropolitan for the province of Africa, properly so called. The term patres was also applied to the fathers of the monasteries, as Jerome and Augustine called them. SEE FATHER.

## Patres Patrum[[@Headword:Patres Patrum]]

             (Lat. for Fathers of the Fathers), a designation sometimes given to bishops in the ancient Christian Church. Gregory of Nyssa was called by this name in the canons of the second Council of Nice; and others say that Theodosius, the emperor, gave Chrysostom the same title after death. SEE PATRES.

## Patres Sacrrum[[@Headword:Patres Sacrrum]]

             (i.e. Fathers of the Sacred Rites), a title given to the priests of Mithras (q.v.) among the ancient Romans under the emperors.

## Patriarch[[@Headword:Patriarch]]

             (πατριάρχης, head of a family or tribe). Paul (Eph 3:15) calls attention to the fact that the term of πατριά comes from Πατήρ, “the great Father of all the πατριαί, both of angels and men” (Ellicott); and thus, constructively, “Patriarch,” in its highest sense, is a title of him whose  offspring all men are. In common use it is applied in the N.T. to Abraham (Heb 7:4), to the sons of Jacob (Act 7:8-9), and to David (2:29); and is apparently intended to be equivalent to the phrase אָבוֹת ראֹשׁ בֵּית, the “head” or “prince of a tribe,” so often found in the O.T. It is used in this sense by the Sept. in 1Ch 24:31; 1Ch 27:22; 2Ch 23:20; 2Ch 26:12. In common usage the title of patriarch is assigned especially to those whose lives are recorded in Scripture previous to the time of Moses.

In the early history of the Hebrews we find the ancestor or father of a family retaining authority over his children, and his children's children, so long as he lived, whatever new connections they might form. When the father died the branch-families did not break off and form new communities, but usually united under another common head. The eldest son was generally invested with this dignity. His authority was paternal. He was honored as the central point of connection, and as the representative of the whole kindred. Thus each great family had its patriarch or head, and each tribe its prince, selected from the several heads of the families which it embraced.

By the “patriarchal system” is accordingly meant that state of society which developed itself naturally out of family relations, before the formation of nations properly so called, and the establishment of regular government; and by the “patriarchal dispensation” the communion into which God was pleased to enter with the families of Seth, Noah, and Abraham, before the call of the chosen people. In the following account we treat the subject from both a Scriptural and a philosophical point of view.

I. In the history of the antediluvian patriarchs, the Scripture record contains, after the first family, little except the list of the line from Seth, through Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, and Lamech, to Noah; with the ages of each at their periods of generation and at their deaths. SEE CHRONOLOGY. To some extent parallel to this is given the line of Cain: Enoch, Irad, Mehujael, Methusael, Lamech, and the sons of Lamech, Jabal, Jubal, and Tubal-Cain. To the latter line are attributed the first signs of material civilization, the building of cities, the division of classes, and the knowledge of mechanical arts; while the only moral record of their history obscurely speaks of violence and bloodshed. SEE LAMECH. In the former line the one distinction is their knowledge of the true God (with the constant recollection of the promised “seed of the  woman”), which is seen in its fullest perfection in Enoch and Noah; and the only allusion to their occupation (Gen 5:29) seems to show that they continued a pastoral and agricultural race. The entire corruption, even of the chosen family of Seth, is traced (in Gen 6:1-4) to the union between “the sons of God” and “the daughters of men” (Heb. “of Adam”). This union is generally explained by the ancient commentators of a contact with supernatural powers of evil in the persons of fallen angels; most modern interpretation refers it to intermarriage between the lines of Seth and Cain. The latter is intended to avoid the difficulties attaching to the comprehension of the former view, which, nevertheless, is undoubtedly far more accordant with the usage of the phrase “sons of God” in the O.T. (comp. Job 1:6; Job 38:7), and with the language of the passage in Genesis itself (see Maitland's Eruvin, essay 6). SEE ATEDILUVIANS.

Descending from this general view to particulars, we find Adam and Eve driven out of Paradise, and having their first child, Cain, born to them, without any more exact indication of their whereabouts in the world than may be derived from what had already been said of Paradise itself. Nor, up to the deluge, is there any landmark supplied, except that mention is made of Nod, the country of Cain's wandering, to the east of Eden (Gen 4:16). The ark itself, which had probably, from its construction, not floated very far from the country in which it was built, rested on the mountains of the region of Ararat; and when, after the flood, men arrived in the land of Shinar or Babylonia, they had journeyed from the east (Gen 11:2). If at the flood the waters of “the great deep” were those of the Persian Gulf, we might suppose the country inhabited by the patriarchs at that time to have possibly been bounded eastward by the nearest range of mountains, and to have extended to the west but little beyond the valley of the Euphrates. SEE FLOOD.

As to their numbers, we have for our guide the enumeration of ten males in one direct line from Adam, through Seth, to Noah, and of eight through Cain to Jabal. There is, of course, nothing to forbid us supposing that many other children were born besides those enumerated. This indeed is taken for granted in the case of women. The names of the wives are not mentioned, until the case of Lamech, who appears to have been the first polygamist, brings them into un-enviable notice; and Cain found a wife, though we have no notice of any woman having been born into the world (see also Gen 5:4).  One of the main questions raised as to the antediluvian period turns on the longevity assigned to the patriarchs. With the single exception of Enoch (whose departure from the earth at 365 years of age is exceptional in every sense), their ages vary from 777 (Lamech) to 969 (Methuselah). It is to be observed that this longevity disappears gradually after the flood. To Shem are assigned 600 years; and thence the ages diminish down to Terah (205 years), Abraham (175), Isaac (180), Jacob (147), and Joseph (110). This statement of ages is clear and definite. To suppose, with some, that the name of each patriarch denotes a clan or family, and his age its duration, or, with others, that the word שָׁנָה (because it properly signifies “iteration”) may, in spite of its known and invariable usage for “year,” denote a lunar revolution instead of a solar one (i.e. a month instead of a year) in this passage, appears to be a mere evasion of the difficulty. It must either be accepted as a plain statement of fact or regarded as purely fabulous, like the legendary assignment of immense ages to the early Indian, or Babylonian, or Egyptian kings. The latter alternative is adopted without scruple by many of the German commentators, some of whom attempt to find such significance in the patriarchal names as to make them personify natural powers or human qualities, like the gods and demigods of mythology. This belongs, of course, to the mythical view of Scripture, destroying its claim, in any sense, to authority and special inspiration. In the acceptance of the literal meaning, it is not easy to say how much difficulty is involved. With our scanty knowledge of what is really meant by “dying of old age,” with the certainty that very great effects are produced on the duration of life, both of men and animals, by even slight changes of habits and circumstances, it is impossible to say what might a priori be probable in this respect in the antediluvian period, or to determine under what conditions the process of continual decay and reconstruction, which sustains animal life, might be indefinitely prolonged. The constant attribution in all legends of great age to primeval men is at least as likely to be a distortion of fact as a mere invention of fancy. But even if the difficulty were greater than it is, it seems impossible to conceive that a book, given by inspiration of God to be a treasure for all ages, could be permitted to contain a statement of plain facts, given undoubtingly, and with an elaborate show of accuracy, and yet purely and gratuitously fabulous, in no sense bearing on its great religious subject. If the divine origin of Scripture be believed, its authority must be accepted in this, as in other cases; and the list of the ages of the patriarchs be held to be (what it certainly claims to be) a statement of real facts. SEE LONGEVITY.

When we endeavor to picture to ourselves the sort of life which these first patriarchs led, we seem invited to think of them as wearing at first coats of skins (Gen 3:21), and at a later time probably some woven garment (Gen 9:23), tilling the ground (Gen 4:2), keeping sheep (ibid.), building cities (Gen 4:17), and in later times handling the harp and organ, and working in brass and iron (Gen 4:21-22). But the great proof of the acquaintance of the primeval patriarchs with mechanical arts is to be found in the construction of the ark itself, which, from its enormous dimensions, must have made huge demands both upon the architect himself and the numerous workmen employed by him. SEE ARK.

As regards their spiritual condition, there is enough to prove that their knowledge of God was intimate, and their trust in God eminently real. But by the knowledge of God must not be understood such knowledge as consists in accurate theological definition. The Reformer Bullinger says: “Out of all this it is easy to understand what faith and knowledge Adam had of our Lord Christ; namely, that he knew in him very Godhead and manhood, and that he saw in faith his passion and cross afar off.” He even attributes to the “holy fathers” the teaching of the doctrine “that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one God in the most reverend Trinity.” Doubtless the first intimations of a Mediator were such as to include within them all subsequent revelation, but there is nothing to show that they were so understood by those who then received them. At the same time God did reveal himself to Adam, to Enoch, and to Noah, as well as to Abraham afterwards, and perhaps to many others. “The traditionary knowledge concerning a promised Mediator was no doubt carefully cherished, and served to enlighten much which in the law, and even in the prophets, might otherwise have been unintelligible. Hence the Mediator, though but faintly shadowed out, was yet firmly believed in. We have our Lord's assurance that Abraham rejoiced to see his day; he saw it, and was glad (Joh 8:56).

We have Paul's assurance that the same Abraham, having received the promise of the Redeemer, believed in it, and was justified by faith (Rom 4:1-20; Gal 3:9; Gal 3:14-19). And we may well suppose that the faith which guided Abraham guided others, both before and after him” (Bp. Browne, On Art. 7). Then, as to their knowledge of a future state, we have (Gen 5:24) a statement concerning Enoch which seems to show that the antediluvian patriarchs were familiar with the idea of a better life than the present. It has been argued that the very brevity and  obscurity of the phrase “God took him” prove this familiarity. His being “taken” was a reward for his piety, a still greater blessing than the long life vouchsafed to so many of his contemporaries. “Now people who knew of the translation of Enoch must have known something of that state of bliss to which he was removed” (Bp. Browne). But, besides, in the first 930 years of the world, Adam still lived, and the communion which he had enjoyed with God could by him never have been forgotten. Is it possible that Adam was not well acquainted with a future life? This communion of God with man is again noticeable in the case of Noah (Gen 6:13; Gen 7:1; Gen 8:16; Genesis 9), as with Abraham and others afterwards. In a general way the earliest patriarchs appear therefore to have lived the simple lives of a pastoral and also agricultural people, furnished with clothing, provided with houses, using herbs and grain and fruits, and probably also, by sufferance, animals for food, offering to God both of the produce of the earth and also slain beasts in sacrifice, able to distinguish the clean from the unclean, speaking one language, holding firmly to the promise of a great blessing to come, familiar with the idea of God's presence in the world, and looking for some better life when this should be ended.

II. The Patriarchs after the flood were at first, in all, but four persons, with each his wife. Noah became the second father of the human race. They were exceedingly fruitful, as God had ordained they should be. The tenth chapter of Genesis is a wonderful document, describing the vast emigrations of the families of the sons of Noah. The number of nations there enumerated is reckoned by the Hebrew expositors as seventy; from Japheth fourteen, from Ham thirty, and from Shem twenty-six. But they no longer lived to the age of their antediluvian forefathers. Abraham was 90 at the birth of Ishmael, and about 100 at the birth of Isaac; Isaac was 60 at the birth of Esau and Jacob, and died at 180; Jacob died at 147, and Joseph at 110. It will be observed that as human life was shortened, children were usually born at an earlier period in the life of their parents. A providential compensation was thus supplied, by which the human family was multiplied, and large portions of the earth occupied. The language of men was, however, no longer one. When an attempt was made to concentrate the race, instead of occupying the earth and replenishing it, the scheme was defeated by the miraculous confusion of tongues. From that time the patriarchal state was preserved, or revived in its purity, chiefly, if not wholly, in the family of Abraham, the friend of God. Nations grew up on the right hand and on the left. In Assyria there arose the kingdom of  Nimrod. “Out of that land he went forth to Asshur and builded Nineveh.” Without notice from the sacred historian the marvelous civilization of Egypt then sprang up, and the thirty pyramids themselves were probably already built when Abraham first arrived in that land. Idolatry, moreover, was fast taking the place of the primeval religion, and if the name of the true God was ever in danger of being wholly forgotten in the world, it was probably then, when Abraham was called to go forth from Ur of the Chaldees. In the book of Joshua (Jos 24:2; Jos 24:14) we read that the original fathers of the Jewish race, who dwelt beyond the Euphrates, served other gods. Such was probably the case with Terah, the father of Abraham. “If we are asked,” says professor Max Muller, “how this one Abraham passed through the denial of all other gods to the knowledge of the one God, we are content to answer that it was by a special divine revelation.” “It is true.” adds dean Stanley, “that Abraham hardly appears before us as... a teacher of any new religion. As the Scripture represents him, it is rather as if he were possessed of the truth himself than as if he had any call to proclaim it to others. His life is his creed; his migration is his mission.... His faith transpires not in any outward profession of faith, but precisely in that which far more nearly concerns him and every one of us — in his prayers, in his actions, in the righteousness, the ‘justice,'... the ‘uprightness,' the moral ‘elevation' of soul and spirit which sent him on his way straightforward, without turning to the right hand or to the left.' Indeed, Abraham must be regarded as the type, ‘the hero,' as he has been called, of the patriarchal state. He was acquainted with civilization and organized government, but in his own person and family adhered to the simple habits of a nomad life. With him and his, the father of the family was the patriarchal priest, the family itself the patriarchal Church.”
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7.Reu322072391321072391322073398.Seru302002010100301302003309.Nahor29119148796914517912530410Terah7013520570751457013520511Abraham---------Dean Stanley has remarked how exactly, when Abraham and Lot “went forth” to go into the land of Canaan, they resembled two Arabian chiefs at the present day on a journey or a pilgrimage. He notes how at this day, as so many centuries ago, “the chief wife, the princess of the tribe, is there in her own tent, to make the cakes, and prepare the usual meal of milk and butter; the slave or the child is ready to bring in the red lentile soup for the weary hunters or to kill the calf for the unexpected guest. Even the ordinary social state is the same: polygamy, slavery, the exclusiveness of family ties; the period of service for the dowry of a wife; the solemn obligations of hospitality; the temptations, easily followed, into craft or falsehood” (Lectures on Jewish Church, lect. 1, p. 12).

But if Abraham was in all outward respects like any other sheik, there was that which distinguished him, as it did Noah before him, and Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and others, after him, from all the world. This distinction consists partly in the covenant whereby these men were especially bound to God, and secondarily in the typical character of their recorded actions. Thus God made a league or covenant (q.v.) with Noah (Gen 9:8-9), and afterwards with Abram (Gen 15:8-18), when, as dean Stanley says, “the first covenant, ‘the Old Testament,' was concluded between God and man, and when there was represented by outward signs that which had its ‘highest fulfillment' in one who, far more than the Jewish people, reflected in his own ‘union of suffering and of triumph, the thick darkness of the smoking furnace, the burning and the shining light.' This league was often renewed, as with Abraham when circumcision was enjoined (17:10), and with Isaac prospectively (17:19), but with each of these as being themselves types of “another seed... and another son of promise, in whom the covenant was to be accomplished” (see dean Jackson, Creed, bk. 9, ch. 16).

From the postdiluvian periods more may be gathered as to the nature of the patriarchal history. It is at first general in its scope. The “covenant” given to Noah is one, free from all condition, and fraught with natural blessings,  extending to all alike; the one great command (against bloodshed) which marks it is based on a deep and universal ground; the fulfillment of the blessing, “Be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth,” is expressly connected, first with an attempt to set up a universal kingdom round a local center, and then (in Gen 10:1) with the formation of the various nations by conquest or settlement, and with the peopling of all the world. But the history soon narrows itself to that of a single tribe or family, and afterwards touches the general history of the ancient world and its empires, only so far as bears upon this.

Hence in this last stage the principle of the patriarchal dispensation is most clearly seen. It is based on the sacredness of family ties and paternal authority. This authority, as the only one which is natural and original, is inevitably the foundation of the earliest form of society, and is probably seen most perfectly in wandering tribes, where it is not affected by local attachments and by the acquisition of wealth. It is one, from the nature of the case, limited in its scope, depending more on its sacredness than its power, and giving room for much exercise of freedom; and, as it extends from the family to the tribe, it must become less stringent and less concentrated, in proportion to its wider diffusion. In Scripture this authority is consecrated by an ultimate reference to God, as the God of the patriarch, the Father (that is) both of him and his children. ) Not, of course, that the idea of God's Fatherhood arried with it the knowledge of man's personal communion with his nature (which is revealed by the Incarnation); it rather implied faith in his protection, and a free and loving obedience to his authority, with the hope (more or less assured) of some greater blessing from him in the coming of the promised seed. At the same time, this faith was not allowed to degenerate, as it was prone to do, into an appropriation of God, as the mere tutelary God of the tribe. The Lord, it is true, suffers himself to be called “the God of Shem, of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob;” but he also reveals himself (and that emphatically, as if it were his peculiar title) as the “God Almighty” (Gen 17:1; Gen 28:3; Gen 35:11); he is addressed as the “Judge of all the earth” (Gen 18:25), and as such is known to have intercourse with Pharaoh and Abimelech (Gen 12:17; Gen 20:3-8), to hallow the priesthood of Melchizedek (Gen 14:18-20), and to execute wrath on Sodom and Gomorrah. All this would confirm what the generality of the covenant with Noah, and of the promise of blessing to “all nations” in Abraham's seed, must have distinctly taught, that the chosen family were, not substitutes, but representatives, of all  mankind, and that God's relation to them was only a clearer and more perfect type of that in which he stood to all.

Still the distinction and preservation of the chosen family, and the maintenance of the paternal authority, are the special purposes, which give a key to the meaning of the history, and of the institutions recorded. For this the birthright (probably carrying with it the priesthood) was reserved to the first-born, belonging to him by inheritance, yet not assured to him till he received his father's blessing; for this the sanctity of marriage was jealously and even cruelly guarded, as in Gen 34:7; Gen 34:13; Gen 34:31 (Dinah), and in 38:24 (Tamar), from the license of the world without; and, all intermarriage with idolaters was considered as treason to the family and the God of Abraham (Gen 26:34-35; Gen 27:46; Gen 28:1; Gen 28:6-9). Natural obedience and affection are the earthly virtues especially brought out in the history, and the sins dwell upon (from the irreverence of Ham to the selling of Joseph), are all such as offend against these.

The type of character formed under such a dispensation is one imperfect in intellectual and spiritual' growth, because not yet tried by the subtler temptations, or forced to contemplate the deeper questions of life; but it is one remarkably simple, affectionate and free, such as would grow up under a natural authority, derived from God and centering in him, yet allowing, under its unquestioned sacredness, a familiarity and freedom of intercourse with him, which is strongly contrasted with the stern and awful character of the Mosaic dispensation. To contemplate it from a Christian point of view is like looking back on, the unconscious freedom and innocence of childhood, with that deeper insight and strength of character which are gained by the experience of manhood. We see in it the germs of the future, of the future revelation of God, and the future trials and development off man.

It is on this fact that the typical interpretation off its history depends — an interpretation sanctioned directly by the example of Paul (Gal 4:21-31; Heb 7:1-17), indirectly supported by other passages of Scripture (Mat 24:37-39; Luk 17:28-32; Rom 9:10-13, etc.), and instinctively adopted by all who have studied the history itself. By this is not meant, of course, that in themselves the patriarchs were different from other men, but that the record of their lives is so written as to exhibit this typical character in them. “The materials of the history of Genesis are so selected, methodized, and marshalled as to be like rays  converging steadily from various points to one central focus. The incidents in the lives of the patriarchs, which seem trivial when read literally, and which would never have been recorded unless they had possessed a prospective value, and unless he who guided the writer had perceived them to have that prospective value, all fall into their proper place when they are read by the light which is shed on them by the Gospel of Christ.... They are so selected as to be full of instruction” (Wordsworth, Introd. to Genesis etc. p. 34). To this may be added, from the same authority, the beautiful illustration of Augustine (comp. Faust. Manich. 22:94: “As it is in a harp, where only the strings which are struck emit the sound, and yet all things in the instrument are so fitted together as to minister to the strings which send forth the music, so in these prophetic narratives of the Pentateuch, the incidents which are selected by the prophetic spirit either send forth an articulate sound themselves, and pre-announce something that is future, or else they are there inserted in order that they may bind together the strings which produce the sounds.”

Even in the brief outline of the antediluvian period we may recognize the main features of the history of the world, the division of mankind into the two great classes, the struggle between the power of evil and good, the apparent triumph of the evil, and its destruction in the final judgment. In the postdiluvian history of the chosen family is seen the distinction of the true believers, possessors of a special covenant, special revelation, and special privileges, from the world without. In it is therefore shadowed out the history of the Jewish nation and Christian Church, as regards the freedom of their covenant, the gradual unfolding of their revelation, and the peculiar blessings and temptations which belong to their distinctive position. It is thus but natural that the unfolding of the characters of the patriarchs under this dispensation should have a typical interest. Abraham, as the type of a faith, both brave and patient, gradually and continuously growing under the education of various trials, stands contrasted with the lower character of Jacob, in whom the same faith is seen, tainted with deceit and selfishness, and needing therefore to be purged by disappointment and suffering. Isaac, in the passive gentleness and submissiveness which characterize his whole life, and is seen especially in his willingness to be sacrificed by the hand of his father, and Joseph, in the more active spirit of love, in which he rejoiced to save his family and to forgive those who had persecuted and sold him, set forth the perfect spirit  of sonship, and are seen to be types especially of him in whom alone that spirit dwelt in all fullness.

This typical character in the hands of the mythical school is, of course, made an argument against the historical reality of the whole; those who recognize a unity of principle in God's dispensations at all times will be prepared to find, even in their earliest and simplest form, the same features which are more fully developed in their later periods. SEE TYPE.

See Maier, De vivacitate patriarcharum (Kiel, 1669); Frondin, De patriarchis Hebraeorum (Greifsw. 1709); Michaelis, De actiquitatibus ocononice patriarchalis (Halle, 1728-9); Hess, Gesch. der Patriarchen (Zurich, 1785); Sommerfeld, Leben der Patriarchen (Elbing. 1841); Walch, lIist. patriarchalrum Jud. (Jena, 1752); Heidegger, Hist. Patriarcharum (Amst. 1667); Cumming, Lives and Lessons of the Patriarchs (Lond. 1865); Maurice, Platriarchs and Lawgivers of the O.T. (ibid. 1855); and the literature referred to in Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. col. 1841.

## Patriarchal Cross[[@Headword:Patriarchal Cross]]

             a cross which, like the patriarchal crosier, has its upright part crossed by two horizontal bars, the upper shorter than the lower. A patriarchal or fimbriated cross was a badge of the Knights Templars.

## Patriarchs[[@Headword:Patriarchs]]

             (Gr. πατριά, family, and ἄοχων, head or ruler) are in the Christian Church ecclesiastical dignitaries, or bishops, so called from the paternal authority which they are claimed to have exercised. In the ancient Christian Church patriarchs were next in order to metropolitans or primates. They were originally styled archbishops and exarchs, and were the bishops of certain great metropolitan sees, and though they held rank next to the metropolitans, they enjoyed a jurisdiction almost identical with that of the metropolitan in his own province. The territory over which they ruled was after their own office called a patriarchate.

The title Patriarch, which is of Eastern origin, is almost synonymous with primate (q.v.), and is by those who use it derived from Act 7:8. They claim that the apostles were so called because they were regarded by the apostolic Christians as the fathers of all other churches. Baronius and Schelstraate derive it from St. Peter only, as they do the pope's supremacy, SEE POPE, but other Romanists assert that the patriarchs took their rise a short time previous to the Council of Nice; and a third party, among whom is Balzamon and other Greek writers, maintain that they were first instituted by that council. In confutation of the last opinion, it may be stated that the evidence in favor of an earlier origin is too strong to be easily set aside; and, further, that the words of Jerome, upon which the error is founded, refer to the canonical confirmation of those rights, titles, and privileges which custom had already established, and not to the creation of any new dignities. The patriarchal sees were by the sixth canon of the Council of Nice acknowledged as of” ancient custom.” Originally the name patriarch seems to have been given commonly to bishops, or at least was certainly given in a less special sense than what it eventually bore. The date at which the title first assumed its now accepted use we think cannot be exactly determined. It is certain, however, that even as late as the time of the Council of Nice no supremacy was recognized in the patriarchs over the provincial metropolitans, and that the authority which the patriarchs have since exercised was arrogated by them at a later period. It was by degrees that the supremacy of the patriarchate rose paramount to all other ecclesiastical dignities; for we find that about the close of the 4th century the established privileges of the patriarchs included, among other things, the right of consecrating bishops, summoning district councils, appointing vicars for remote provinces, invested with their own authority, and giving a decisive judgment in those cases of appeal which came before them from other courts. In short, nothing was done without consulting them, and their decrees were executed with the same regularity and respect as those of princes. The first time we meet with the name patriarch given to any bishop by public authority of the Church is in the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451, which mentions the most holy patriarchs, particularly Leo, patriarch of great Rome. Among private authors, the first who mentions patriarchs by name is Socrates, who' wrote his history about the year 440, eleven years before the Council of Chalcedon. At first each quarter of the Christian world lad its patriarch-Europe, Rome; Asia,  Antioch; Africa, Alexandria: at a later period there were two more-those of Jerusalem, as the mother of all churches, “the apostolical see” of St. James the First, founded by the Council of Chalcedon: and Constantinople, by the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 451), as Byzantium was then another Rome and imperial city: All these were independent of one another, till Rome by encroachment, and Constantinople by law, gained a superiority over some of the rest. The subordinate patriarchs nevertheless still retained the title of exarchs of the diocese, and continued to sit and vote in councils. The contests between the patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople were among the chief causes of the Greek schism. SEE GREEK CHURCH.

After the Greek schism, and particularly after the establishment of the Latin kingdom of Jerusalem, Latin prelates were appointed with the title and rank of patriarch in the four great Eastern sees. It was hoped that the union of the churches, effected at the Council of Florence, would have put an end to the contest thus created; but that union proved transitory, and the double series of patriarchs has been continued to the present day. The Nestorian and Eutychian sections of .the Eastern churches, too, have each their own patriarch, and the head of that portion of the former which in the 16th century was reconciled with the Roman see, although known by the title of Catholicos, has the rank and authority of patriarch. SEE NESTORIANS.

Besides these, which are called the Greater Patriarchates, there have been others in the Western Church known by the name of Minor Patriarchates. Of these the most ancient were those of Aquileia and Grado. The latter was transferred to Venice in 1451; the former was suppressed by Benedict XIV. France also had a patriarch of Bourges; Spain, for her colonial missions, a patriarch of the Indies, and Portugal a patriarch of Lisbon. These titles, however, are little more than honorary. The Armenians likewise have their own patriarch at Jerusalem.

In the non-united Greek Church the ancient system of the three patriarchates of Constantinople, Antioch, and Jerusalem is nominally maintained, and the authority of the patriarchs is recognized by their own communion. But the jurisdiction-limits of the patriarch of Constantinople, who is acknowledged as the head, have been much modified. The patriarch resides at Constantinople, and is styled the thirteenth apostle. The right of election is vested in the archbishops and bishops, but the power of confirming the appointment is exercised by the sultan of Turkey who exacts twenty-five thousand crowns, and sometimes more, on the occasion  of the patriarch's installation. Besides this immense sum, the various fees of the ministers of state and other officers swell the oppressive amount so much that the patriarch is generally encumbered with heavy debts during the period of his patriarchate. Before an election, it is usual for the bishops to apply to the grand vizier for his license to proceed; he replies by summoning them to his presence, when he demands if they are fully determined to proceed with the election. Being answered in the affirmative, his consent is then given. The election over, the vizier presents the patriarch with a white horse, a black capuche, a crosier, and an embroidered caftan. A pompous and magnificent procession is then formed, consisting of the patriarch, attended by a long train of Turkish officers, the Greek clergy, and a vast concourse of people. The patriarch is received at the church door by the principal archbishops, who hold wax tapers in their hands; and the bishop of Heraclea, as chief archbishop, takes him by the hand and conducts him to his throne, and he is then invested with the insignia of his office. When the patriarch subscribes any ecclesiastical document his title is, “By the mercy of God, archbishop of Constantinople, the new Rome, and oecumenical patriarch.” The sultan retains the unmitigated power of deposition, banishment, or execution; and it is needless to add that even the paltry exaction on institution is motive sufficient for the frequent exertion of that power; and it has sometimes happened that the patriarch, on some trifling dispute, has been obliged to purchase his confirmation in office. He possesses the privilege (in name, perhaps, rather than in reality) of nominating his brother patriarchs; and, after their subsequent election by the bishops of their respective patriarchates, of confirming the election; but the barat of the sultan is still necessary to give authority both to themselves and even to every bishop whom they may eventually appoint in the execution of their office. The election of the other patriarchs, as they are farther removed from the center of oppression, is less restrained, and their deposition less frequent. But this comparative security is attended by little power or consequence; and two at least of the three are believed to number very few subjects who remain faithful to the orthodox Church.

The patriarch of Antioch has two rivals who assume the same title and dignity; the one as the head of the Syrian Jacobite Church, the other as the Maronite patriarch, or head of the Syrian Catholics. The patriarch of Alexandria, who resides generally at Cairo, has also his Coptic rival; and the few who are subject to him are chiefly found in the villages or capital of  Lower Egypt. The patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem reside usually at Constantinople, and enjoy very slender and precarious revenues. The Russo-Greek Church withdrew from the patriarchate of Constantinople partially in the 17th, and finally in the 18th century. There was then established at Moscow a metropolitan, whose name and authority was finally transformed into that of patriarch. But the emperor Peter the Great eventually abolished the titles altogether. SEE RUSSIA. Greece proper has been practically separated from the patriarchate of Constantinople since the independent establishment of the kingdom of Greece (q.v.), but its formal separation took place later.

In the Roman Catholic Church the title of patriarch is now little more than an honorary title. The dress of the five patriarchs of Rome, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, ranking next to cardinals, resembles that of cardinals except that the color is purple. In the papal chapel they wear over their soutane and rochets amices and a purple serge cappa, gathered up with a fold under the left arm, with a white ermine tippet, and when the pope officiates, plain linen mitres and copes of the color of the day. The Greek patriarchs have a lampadouchon, or lighted candlestick, carried before them. In the 12th century the right, hitherto exclusively attached to the pontificate, of having a cross borne before them was conceded to all patriarchs and metropolitans, and granted to all archbishops from the time of Gregory IX. See Bingham, Origines Eccles. bk. 2, ch. xvii, § 12, 19; Morin, De Patriarcharum origine Exerc. 3, etc.; Ziegler, Pragmat. Gesch. der kirchl. Veof. Formen, p. 164 sq.; Siegel, Christl. Alterthumer, 3:288; 4:195 sq.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 219, 228 sq.; Neale, Hist. Eastern Church (Introd.), ch. i.

## Patriarchs (The Twelve), Testament Of[[@Headword:Patriarchs (The Twelve), Testament Of]]

             SEE TESTAMENT.

## Patricians[[@Headword:Patricians]]

             a Christian sect named by all the early heresiologists as followers of Patricius, of A.D. 410-412, are charged with believing, like all Manichaean heretics in after-times, that the devil made man's body altogether; and that therefore a Christian may kill himself to become perfect through separation from his evil body (Augustine, Heres. c. 61; Praedestinatus, Haeres. c. 61). These tales, though they originated with the saints and fathers of the Church, may seem too absurd to be believed in the 19th century, and it is  even probable they were founded on hearsay; yet the recent existence of Muggletonians and Southcottians shows that nothing is too ridiculous to find credit with some people. St. Augustine also classes the Patricians with Basilides, Carpocrates, Marcion, and other precursors of the Manichees, as repudiating the Holy Scriptures (Contra Adversar. Leg. et Proph. c. 2). Nothing is known of Patricius himself beyond the bare statement of Philaster; and as the heresy of which he is said to be the founder is not mentioned by Epiphanius, Damarius thinks it probable that it arose after his time, perhaps about A.D. 380. Praedestinatus says that the Patricians sprung from the northern parts of Numidia and Mauritania. See Turner's Hist. p. 188, 189.

## Patricius[[@Headword:Patricius]]

             SEE PATRICIANS.

## Patrick[[@Headword:Patrick]]

             ST., one of the most noted of Christian saints, is distinguished as a missionary of the 5th century, and is commonly designated as the Apostle of Ireland. There is much uncertainty as to his personal history, and great difference of opinion regarding his religious sentiments. About his life we know very little, except what is derived from his own writings. He left only two short compositions, his Confession and his Epistle to Coroticus, both of which are well authenticated. Of the former the London Quarterly for April, 1866, says, “There is now almost a universal agreement in regard to St. Patrick's Confession. Its genuineness is admitted by bishop Usher, Sir James Ware, Spelman, Tillemont, Mabillon, Ducange, Lanigan, and a long list of both Roman Catholics and Protestants. Formerly there was some difference in regard to the place of his birth; at present the best authorities are nearly unanimous in believing that he was born in Armoric Gaul, about A.D. 387.”

According to his own account of himself (Conf. 5): “I had for my father Calphornius, a deacon, the son of Potitus, a presbyter in the Church, who lived in the village of Benavem of Tibernia, near the hamlet of Enon, where I was captured.” In his Epistle to Coroticus, he adds (sect. 5), “I was born free according to the flesh; I was the son of a father who was a decurio (a Roman magistrate). I sold my nobility for the advantage of this nation. But I am not ashamed, neither do I repent; I became a servant for Jesus Christ our Lord, so that I am not recognised in my former position.” Elsewhere (Conf. 1) he says, “I was about sixteen years old; but I knew not  the true God, and was led away into captivity to Hibernia, with a great many men according to our deservings.” Uncontradicted tradition says he was bought by Milcho, who lived in Dalvidda, now the county of Antrim. He lived with him six years. His occupation was herding or keeping cattle. His conversion and employment are thus described (Conf. 6): “My constant business was to keep the flocks; I was frequent in prayers. The love and fear of God more and more inflamed my heart. My faith and spirit were enlarged; so that I said a hundred prayers in a day, and nearly as many at night. And in the woods and on the mountain I remained, and before the light I arose to my prayers, in the snow, in the frost, and in the rain; and I experienced no evil at all. Nor was I affected with sloth, for the spirit of God was warm in me.” Near the close of the sixth year of his captivity he dreamed that he was soon to return to his parents, and that on the sea-coast he would find a vessel to take him to them. He readily found the vessel, but at first he was very roughly refused a passage. On retiring he began to pray; soon one from the ship came after him, and kindly offered to take him with them. On the third day of their voyage they reached land, but he does not tell us what land, and immediately adds that they entered the desert, which required twenty-eight days to pass through it. At last he reached home.' His parents received him very affectionately, and entreated him never again to leave them.

In regard to his return we have no trustworthy account, except that in his Confession, which is wholly defective in dates and places, and seems to have been intended merely as an acknowledgment of God's goodness in his deliverance. There is here a hiatus of unknown length in his life; a chasm, however, which his mediaeval biographers have filled up according to the liveliness of their fancy, or the supposed credulity of their readers. They wrote of his studying with St. Germain, of his attending a monastery near the Mediterranean, and finally of his going to Rome and receiving ordination from the pope. All these are mere inventions, and were not put forth till more than five hundred years after St. Patrick's death, and all of them are presented without a shadow of proof. They are not worthy the time or the space to disprove them. All that is really known of St. Patrick during this interval is from himself. Some time during this long interval St. Patrick had a dream. He says (Conf. 10), “I saw in my dream a man coming to me from Ireland, whose name was Victoricus, with a great number of letters. He gave me one of them, in the beginning of which was this word, Hibernioecum. While I was reading this, I thought I heard the voices of the inhabitants who lived near the woods of Floclu crying with one voice, ‘We  entreat thee, holy youth, that you come here and walk among us.' I was greatly touched in my heart, and could read no more; and then I awoke.”

This dream, and the several accompanying circumstances, led him to believe that it was a call to Ireland, and about it he was variously exercised, sometimes very happy, again strangely perplexed, till he felt “that the Spirit helped his infirmities to pray as he ought.” At some time in this interval, he says (Conf. 12), “I was brought down; but it was rather good for me, for from that time, by the help of God, I began to mend, and he prepared me that day for what I should be, which before had been far from me, to wit, that I should have a care and anxiety for the salvation of others. After this I did not think of myself.” Perhaps it was on this occasion that he made the vow to God (Conf. 15) “that he would go and preach to the Gentiles, and that he would never leave them.” Afterwards (Conf. 15) he says, “I left my country, my parents, and the many rewards which had been offered to me, and with tears and weeping I displeased them, and some of these were older than myself; but I did not act contrary to my vow (sed gubernante Deo nullo modo consensi neque acquidvi illis, ut ego venirem ad Hiberniam). God directing me, I consented to no one, nor yielded to them, nor what was grateful to myself. God had overcome me, and restored all things. So I went to Ireland, to pagans, to preach the Gospel.” Thus it would seem that he was sent by no one, but relying wholly on his divine call, without bishop, pope, or council, he went to win a pagan nation to Christ, and he did it. Of the time or events of his passage to Ireland we have no trustworthy account. From tradition and contemporary history it appears that St. Patrick commenced his ministry in Ireland about A.D. 432, when nearly forty-three years of age. His early movements were not noticed. Gildas (A.D. 540) never alludes to him. The venerable Bede (A.D. 731) never mentions his name, but does that of Palladius, his predecessor, and rather tries to attribute the success of St. Patrick to him. There is ample evidence that the early Irish Church was not in repute among the Roman Catholic clergy of the 6th, 7th, and 8th centuries, nor, indeed, fully until the 12th.

Then his mediaeval biographers, in their legendary tales, write much about his movements generally; they represent the whole nation as immediately bowing to the new religion, so that Geraldus, in the 12th century, doubted the genuineness of the Irish Church because it had not been founded in blood and persecution. But St. Patrick and the early Irish converts were persecuted, while the common people received the new faith with great readiness; there is evidence that among the ruling classes and the higher order of the Druids there still existed a secret though smothered  opposition to Christianity, which was only kept in check by the masses of the people. St. Patrick writes thus (Conf. 22): “At a certain time .they even desired to kill me, but my time had not come. Everything they found with us they seized, and bound myself with fetters; but on the fourteenth day the Lord delivered me, and what was ours they returned.” In Conf. 18, he “thanks God who had given grace to his servants to persevere, and that although they were threatened with terrors, they stood the firmer.” Other instances of persecution might be presented. The Irish saint was very taciturn, scarcely ever alluding to his trials, unless to thank God for his deliverance from them. In the establishment of his Church, St. Patrick in no instance ever appealed to any foreign Church, pope, or bishop. In his Epistle to Coroticus (sect. 1), he simply announces himself as bishop: “Ego Patricus, indoctus, scilicet, Hibernione, constitutum episcopum me esse recor: a Deo accepi, id quod sum” (“I, Patrick, an unlearned man, to wit, a bishop constituted in Ireland: what I am I have received from God”). Here is no appeal to any foreign authority; and solely on this authority he superintended the Irish Church for thirty-four years, and while in office he excommunicated the British pirate who had carried off some of his recent converts into slavery. These well-authenticated statements of St. Patrick concerning himself are wholly at variance with those of Probus and Joscelyn, who, for the first time, put forth their fabrications full five hundred years after his death. In regard to his studying with St. Germain at Tours, and of his going to Rome for ordination, all these stories were invented in the 10th or 12th century. Joscelyn, who wrote the fullest life of the saint, about A.D. 1130, has, in one sense, really the praise or dispraise of bringing the Irish Church into that of Rome. The abbe, not being embarrassed with facts, dates, or contemporary history, wrote easily and readily, and presented a life of the Irish saint that exactly suited his times, in the beginning of the 12th century. He represented St. Patrick and the early Church of Ireland in the 5th century as exact models of his own in the 12th. This life of the saint was readily received and adopted as the only true one by the Roman Catholic Church, and it has been ever since the “storehouse” from which his numerous and papal biographers have drawn their materials.

After the publication, and the general reception of this book, there was no hesitation in the full acknowledgment of all the Irish Christians, and of St. Patrick among them. Archbishop Usher, on the Religion of the Early Irish, asks (4:320): “Who among them [the early Irish] was ever canonized before St. Malachias, or Malachy, was?” (A.D. 1150). St. Patrick himself seems never to have been sainted till all Ireland  was sainted or canonized. From this mere papal acknowledgment the old evangelical Church of St. Patrick rapidly passed through several transformations. St. Malachy went all the way to Rome, and obtained for it the palliums, or papal investures. Lanfranc, archbishop of Canterbury, disregarding the old Irish ministerial line of seven hundred years, ordained several Dano-Irish bishops for the new hierarchy just set up, and in 1167 Henry II of England, by commission from pope Adrian, landed five thousand steel-clad soldiers in Ireland, and, after several sanguinary battles, called, in 1172, a synod at Cashel, to bring the Irish Church to papal conformity. But the old Irish Church was not yet extinct, for in 1170 they held a synod in Armagh, in which they confessed their sins, deprecated the “scourge of God,” as they called the English papal soldiers, and liberated all English slaves then held in Ireland. Yet conformity to “papal practices” was very tardy; “Celtic tenacity” predominated in religious as it had in civil matters. The same Brehon laws which St. Patrick heard proclaimed on the hills in the 5th century were again, despite the most barbarous penalties of the English, proclaimed on the same hills and in the same language one thousand years afterwards.

It has been asked,” Did St. Patrick give the Irish, in whole or in part, a translation of the Scriptures in their own language?” To this we reply, there is no positive proof that he did; but a priori arguments ought not to be despised. 1. St. Patrick was a great Bible reader; in his two short compositions he quotes the Scriptures forty-three times. 2. In his day the Irish had a written language; their annals were then written in it. 3. In his Epistle to Coroticus he “calls upon every family to read it to the people.” 4. Can we suppose that St. Patrick and his immediate followers, who founded Iona, “the star of the west,” and who were enlightening Central Europe with religion and letters, could have left their own Church and country without at least some portion of God's Word in Irish. Towards the close of his life, about A.D. 455, St. Patrick in Ireland wrote his Confession in what some call “homely Latin.” He directed it (Conf. 6) to his “Gallican brethren, and the many thousand spiritual children whom God had given him.” Most probably some copy of this and of his Epistle found their way to the Continent, and finally to some of the monasteries, then almost the only repositories of letters, where it seems to have remained unnoticed for a thousand years. When the Bollandists, in A.D. 1660, began their collections of the writings of the fathers, those of St. Patrick were  collected, and thus preserved from extinction. In 1848-60 they were copied into abbe Migne's Patrology, and are in vol. 53 of that great work.

According to tradition and contemporary history, St. Patrick died near Armagh, March 17, A.D. 455, in the seventy-eighth year of his age. The anniversary of his death has ever been held as a festive day by the Irish, not only on their own green isle, but in every other part of the wide world to which wars and oppression have driven them. The early Irish, like the Asiatic Christians, celebrated the dying day of their saints, rather than, as with us, the day of their birth. He was the honored means of introducing Christianity to a people who, more than any other in proportion to their number, have spread themselves over the globe, and who have always carried their religion with them, whether in its pure and primitive state, or unhappily in its later and vitiated form. St. Patrick's piety was deep and abiding. He would have been a saint in any age or country. He was a man of great meekness; in his government of the Church and his intercourse among men, love and humility were always and everywhere predominant. His religion lifted him above the love of wealth or of worldly honor. Like the prophet Samuel in the Old Testament, he used to appeal to the people, after living with them thirty years: “If in any way I have taken aught from you, tell me, and I will restore you fourfold.” He kept his vow to God “never to leave Ireland.” During his mission of thirty-four years among them he nearly lost the use of his mother tongue. He was perhaps the most successful missionary of the 5th century. The Roman Catholics have proudly and exclusively claimed St. Patrick, and most Protestants have ignorantly or indifferently allowed their claim, thus giving to error a gratuity which it is difficult to recover. But he was no Romanist. His life and evangelical Church of the 5th century ought to be better known. The familiar story of the expulsion of the reptiles from Ireland by this saint has the signification of many other legends and allegories, and figures the triumph of good over evil. His resting-place at Down, in the province of Ulster, is still venerated by the people, and his remains were preserved many years, but his church at Down was destroyed in the reign of Henry VIII, and such relics of him as remained were scattered either by the soldiers of Elizabeth or by those under Cromwell. When represented as bishop, he wears the usual dress with the mitre, cope, and crosier, while a neophyte regards him with reverence. As the apostle of Ireland, he should wear a hooded gown and a leathern girdle. The staff, wallet, standard with  the cross, and the Gospel are all his proper attributes. A serpent should be placed beneath his feet.

Those who desire all the knowledge so far obtained regarding this noted man and his relation to the Church must consult Potthast, Biblioth. Hist, Med. AEvi, p. 840 sq. Of the latest biographies, that by Miss Cusack (1870) gives the Roman Catholic side of the case; that by Todd (Dublin, 1863) the Protestant view. Besides these, consult De Vinne's Hist. of the Irish Primitive Church, together with the Life of St. Patrick (New York, 1870,12mo), where the authorities on St. Patrick's life, labors, and doctrines are given. See also Todd, Hist. of the Irish Church; Inett, Hist. of the Early English Church; Mrs. Jameson, Legends; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy; Hill, Hist. of Eng. Monasticism, p. 63, and Append. iii; Maclear, Hist. of Missions in the Middle Ages; Contemp. Rev. Sept. 1868; Westminster Rev. Oct. 1868, p. 240; Brit. Qu. Rev. Oct. 1867, art. i; Harper's Monthly, Oct. 1871; Friends' Review, 4:427 sq. (D. D.)

## Patrick (St.), Knights of[[@Headword:Patrick (St.), Knights of]]

             is the title of the members of an Irish order of knighthood founded by king George III of Great Britain on Feb. 5, 1783, in honor of the great Irish apostle. As originally constituted, the order consisted of the sovereign, the grand-master (who was always the reigning lord-lieutenant of Ireland), and fifteen knights; but in 1833 the number of knights was increased to twenty- two. The order is indicated by the initials “K. P.” Their dress is as follows: The collar (of gold) is composed of roses alternating with harps, tied together with a knot of gold, the roses being enameled alternately white within red, and red within white, and in the center is an imperial crown surmounting a harp of gold, from which the badge is suspended. The badge or jewel is of gold, and oval; surrounding it is a wreath of shamrock proper on a gold field; within this is a band of sky blue enamel charged with the motto of the order, “Quis separabit. mdcclxxxiii,” in gold letters, and within this band a saltire gules (the cross of St. Patrick), surmounted by a shamrock or trefoil slipped vert, having on each of its leaves an imperial crown or. The field of the cross is either argent or pierced and left open. A sky-blue ribbon, worn over the right shoulder, sustains the badge when the collar is not worn. The star, worn on the left side, differs from the badge only in being circular in place of oval, and in substituting for the  exterior wreath of shamrocks eight rays of silver, four of which are larger than the other four. The mantle is of rich sky-blue tabinet, lined with white silk, and fastened by a cordon of blue silk and gold with tassels. On the right shoulder is the hood, of the same materials as the mantle.

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

             D.D., an English divine, brother of the succeeding, was born at Gainsborough, in Lincolnshire, about 1640, and was educated at Cambridge University. After taking holy orders he was preacher at the Charter-house, London. He died about the opening of the 18th century. Like his brother the bishop, Dr. John Patrick was a decided opponent of the papists. He wrote, Reflections vpon the Devotions of the Roman Church, with the Prayers, Hymns, and Lessons themselves, taken out of their authentic Books; in three Parts, this first Part containing their Devotions to Saints and Angels [all ever published]; with two Digressions concerning the Reliques and Miracles in Mr. Cressy's late History [anonymous] (Lond. 1674, 8vo) The Virgin Mary misrepresented by the Roman Church; in the Traditions of that Church concerning her Life and Glory, and in the Devotions paid to her as the Mother of God; both showed out of the Offices of that Church, the Lessons on her Festivals, and from their allowed Authors; Part I, wherein Two of her Feasts, her Conception and Nattivity, are considered [anonymous] (Lond. 1688, 4to); also in Gibson's Preservative, 15:292, and 16:1. Dr. Patrick also published The Psalms in metre (Lond. 1710, 12mo).

## Patrick, Symon[[@Headword:Patrick, Symon]]

             D.D., a celebrated English prelate of the orthodox school, flourished during the important events of the 17th century, and stands next to Tillotson in influence .,and learning. Burnet, his contemporary, ranks Patrick with the most worthy of the English nation, and pronounces him one who was an honor to the Church and the age in which he lived. Symon Patrick was born at Gainsboroagh, in Lincolnshire, in 1626. His father was a mercer of good credit, and sent him, with a view to affording the boy all the educational advantages of his time, early to school. He received his first educational training in his native place, under one Merriweather, the translator of Sir T. Browne's Religio Medici. At the age of eighteen Patrick was admitted into Queen's College, Cambridge, where he studied with great diligence and unceasing perseverance. At the usual time he took  the degrees of M.A. and B.A., and was chosen fellow of his college; and very shortly after received holy orders from Hall, bishop of Norwich, in his retirement at Heigham, after his ejection from his bishopric, which, having never vacated, he continued to regard as his see.

Very soon after his ordination, Patrick was received as chaplain into the family of Sir Walter St. John, of Battersea, who gave him that living in 1658. In 1661 he was elected, by a majority of fellows, master of Queen's College, in opposition to a royal mandamus appointing Mr. Anthony Sparrow to that place; but the affair, being brought before the king and council, was soon decided in favor of Mr. Sparrow; and some of the fellows, if not all, who had formerly agreed with Mr. Patrick, were ejected. His next preferment was the rectory of St. Paul's, Covent Garden, London, given him by the earl of Bedford in 1662, where he endeared himself much to the parishioners by instruction and example, and particularly by continuing all the while among them during the plague in 1665. He studied, preached, visited the sick, and distributed alms as composedly as if there had not been a plague thought of, and upon a review of the awful season and his own peril, recorded the following words: “I suppose you think I intend to stay here still; though I understand by your question you would not have me. But, my friend, what am I better than another? Somebody must be here; and is it fit I should set such a value upon myself as my going away and leaving another will signify? For it will, in effect, be to say that I am too good to be lost; but it is no matter if another be. Truly, I do not think myself so considerable to the world: and though my friends set a good price upon me, yet that temptation hath not yet made me of their mind; and I know their love makes me pass for more with them than I am worth. When I mention that word, love, I confess it moves me much, and I have a great passion for them, and wish I might live to embrace them once again; but I must not take any undue courses to satisfy this passion, which is but too strong in me. I must let reason prevail, and stay with my charge, which I take hitherto to be my duty, whatever come.”

A little later he writes: “During my confinement with these afflicted people I had many heavenly meditations in my mind, and found the pleasure wherewith they filled the soul was far beyond all the pleasures of the flesh. Nor could I favor anything that would last so long, nor give me such joy and delight, as those thoughts which I had of the other world, and the taste which God vouchsafed me of it” (Autobiography, p. 52). It is said, further, that, out of a special regard to these people, he refused the archdeaconry of Huntingdon. Having sufficient reasons for dislike to his college at  Cambridge, he went to Oxford for his degrees in divinity; and, entering himself of Christ Church, took his doctor's degree there in 1666. He was made chaplain in ordinary to the king about the same time. In 1672 he was made prebendary of Westminster, and dean of Peterborough in 1679. In 1680 the lord-chancellor, Finch, offered him the living of St. Martin's in the Fields; but Dr. Patrick refused it, and recommended Dr. Thomas Tenison. In 1682 Dr. Lewis de Moulin, who had been history professor at Oxford, and had written many bitter books against the Church of England, sent for Patrick upon his sickbed, and solemnly declared his regret upon that account, which declaration, being signed, was published after his death. During the reign of James II Dr. Patrick was one of those champions who defended the Protestant religion against the papists. In the proposed revision of the Liturgy, his special share was the remodeling of the Collects; the process employed for which purpose is described in Birch's Life of Tillotson, who at that time was dean of St. Paul's, and was the soul of the commission. In Tillotson's commonplace-book was found a paper in short-hand, entitled “Concessions which will probably be made by the Church of England for the union of Protestants; which I sent to the earl of Portland by Dr. Stillingfleet, Sept. 13, 1689.” There were seven heads, which it may not be foreign to our subject to transcribe, as Patrick was one of the most active commissioners:

“1. That the ceremonies enjoined or recommended in the Liturgy or Canons be left indifferent.

“2. That the Liturgy be carefully reviewed, and such alterations and changes therein made as may supply the defects, and remove, as much as possible, all grounds of exception to any part of it, by leaving out the apocryphal lessons, and corrected the translation of the Psalms, used in the public service, where there is need of it; and in many other particulars.

“3. That, instead of all former declarations and subscriptions to be made by ministers, it shall be sufficient for them that are admitted to the exercise of their ministry in the Church of England to subscribe one general declaration and promise to this purpose, viz. that we do submit to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church of England as it shall be established by law, and promise to teach and practice accordingly.  “

4. That a new body of ecclesiastical canons be made, particularly with a regard to a more effectual provision for the reformation of manners both in ministers and people.

“5. That there be an effectual regulation of ecclesiastical courts to remedy the great abuses and inconveniences which, by degrees and length of time, have crept into them; and, particularly, that the power of excommunication be taken out of the hands of lay officers, and placed in the bishop, and not to be exercised for trivial matters, but upon great and weighty occasions.

“6. That for the future those who have been ordained in any of the foreign Reformed churches be not required to be re-ordained here to render them capable of preferment in this Church.

“7. That for the future none be capable of any ecclesiastical benefice or preferment in the Church of England that shall be ordained in England otherwise than by bishops. And that those who have been ordained only by presbyters shall not be compelled to renounce their former ordination. But because many have and do still doubt of the validity of such ordination, where episcopal ordination may be had, and is by law required, it shall be sufficient for such persons to receive ordination from a bishop in this or the like form: If thou art not already ordained, I ordain thee, etc.; as in case a doubt be made of any one's baptism, it is appointed by the Liturgy that he be baptized in this form: If thou art not baptized, I baptize thee,” etc.

At the Revolution in 1688 great use was made of dean Patrick, who was very active in settling the affairs of the Church: he was called upon to preach before the prince and princess of Orange, and soon afterwards was appointed one of the commissioners for the review of the liturgy. In 1689 he was made bishop of Chichester, and employed, with other bishops, to compose the disorders of the Church of Ireland. In 1691 he was translated to the see of Ely, in the room of Turner, who was deprived for refusing the oaths to the government. Here he continued to perform all the offices of a good bishop, as well as a good man, which he had proved himself to be. In his early life he had regarded the Nonconformists with little favor, and had even written against them in a pamphlet entitled A friendly Debate between a Conformist and Nonconformist (1668), but in his latter years, especially while in the episcopate, he had had occasion to change his opinion. He had even a great share in the comprehension projected by archbishop Sancroft,  in order to gain over the Dissenters. This may appear strange, as in the preface to his dialogue between a Conformist and a Nonconformist he had opposed such a design, and thereby given great offense to lord chief-justice Hale, who was zealous for it. His notices of the comprehension proceedings, in his autobiographical detail, are meager, and cast no light upon the subject.

The chief particulars may be found in Calamy's Life of Baxter, Birch's Life of Tillotson, Burnet's Own Time, and other publications. Says Harris, the biographer of Dr. Manton: “Bishop Patrick, in advanced age, remarked, in a speech in the House of Lords in favor of the ‘Occasional Conformity' Bill, that ‘He had been known to write against the Dissenters in his younger years, but that he had lived long enough to see reason to alter his opinion of that people, and that way of writing.'“ The reason was probably, his more intimate, and therefore more accurate knowledge of the Nonconformists. Many of these with whom he was brought into personal contact he was disappointed, happily, not to find violent political partisans, but men who professed the constitutional principles of the Revolution of 1688; men of devout and exemplary life; men who held the doctrinal articles of the Church of England, and lamented that a few things — and only a few — prevented their embracing its communion; for they entertained no opposition as to the utility of national ecclesiastical establishments. Indeed it remains an open question at this day whether Dissent might not have been forever ended in that period of English history had not the Altitudinarians, or Tractarians as we now call them, been so powerful in the Anglican Church. Indeed, we think, had there not been such moderate men as Tillotson and Patrick to allay the storm which was then preparing again, there might have been a renewal of the melancholy scenes of the days of Charles I. Bishop Patrick's services to the English Church, and the English people as well, cannot, then, be too highly prized. He died at Ely May 31, 1707, and was interred in the cathedral, where a monument is erected to his memory. Bishop Patrick was one of the most learned men as well as best writers of his time. He published many and various works: some of the devotional kind, many Sermons, Tracts against Popery, and Paraphrases and Commentaries upon the Holy Scriptures. These last are excellent in their way, and perhaps the most useful of any ever written in the English language. They were published at various times, but as this prelate did not proceed beyond the Song of Solomon, the commentaries of Lowth, Arnald, Whitby, and Lownan are generally added to complete the work. In this enlarged or completed form it is published, entitled A critical Commentary and  Paraphrase on the Old and New Testament and the Apocrypha, by Patrick, Lowth, Arnald, Whitby, and Lowman; corrected by the Rev. J. R. Pitman (Lond. 1822, 6 vols. 4to). The historical and poetical hooks of the Old Testament are by Bp. Patrick; the Prophets, by W. Lowth; the Apocrypha, by Arnald; the New Testament (with the exception of the Revelation), by Whitby; the Revelation, by Lowman. There is a new edition, with the text printed at large (not formerly given), 4 vols. imp. 8vo, 1853, and other dates. There are various editions in folio, which are esteemed for the large type with which they are printed; but none of them contain Lowman, and but few copies contain Arnald. In that size the work is in 6 vols. without Arnald. which makes a seventh when added. An edition of all Bp. Patrick's works was brought out in 1858 by the Rev. Alexander Taylor, A.M. (Oxf. 9 vols. 8vo). His Autobiography was published at Oxford in 1839. A list of all his writings is given by Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. 2:2304-2307. See Debary, Hist. of the Ch. of England, 1685-1717, p. 20, 81, 203, 380; Perry, Hist. of the Ch. of England, 2:397; 3:82; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England, 1:338; 2:140, 354; Christian Observer, Nov. 1843, art. 1.

## Patrii Dei[[@Headword:Patrii Dei]]

             (Lat. pater, “a father,” and Dii, “gods”), a name applied in heathen antiquity to the gods from whom tribes were believed to be sprung, or to gods worshipped by their ancestors. Sometimes the name was given to the spirits of their deceased ancestors. Among the ancient Romans the term was sometimes used to denote the Furies or Eumenides.

## Patrimi And Matrimi[[@Headword:Patrimi And Matrimi]]

             are names applied among the ancient Romans to children whose parents had been married according to the religious ceremony called Confarreatio. These were .generally considered as more suitable for the service of the gods than the children of other marriages.

## Patrimony[[@Headword:Patrimony]]

             is the term anciently given to Church estates or revenues. Thus we find mentioned, in the letters of St. Gregory, not only the patrimony of the Roman Church, but those likewise of the churches of Rimini, Milan, and Ravenna. This name, therefore, does not peculiarly signify any foreign dominion or jurisdiction belonging to the Roman Church or the pope.  Churches, in cities whose inhabitants were but of modern existence, had no estates left to them out of their own district; but those in imperial cities, such as Rome, Ravenna, and Milan, where senators and persons of the first rank inhabited, were endowed with estates in divers parts of the world. St. Gregory mentions the patrimony of the Church of Ravenna, in Sicily, and another of the Church of Milan, in that kingdom. The Roman Church had patrimonies in France, Africa, Sicily, in the Cottian Alps, and in many other countries. The same St. Gregory had a lawsuit with the bishop of Ravenna for the patrimonies of the two churches, which afterwards ended by agreement.

## Patriots in Christ[[@Headword:Patriots in Christ]]

             an appellation given to certain- Wurtemberg Separatists, originated by the abbe Gregoire, who appeared in 1801, during the rising popularity of Bonaparte, and maintained that he was the second and true Messiah, who was to destroy the spiritual Babylon and give freedom to the nations. They formed themselves into an order of knighthood, called the Knights of Napoleon, but as the ambitious personage on whom their expectations rested made no pretensions to the dignity which they had marked out for him, they met with no encouragement, and speedily fell into oblivion.

## Patripassians[[@Headword:Patripassians]]

             (from Patre Passo, “a suffering Father”), a title given by their opponents to those Christians who deny the distinct personality of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The first to whom it was applied were the followers of Praxeas, against whom Tertullian published, about the year 200, one of his celebrated treatises. Praxeas was a Phrygian, who had come to Rome, and exerted himself there with great effect against the Montanists, whom the Roman bishop was almost on the point of admitting into the communion of the Church. His peculiar views on the Trinity were overlooked at the time. But Tertullian shortly afterwards became a Montanist, and as such had a double motive for attacking Praxeas and his followers. His treatise is our chief authority for the opinions they held, but there is some obscurity about it. From some passages it would appear that Praxeas admitted no distinctions in the Godhead previous to the appearing of God in the person of Christ. From others it rather seems that he supposed him to have manifested himself as the Son under the old dispensation. But there can be no doubt that Praxeas believed, as the Sabellians did after him, that Father,  Son, and Holy Ghost were merely names for the different modes under which one and the same person operated or was manifest. Tertullian argued that if this view was carried out to its legitimate consequences, it must be admitted that the Father was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered on the cross. SEE MONARCHIANS; SEE NOETUS; SEE SABELLIANS; and SEE SABELLIUS.

The followers of Praxeas were also called Monarchians, because of their denying a plurality of persons in the Deity; and Patripassians, because they believed that the Father was so intimately united with the man Christ, his Son, that he suffered with him the anguish of an afflicted life, and the torments of an ignominious death. It does not appear that this sect formed to itself any separate place of worship, or removed from the ordinary assemblies of Christians. See Neander, Hist. of Dogmas (see Index); Planting and Training, vol. 2; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 1:73; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1:112; Schaff, Church Hist. vol. 1; Liddon, Divinity of Christ (see Index); Haag, Hist. des Dogmes; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index in vol. 2).

## Patristics[[@Headword:Patristics]]

             is a department of ecclesiastical history, and more particularly of doctrinal history. It is an account of the lives, writings, and theological opinions of the Christian authors of the ancient Graeco-Latin Church before the separation into two antagonistic bodies. The terms are sometimes so distinguished that Patrology is defined to be biographical and literary, Patristics doctrinal and ethical. A complete work must cover both. There is a difference of opinion concerning the precise boundaries. Patristics begins with the apostolic fathers, and closes with Gregory I in the West, and with John of Damascus in the East. John of Damascus cannot be omitted, since he is the last authoritative divine of the Greek Church who sums up the labors of the earlier Greek fathers. But it is improper to carry patristics down to the Middle Ages, so as to comprehend Anselm, Peter the Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, and other schoolmen. It must be strictly confined to the fathers, i.e. to those writers who produced the Catholic dogmas, as distinguished from the schoolmen who digested, analyzed, and systematized these dogmas. The title father, Church father (pater ecclesiae corresponding to the Heb. אָב), is relative. Every Church has its fathers and founders. But it is usually applied to those divines of the early Christian centuries who excelled in learning, judgment, piety, and orthodoxy. Some of them were not only luminaries (luminaria), but also  princes (primates) and saints of the Church (sancti patres). In a wider sense it is extended to other ecclesiastical writers of merit and distinction. The line of the Greek fathers is usually closed with John of Damascus (d. 754), the line of the Latin fathers with Gregory I (d. 604).

The Roman Church makes a distinction between pater ecclesiae, doctor ecclesiae, and auctor ecclesiasticus.

(1.) Patres ecclesic are all ancient teachers who combine antiquitas, doctrina orthodoxa, sanctitas vite, and approbatio ecclesiae (which may be expressed or silent). These requisites, however, are only imperfectly combined even in the most eminent of the fathers; some excel in learning (Origen, Jerome), some in piety (Polycarp), some in orthodoxy (Irenaeus, Athanasius, Leo I), some in vigor and depth (Tertullian, Augustine), some in eloquence (Chrysostom), but none could stand the test of Roman orthodoxy of the Tridentine or Vatican stamp, and many of them would have to be condemned as heretics. This is especially the case with the fathers of the ante-Nicene age (see Schaff, Church Hist. 1:455).

(2.) Doctores ecclesiae are the most authoritative of the Church fathers, who, in addition to the above requisites, excel in learning (eminens eruditio), and have the express approbation of the Church (expressa ecclesios declaratio). The recognized Greek Church doctors are: Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nazianzum, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, John of Damascus. The Latin Church doctors are: Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, also Hilary of Poitiers, to whom are added the leading medieval divines, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventura. (Among more recent divines, Bellarmine, Bossuet, and Perrone would deserve a place among the doctors of the Roman Catholic Church.)

(3.) Auctores ecclesiastici: those ancient Christian writers who are less important for didactic theology, or held questionable or heterodox opinions, as Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Arnobius, Lactantius, Theodoret.

Patristics may be divided into three periods:

(1.) The Apostolic fathers, i.e. the immediate disciples of the apostles, who flourished at the end of the 1st and the beginning of the 2d century, and represent a faint echo of the age of inspiration. These are Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Ignatius (and Pseudo-Ignatius), Pseudo-Barnabas, Papias,  Hermas, and the anonymous author of the beautiful Epistle to Diognetus. Important literary discoveries, which throw some light on doubtful questions of the sub-apostolic age, have recently been made, viz. the Syriac Ignatius, the Greek Hermas, the Greek of the first five chapters of Barnabas, and a new MS. of the Clementine Epistles, edited by Bryennios (1876). The best edition, now in course of publication, is Patrum Apostolicorum Opera (ed. P. de Gebhardt, Ad. Harnack, Th. Zahn, Leips. 1876 sq.).

(2.) The anteNicene fathers, i.e. the apologists and theologians of the 2d and 3d centuries, who were chiefly engaged in the defense of Christianity against Jews and Gentiles, and the refutation of the Ebionitish and Gnostic heresies (see Otto, Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum [2d ed. Leips. 1876 sq.]; and the Ante-Nicene Library published by Clark [Edinb. 1867- 72, 25 vols.]).

(a) Greek fathers: Justin Martyr (d. 166), Irenaeus (d. 202), Hippolytus (d. 236), Clement of Alexandria (d. 220), Origen (d. 254), and others of less importance. Of these Irenaeus is the soundest divine, Origen the greatest scholar.

(b) Latin fathers: Tertullian (d. about 220), Cyprian (d. 258), Minucius Felix, Arnobius.

(3.) The Nicene fathers of the 4th century, who chiefly developed and defended the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation in the Arian conflict from 325 to 381.

(a) Greek fathers: Eusebius (the historian, d. 340), Athanasius (the father of orthodoxy, d. 373), Gregory of Nazianzum (the theologian, d. 391), Gregory of Nyssa (d. 395), Basil the Great (d. 379), Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386), Chrysostom (the prince of pulpit orators, d. 407), Epiphanius (the orthodox zealot, d. 403), and others.

(b) Latin fathers: Hilary of Poitiers (“the Athanasius of the West,” d. 368), Ambrose of Milan (d. 397).

(4.) The post-Nicene fathers, who developed the orthodox christology and the fundamental doctrines of Christian anthropology and soteriology.

(a) Greek Church: Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), Theodoret (d. 458), John of Damascus (d. about 750).

(b) Latin Church: Jerome (d. 419), Augustine (d. 430), Leo the Great (d. 461), Gregory the Great (d. 604).

Literature. — Patristics began with the work of Jerome (d. 419), De viris illustribus s. de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, which contains biographical sketches of the most eminent Christian authors down to the 5th century. It was continued by Gennadius (490), Isidore of Spain, and other mediaeval writers. Since the Reformation this study was especially cultivated by Roman Catholic scholars, as Bellarmine, Oudin, Du Pin, C. Nourry, Tillemont, Ceillier, Lumper, Sprenger, Mohler, Fessler, Alzog; and by some Anglican divines, as Cave, Pearson, Fell, and the Tractarian school. The Germans have cultivated the biographical and critical department, and furnished a number of valuable patristic monographs, as Tertullian and Chrysostom by Neander, Origen by Thomasius and Redepenning, Gregory of Nazianzum by Ullmann, Jerome by Zochler, Augustine by Bindemann. The best editions of the fathers are the Benedictine, as far as they go, and the most complete and convenient (though by no means the most critical) is Migne's Patrologice Cursus completus s. Bibliotheca Universalis... omnium SS. Patrum, Doctorum, Scriptorumque ecclesiasticorum, embracing the ecclesiastical literature from the apostolic fathers down to the age of Innocent III (Paris, 1844 sq.). A more critical edition of the Latin fathers was begun under the auspices of the Academy of Vienna (1866), and embraces so far Sulpicius Severus, Minucius Felix, and Cyprian. Of modern works on patristics, the principal are: Mohler, Patrologie (ed. Reithmayr, Regensburg, 1850, only 1 vol. to close of 300); Fessler, Institutiones Patrol. (Oenip. 1850, 2 vols., to Grengory the Great); Alzog, Grundriss der Patrologie (2d ed. Freiburg, 1869; 3d ed. 1876); Donaldson, A Critical History of Christian Literature and Doctrine from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council (Lond. 1864-66, 3 vols.). A biographical Dictionary of the first ten centuries, under the editorship of William Smith, has been published in London as a sequel to the Dictionary of Christian Antiquities, of which the first volume was issued in 1875. SEE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH; SEE PATROLOGY. (P. S.)

## Patrizi, Constantin[[@Headword:Patrizi, Constantin]]

             a modern Italian prelate, the intimate companion of pope Pius IX, and cardinal-vicar, was born at Siena Sept. 4, 1798. He was the scion of a noble family, and was intended for military service, but being of a serious turn of mind he preferred the service of the Church, and in her ranks  rapidly rose to places of responsibility and influence. In 1834 he was honored with a bishopric, and two years later was created a cardinal. Five years after this he was made the vicargeneral of his holiness the pope, whom he served most faithfully his life long. Patrizi had been instrumental in the election of Pius IX, and became the most devoted, laborious, and perhaps important official, after Antonelli, in this pontificate. He was, however, the decided foe of the Jesuits, and in these latter years, when the Jesuits rule with high hand at Rome, Patrizi has had but little to say that was not carefully weighed, lest it were intended in injury to the Society of Jesus. But the pope himself never wavered in his affection for Patrizi. Pius IX knew him to be an honest man whose counsels were worth heeding, and to the last esteemed his friend the vicar-general. Patrizi died Dec. 17, 1876. Besides the offices above referred to, he was bishop of Porto and Rufinus, prefect of the Congregation of the Episcopal Residence, prefect of the Congregation of Rites, archpriest of the Maria Majoria, and, besides, dean of the Sacred College. His last years were embittered by the presence of a Methodist church just across the way from his vicarial palace. A few days before his death a mutual friend informed the pope that Patrizi avowed his “illness afflicted him only for two reasons: because it prevented his saying mass and seeing his holiness.” Pius IX, greatly moved by this declaration, resolved to break his voluntary imprisonment to attest in person his affection for his best friend. He gave orders accordingly, but his physicians effectively interfered, and Patrizi was denied this last favor.

## Patrizi, Francis Xavier[[@Headword:Patrizi, Francis Xavier]]

             a Jesuit, who died at Rome, April 23, 1881, professor of exegesis at the Collegium Romanum, is the author of, De Interpretatione Scripturarum Sacrarum (1844, 2 volumes): — De Evangeliis (1853, 2 volumes): — Commentarius in Evangelium Joannis(1857): — Comment. in Evangelium Merci (1862). (B.P.)

## Patrobas[[@Headword:Patrobas]]

             (Πατρόβας, probably for Πατρόβιος, life of his father, see Wolf, Curce, ad loc.), a Christian at Rome to whom Paul sent his salutation (Rom 16:14). A.D. 55. According to late and uncertain tradition, he was one of the seventy disciples, became bishop of Puteoli (Pseudo-Hippolytus, De Sept. Apostolis), and suffered martyrdom together with Philologus on November 4 (Estius). Accordingly the Roman martyrology assigns that day as his anniversary. Like many other names mentioned in Romans 16, this was borne by at least one member of the emperor's household (Sueton. Galba, 20; Martial, Ep. 2:32, 3).

## Patrocinium[[@Headword:Patrocinium]]

             is a name for the festival annually observed by the Romanists to commemorate those saints under whose protection a church has been built or founded. SEE PATRON.

## Patroclus[[@Headword:Patroclus]]

             (Πάτροκλος, a frequent Greek name since the time of Homer), the father of Nicanor, the famous adversary of Judas Maccabaeus (2Ma 8:9).

## Patroclus Of Arles[[@Headword:Patroclus Of Arles]]

             a French Roman Catholic prelate, flourished in the early part of the 5th century as bishop of the diocese from which he is named. A dispute of long standing then existed between the bishops of Aries and Vienne with regard to metropolitan jurisdiction. The question was brought before a council at Turin in the year 401, when it was decided, for the sake of peace, that the dignity of metropolitan should belong to that prelate who could prove his see to be the civil capital of the province; and that meanwhile each should execute the office in the dioceses nearest to his own. The strife was thus suspended for the time; but in 417 Patroclus addressed himself to pope Zozimus, to obtain restitution of the rights which he maintained to be originally inherent in his see; and that pontiff, probably without sufficient examination, granted his request. He wrote to the bishops of Gaul, directing that the bishop of Aries should exercise metropolitan jurisdiction over these provinces, Viennensis, and Prima and Secunda Narbonensis; that he should preside at the consecration of their bishops; that all clergy traveling abroad should obtain from him litterae formate or commendatory letters; and that he should decide ecclesiastical causes, with the exception of those which were important enough to be reserved to the cognizance of the pope himself. These distinctions he declared to rest upon the apostolic foundation of the see; Trophimus having been despatched from Rome to be the first bishop of Aries, and the Christian faith having been diffused from that original source throughout Gaul. See Jarvis, Hist. of Ch. of France, 1:6 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy.

## Patrology[[@Headword:Patrology]]

             a term which properly applies to the doctrinal and ethical systems found in the writings of the Christian Church fathers; while Patristics strictly relates  to their life, history, and literary character. The two words, however, are generally used interchangeably. The writings of the ante-Nicene fathers are remarkable for their deference to the teaching of the Scriptures. Their doctrines and exhortations are based upon the New Testament, and fortified by citations from the Gospels and Epistles. This peculiarity aids one in determining how far the New Testament was regarded as of divine authority, and what approach had then been made towards the settlement of the canon. The ante-Nicene fathers agree in their testimony to the reformation wrought by Christianity in private morals and in public manners. Thus Tertullian, in his Apology, boldly challenges the enemies of Christians to point out any evil in their lives that can be fairly ascribed to their religion, and refers with exultation to their domestic purity, their integrity in business, their sobriety and order, and their abounding charities, as fruits of the Gospel. Nor are there wanting in the ante-Nicene fathers traces of that spirit of philosophy and of erudition which in their successors shaped the doctrinal germs of the New Testament into elaborate systems of theology, varying according to the influence of Plato and of Aristotle upon the thought of the age, though in general one finds in that period rather the elementary and practical truths that belong to an age of missionary zeal. But though we may not look to the early fathers for classic elegance of style or the perfection of rhetorical art, one is charmed with their simple fervor, with their earnestness of purpose, with their unflinching devotion to the cause they had espoused; and something of roughness, even of violence, may be pardoned in men who lived in stormy times, and spoke and wrote in view of the torture, the block, the arena. We owe to them a living picture of Christianity as a working power in human thought and society at the beginning of its triumphs. SEE PATRISTICS.

## Patron[[@Headword:Patron]]

             (Lat. patronus, from pater, “father”) among the Romans originally signified a citizen who had dependents that under the name of clients were attached to him. Before the time of the Laws of the Twelve Tables, the most frequent use of the term patronus was in opposition to libertus, these two words being used to signify persons who stood to one another in the relation of master and manumitted slave. The Roman was not denuded of all right in his slave when he freed him: a tie remained somewhat like that of parent and child, and the law recognized important obligations on the part of the libertus towards his patron, the neglect of which involved severe punishment. In some cases the patron could claim a right to the  whole or part of the property of his freedman. The original idea of a patron apart from the manumitter of slaves continued to exist. A Roman citizen, desirous of a protector, might attach himself to a patron, whose client he thenceforward became; and distinguished Romans were sometimes patrons of dependent states or cities, particularly where they had been the means of bringing them into subjection. Thus the Marcelli were patrons of the Sicilians, because Claudius Marcellus had conquered Syracuse and Sicily. The patron was the guardian of his client's interest, public and private; as his legal adviser, he vindicated his rights before the courts of law. The client was bound, on various occasions, to assist the patron with money, as by paying the costs of his suits, contributing to the marriage portions of his daughters, and defraying in part the expenses incurred in the discharge of public functions. Patron and client were under an obligation never to accuse one another; to violate this law amounted to the crime of treason, and any one was at liberty to slay the offender with impunity. One obvious effect of the institution of clientela was the introduction of an element of union between classes of citizens who were otherwise continually brought into opposition to each other. As the patron was in the habit of appearing in support of his clients in courts of justice, the word patronus acquired, in course of time, the signification of advocate, or legal adviser and defender. the client being the party defended; hence the modern relation between counsel and client.

Patron, in time, came to be a common designation of every protector or powerful promoter of the interests of another; thus also the saints, who were believed to watch over particular interests of persons, places, trades, etc., acquired in the Middle Ages the designation of patron saints. These patron saints of professions, trades, conditions, and callings were called, in Church language, Defensores. Several such are clearly connected by a sort of pun (as St. Clair, of lamplighters; St. Cloud, of the nailmakers; and St. Blanc, or Blanchard, of laundresses), or are derived from some incident in their life (as St. Peter, of fishmongers), or in their legends (as St. Dunstan, of goldsmiths; St. Sebastian, of archers; St. Blaise, of combmakers; St. Lawrence, of girdlers and cooks; SS. Hubert and Eustace, of huntsmen; St. Cecilia, of musicians; St. Catharine, of philosophers). Some preside over different trades, as St. Eloi, patron of hangmen, coachmen, tinmen, nail and shoeing smiths, and metalworkers; St. George, of soldiers, clothiers, and horsemen; St. Anne, of grooms, toymen, turners, and combmakers; St. Michael, of fencing-masters and pastrycooks; St. John at the Latin Gate, of  printers, attorneys, and papermakers; IV Coronati, of masons and builders; SS. Cosmas and Damian, of physicians and surgeons; SS. Crispin and Crispinian, of cordwainers and embroiderers; St. Nicholas, of butchers, scholars, seamen, and thieves; St. Vincent, of vinedressers and vinegar- makers.

We append a list of patron saints, as popularly understood.

Artillery, and engineers and mechanics, and married women, St. Barbara. Bakers, SS. Wilfred and Itonorius. Basketmakers, St. Anthony. Blind men, St. Thomas a Becket. Bookbinders, the Ascension. Booksellers, St. John the Evangelist. Boys, St. Gregory. Brewers, SS. Homnorins and Clement. Brokers, St. Maurice. Builders, SS. Coronati, Severus, Severianus, Carpophorus, and Victorius. Butchers, SS. Anthony the Abbot and Francis. Carpenters, SS. Joseph and Andrew. Carters, St. Catharine. Chandlel's, the Purification (Candlemas). Charcoal-cutters, St. Anthony. Children, the Holy Innocents, St. Felicitas. Chinamen, St. Anthony of Padua. l Common women, SS. Bride and Afra. Confectioners, the Purification. Coopers, SS. Mary Magdalen and Hilary. Captives, SS. Leonard and Barbara. Curriers, SS. Simon and Jude. Divines, St. Thomas Aquimnas. Drapers, SS. Blaise and Leodegar. Drunkards, SS. Martin aind Urban. Falconers, St. Tibba. Ferrymen, St. Christopher. Fools, St. Mathuriln.  Fullers, St. Severus. Gardeners, SS. Urban of Langres and Fiacre. Girls, St. Catharine. Glaziers, St. James of Germany. Granarers and millers, St. Anthony. Grocers, the Purification, St. Anthony. Hairdressers, St. Louis. Hatters, SS. James and William. Horsedealers, St. Louis. Hotel-keepers, St. Theodotus. Jockeys, St. Euloge. Laborers, SS. Walstan and Isidore. Lawyers, St. Ives. Locksmiths, St. Peter-es-Liens. Lovers, St. Valentine. Master-shoemakers, St. Martin. Matmakers, the Nativity. Mercers, St. Florilan. Millers, SS. Martin and Arnold. Mowers and reapers, St. Walstaln. Nurses, St. Agatha. Painters, SS. Luke and Lazarus. Paviors, St. Roche. Peasants, St. Lucia. Physicians, St. Pantaleon. Pilgrims, St. Julian. Pinmakers, St. Sebastian. Plasterers, IV Corolnati. Ploughmen, St. Urban. Potters, St. Gore. Saddlers, St. Gualfard. Seamen and fishermen, SS. Nicholas, Dismas, Christopher, and Elmo. Shepherds, SS. Neomaye, Drugo, and Wendolin. Spinners, St. Catharine. ,  Spurriers, St. Giles. Students and scholars, SS. Jerome, Lawrence, Mathurin, Mary Magdalene, Catharine, Gregory the Great, Ursul. Tailors, SS. John Baptist, Goodman, and Anne. Tanners, SS. Simon, Jude, and Clement. Taverners, St. Lawrence. Theologians, SS. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. Thieves, St. Dismas. Travellers, St. Julian. Virgins, St.Winifred. Washerwomen, SS. Hunna and Lidoise. Weavers, St. Stephen. Woolcombers, SS. Blaise and Mary Magdalene. The saint in whose name a church is founded is considered its patron saint. But the dedication of a church often commemorates the patron of the staple trade of the vicinity.

PATRONS IN DISEASES, ETC.

St. Agatha presided over fire and valleys; St. Barbara, over hills; St. Florian, over fire; St. Anne, over riches; St. Osyth, over house-keys: St. Sylvester, over woods; St.Vincent and St. Anne, over lost goods; St. Urban, over vineyards; St. Anthony, over pigs; St. Gall, St. Leodegar, or St. Ferrioll, over geese; St. Leonard, over ducks; St. German, over hen- roosts; St. Gertrude, over eggs; St. Huldeth, over mice; St. Hubert, over dogs; St. Magnus, over locusts; St. Pelagius, ove ooxen; St. Wendoline, over sheep.

St. Barbara took care that none died without the viaticum.

St. Judocus preserved from mildew; St. Magnus, from grasshoppers: St. Mark, from sudden death.

St. Leonard broke prison chains.

St. Otilia watched over the head; St. Blaise, over the neck; St. Erasmus, the chest; St. Catharine, the tongue; St. Lawrence, the back; St. Burghart, the lower members.

St. Romain drove away spirits.  St. Roche cured pestilence; St. Apollionia, toothache; St. Otilia, bleared eyes; St. Entropius, dropsy; St. Chiacre, emerods; St. Wolfgang, the gout; St. Valentine, the falling sickness; St. Erasmus, the colic; St. Blaise, the quinsy; St. John, shorn; St. Pernel, the ague; St. Vitus, madness; St. Lawrence, rheumatism; SS. Wilgford and Uncumber, bad husbands.

St. Susanna helped in infancy; St. Florian, in fire.

PATRONS OF COUNTRIES, CITIES, AND TOWNS:

Asturia, St. Ephlrem. Austria, SS. Colinan and Leopold. Bavaria, SS. George, Mary, and Wolfgang. Bohemia, SS. Norbert, Wenceslaus, John Nepomuc, Adalbert, Cosmas, Damian, Cyril, and Methodins. Brabant, SS. Peter, Philip, and Andrew. Brandenburg, St. John Baptist. Brunswick, St. Andrew. Burgundy, SS. Andrew and Mary. Denmark, SS. Anscharius and Canute. England, SS. George and Mary. Flanders, St. Peter. France, SS. Mary, Michael, and Denis. Germany, SS. Martin, Boniface, and George. Hanover, St. Mary. Holland, St. Mary. Holstein, St. Andrew. Hunnary, SS. Mary and Louis. Irelsand, St. Patrick. Italy, St. Anthony. Leon, SS. Isidore, Pelagius, Ramiro, and Claude. Luxemburg, SS. Peter, Philip, and Andrew. Mecklenburg, St. John the Evangelist. Naples, St. Jaunarius. Navarre, SS. Fermin and Xavier. Norway, SS. Anscharius and Olans.  Oldenburg, St. Mary. Parma, S. Hilary, John Baptist, Thomas, and Vitalis. Poland, SS. Stanislaus and Hederiga. Pomerania, SS. Mary and Otho. Portugal, SS. Sebastian, James, and George. Prussia, SS. Mary, Adalbert, and Andrew. Russia, SS. Nicholas, Andrew, Wladimir, and Mary. Sardinia, St. Mary. Savoy, St. Maurice. Scotland, St. Andrew. Sicily, SS. Mary, Vitus, Rosalie, and George. Spain, SS. James the Great, Michael, Thomas a Becket, and Edward. Snabia, St. George. Sweden, SS. Bridget, Eric, Anscharius, and John. Switzerland, SS. Martin, Gall, and Mary. Venice, SS. Mark, Justina, and Theodore. Wales, St. David. Many cities and towns bear the name of their patron saint, to whom the principal church is dedicated, as St. Remo, St. Sebastian, St. Malo, St. Omer, St. Quentin, St. Die, Peterborough, Bury St. Edmund's, St. David's, St. Asaph, St. Alban's, Boston (St. Botolph's town), Kircudbright (St. Cuthhert's Church), Malmesbury (Maidulph's town), St. Neot's, St. Ive's, St. Burean's, St. German's, St. Marychurch, St. Andrew's. Others have special saints: St. Fredeswide, of Oxford; St. Sebald, of Nuremberg; St. Giles, of Edinburgh; SS. Peter and Paul, of Rome; St. Mark, of Venice; St. Stephen, of Vienna; St. Genevieve, of Paris; St. Januarius, of Naples; St. Nicholas, of Aberdeen; St. Gudule, of Brussels; St. Norbert, of Antwerp; St. George, of Genoa; St. Ursula, of Cologne; St. Bavon, of Ghent; St. Ambrose, of Milan; St. Vincent, of Lisbon; St. Boniface, of Mentz; St. Domatian, of Bre; St. Romniaold, of Mechlin, etc.

The term patron has also been applied to those who endowed or supported churches and convents. SEE PATRONAGE, ECCLESIASTICAL.

## Patronage Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Patronage Ecclesiastical]]

             is a term for the right of presenting a fit person to a vacant ecclesiastical benefice. SEE PATRON. In the early period of Christianity's successes the  countries where the new religion had been adopted were parceled out into large districts or dioceses, under the superintendence of a bishop, who usually resided in the neighborhood of one of the religious houses. Within such district the bishop had the nomination of the priests, who supplied religious instruction to the people. The priests were paid out of the episcopal treasury, and traveled about in the exercise of their duties, having their residence with the bishop, and forming that episcopi clerus which constituted the notion of cathedral churches and monasteries in their simplest form. Occasionally a bishop .endowed a church in his diocese, and attached a priest permanently to it; and in Gaul, in the 5th century, a bishop who founded a church in a neighboring diocese was allowed to appoint an incumbent of his choice. As Christianity became more universal, and the population increased, the means of worship supplied by the bishoprics, the monasteries, and occasional episcopally endowed churches, became inadequate for the demands of the people, and the proprietors of lands began to build and endow churches in their own possessions. In such cases the chaplain or priest was not paid by the bishop, but was allowed to receive for his maintenance, and for the use of his church, the whole or a part of the profits of the lands with which the founder had endowed it, and the offerings of those who frequented the church for worship. A district was defined by the founder, within which the functions of the officiating priest were to be exercised; and both the burden and the advantages of his ministry were limited to the inhabitants of that district. As these pious foundations tended both to the advancement of religion and to the relief of the episcopal treasury, they were encouraged by the bishops, who readily consecrated the churches thus established, and consented that the incumbent should be resident at the church, and receive the tithes and offerings of the inhabitants and what endowment the founder had annexed to the church.

Eventually it came also to be stipulated with the bishop that the founder and his heirs should have a share in the administration of the property, and have the right to nominate a person in holy orders to be the officiating minister whenever a vacancy occurred. It also became a not unusual arrangement that when owners of estates rebuilt such churches as were dependent on the cathedral, or undertook to pay the incumbent, to the relief of the cathedral, the right of presentation was transferred from the bishop to these persons, who thenceforward stood in the same relation to these churches as if they had been the original founders. Out of these private endowments arose the parochial divisions of a later time, which thus owe their origin rather to accidental and private dotation than to any  legislative scheme for the ecclesiastical subdivision of the country. The bounds of a parish (q.v.) were at first generally commensurate with those of a manor, and the lord of the manor was the hereditary patron. The person enjoying the privileges of a founder was called patronus and advocatus. He had a pre-eminent seat and a burial-place in the church; he enjoyed a precedence among the clergy in processions; his name and arms were engraved on the church and on the church bells, and he was specially named in the public prayers. He had the right to a certain portion of the Church funds, called patronagium, and enjoyed the fruits of the benefice during a vacancy. In the course of time it sometimes happened that, with the concurrence of all parties interested, the patronage, and the church with its revenues and appurtenances, were made over to a religious house, which thus became both patron and perpetual incumbent of the parish, while the immediate duties of the cure were devolved on a vicar or stipendiary curate. In France the right of patronage was often extended to churches not originally private foundations by the necessities of the sovereigns, which led them to take possession of Church property, and bestow it in fee on laymen, who appropriated the greater part of the revenues, and took the appointment of the clergy into their own hands. For a length of time not merely the nomination but the investiture of the clergy came to be exercised by lay patrons, a state of things which roused the indignation of successive popes and councils; until it was at last ruled by the third and fourth Lateran councils (A.D. 1179 and 1215) that the presentation of the patron should not of itself suffice to confer any ecclesiastical benefice, even when qualified by the discretionary power of rejection given to the bishop, when the presentee was a layman. It was declared necessary that the presentee should not merely have the temporalities of the benefice conferred on him by induction, but also be invested with the spiritualities by institution. When the bishop was patron of the benefice, the ceremonies of induction and institution were united in that of collation.

With the growth of the papal power, however, a practice arose by which the right of presentation or induction, which had nominally been left to the patrons, became in some degree nugatory. Towards the close of the 12th century, letters of request, called mandates or expectatives, began to be issued by the popes to patrons, praying that benefices should be bestowed on particular persons. What had at first been requested as a favor was soon demanded as a right, and a code of rules was laid down with regard to  grants and revocations of expectatives. In the 13th century the patronage of all livings whose incumbents had died at the court of Rome (vacantia in curia) was claimed by the pope; and as ecclesiastics of all ranks from every part of Europe frequently visited Rome, the number of benefices vacantia in curia was always very great. Clement V went so far as broadly to declare that the pope possessed the full and free disposal of all ecclesiastical benefices. The practice next arose of the pope making reversionary grants, called provisions of benefices, during the lifetime of the incumbent, and reserving what benefices he thought fit for his private patronage. By means of permissions to hold benefices in commendam, and dispensations for nonresidence and holding of pluralities, upwards of fifty benefices were often held by one person; and throughout all Europe the principal benefices were filled by Italian priests, nominees of the popes, who were often ignorant even of the language of the people among whom they ministered. In the 14th century these claims encountered much opposition. England took the lead in an organized resistance, which was in the end successful. A series of English statutes was passed, beginning with the Statute of Provisors, 25 Edw. III, c. 6, solemnly vindicating the rights of ecclesiastical patronage, and subjecting to severe penalties, SEE PREMUNIRE, all persons who should attempt to enforce the authority of papal provisions in England. The principles adopted by the third and fourth Lateran councils have since been substantially the law of patronage in Roman Catholic countries. A lay patron is, by the canon law, bound to exercise his right of presentation within four, and an ecclesiastical patron within six months, failing which the right to present accrues jure de voluto to the bishop of the diocese. Patronage has always been more or less subject to alienation, transmission, and the changes incident to other kinds of property. The modern practice of patronage in the Roman Catholic Church is detailed under the head PROVISION.

In England, where the modified canon law, which was in use before the Reformation, is still in force, the rights of patrons do not materially differ from those which they possess in Roman Catholic countries. When, in the reign of Henry VIII, the monasteries were abolished and their Church property confiscated, it passed into the hands of the friends ‘and supporters of the king, and so has descended to laymen to the present time. Thus in England the lay patrons were greatly increased in number, and in many cases the tithes and other income which before belonged to the Church. and went to the support of its incumbent, passed directly into the hands of  laymen. At the present time there is no common law governing the various parishes, but the financial government of each one depends largely upon its historical foundation. In some cases the patron has simply the right to present a candidate for the office of parson, who, when appointed, receives all the income of the parish, and who in such case is called rector (q.v.). In some cases a portion of the income belongs to the patron, while a portion is set apart to the incumbent, who in that case is called a vicar (q.v.). In some cases the incumbent is dependent on the will of the patron for his salary, in which case he is called curate (q.v.). The ecclesiastical living or preferment is called a benefice (q.v.), and the patron's right of presentation an advowson (q.v.). There has been of late years some earnest agitation in the Church of England to get rid of patronage altogether; and the evils of a system which places the appointment of the clergy in the hands of laymen, who are often indifferent to the spiritual interests of the Church, are conceded by all parties. But the vested rights are so immense, and the system is so incorporated into the whole organization of the Established Church, that for the abuses of patronage no adequate remedy has yet been discovered; and it is hardly too much to say that there is no radical remedy except in the abolition of the Church Establishment, and the substitution of the voluntary system of Church support as maintained in the United States. In order to prevent the transfer of patronage from the laity to the episcopal dignitaries of the Church of England, some of its laity formed themselves in 1875 into an association called “The Church Private Patronage Association,” the object of which is to counteract by every available means the invasion of the immemorial rights of private patrons, and the consequent monopoly, in case of its success, tending to deter independent clergymen from entering the service of the Established Church. It is a special object of the association to disabuse the public mind of many errors on the subject, fostered by much ignorance and prejudice, to correct prevailing fallacies as to the nature of simony, to show the obvious distinction between a spiritual office and a temporal qualification required for its exercise, and to make it clear that the unfettered transfer of benefices, under certain approved regulations, is the most likely means to improve the quality of the clerical profession, and to add increased stability to the Established Church of England.

In Scotland, at the Reformation, the rights of patrons were reserved, and presbyteries were bound by several statutes to admit any qualified person presented by the patron. The principle of these statutes was retained in the  enactments introducing Episcopacy. On the establishment of Presbyterianism under favor of the civil war, patronage was abolished by act 1649, c. 23, and the election of the clergy was committed to the kirk- session. At the Restoration this statute fell under the act rescissory, and patronage was replaced on its former footing. On the reintroduction of Presbyterianism at the Revolution, patronage was again canceled, and the right to present conferred on the Protestant heritors and the elders of the parish, subject to the approval or rejection of the whole congregation. In consideration of being deprived of the right of presentation, patrons were to receive from the parish a compensation of 600 merks (£33 6s. sterling), on payment of which they were to execute a formal renunciation of their rights. Only three parishes effected this arrangement with the patron, and patronage was permanently restored in all the parishes where no renunciation had been granted, by 10 Anne, c. 12. This act, with modifications introduced by 6 and 7 Vict. c. 61, is now law. Should a patron fail to present for six months after the occurrence of a vacancy, the right to present falls to the presbytery jure de volzto. The presentee, before he acquires a right to the emolumnents of the benefice, must be admitted to it by the presbytery of the bounds. He is first appointed to preach certain trial sermons, after which a day is fixed within six weeks for moderating in his call. On that day the people are invited to sign a written call to the presentee to be their minister, and however few the signatures to the call may be, the presbytery are accustomed to pronounce a formal judgment sustaining it.

They then proceed to examine into the qualifications of the presentee, and, provided the result be satisfactory, the ordination follows (if he have not been previously ordained), and he is formally admitted minister of the parish by the presiding minister. Soon after the above- mentioned act of queen Anne, a feeling which had sprung up in favor of popular election, in opposition to patronage, led to various acts of resistance to the settlement of presentees, and brought about two considerable secessions from the Church of Scotland. It continued for a length of time to be a subject of dispute how far the right of the Church to judge of the fitness of presentees could entitle her to make rules tending to disqualify them, and in particular whether she could legally make the dissatisfaction of the congregation a disqualification. For a long time prior to 1834 there had been no attempt to give effect to any dissent on the part of the congregation. In that year the law of patronage again became a ground of contention, when a majority of the General Assembly embodied their views on the subject in the so-called Veto Act, which declared that no  minister was to be imposed on a congregation when a majority of heads of families and communicants should dissent from his admission. The decision of the Court of Session, confirmed any the House of Lords, making this act to be ultra vires of the General Assembly, provoked the secession of 1843 and the formation of the Free Church (q.v.). After that event an Acts , 6, 7 Vict. c. 71, commonly called Lord Aberdeen's Act, was passed to fix by a legislative provision the effect which the Church courts were in future to be entitled to give to the dissent of the congregation in the collation of ministers. It is there enacted that after the trial sermons the presbytery shall give to the parishioners, being members of the congregation, an opportunity to state objections which do not infer matter of charge to be proceeded against according to the discipline of the Church. The presbytery are either to dispose of the objections, or to refer them to the superior Church judicatory; and if the objections be considered well founded, the presbytery may reject the presentee. No power is, however, given to reject him on the ground of mere dislike as such on the part of any portion of the congregation. In Scotland, patronage is in all cases a heritable right; it is transferable by disposition without enfeudation, but is capable of being feudalized, after which it can be completely conveyed only by infeudation.

In the Protestant churches of Germany, Sweden, and Denmark, patronage exists to some extent, subject to restrictions, which differ much in different localities. The right to present is sometimes divided between the patron and the consistory. The parishioners have in many instances a voice: the appointment may be entirely in their hands, or they may have merely a right to reject the presentee after he has been subjected to the ordeal of a trial sermon; and in either case this right may be exercised, according to local usage, either by the parishioners at large, by a committee of their number. or by the Burgermeister. When there is no patron, the choice generally rests with the consistory in East, and with the parishioners in West Germany. Induction by the superintendent completes the right of the presentee.

In the Greek Church the right to present is generally in the, hands of the bishops, excepting in Russia, where lay patronage exists to a limited extent. Chambers, Cyclop. s.v. See Lippert, Versuch einer historisch- dognmaischen En-twickelung derLehre vom Patronat (Giessen, 1819); Hinschius, Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken u. Protestanten (Berl. 1870); Brit. Qu. Rev. Oct. 1874, art. 6 (on England); Eadie, Eccles. Dict. s.v. (on  Scotland); Gardner, Faiths of the World, 2:633 sq.; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1:335, 502 (on Roman Cath. Ch.); Riddle, Christian Antiquities, and Bingham, Origines Ecclesiasticae (Patristic period).

## Patrophilus Of Scythopolis[[@Headword:Patrophilus Of Scythopolis]]

             one of the leaders of the Eusebian or semi-Arian party in the 4th century, flourished as bishop of Scythopolis until A.D. 859, when he was deposed by the Council of Seleucia for contumacy, having refused to appear before that body to answer the charges of the presbyter Dorotheus (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 2:40; Sozomen, 4:22). He must have died soon after, for his remains were disinterred and insultingly treated (Theophanes, Chronographia) during the reaction which followed the temporary triumph of paganism (A.D. 361-363) under Julian the Apostate. SEE JULIAN. Patrophilus appears to have been eminent for Scriptural knowledge. Eusebius of Emesa is said to have derived his expositions of Scripture from the instructions of Patrophilus and Eusebius of Caesarea (Socrates, 2:9); but Sixtus Senensis is mistaken in ascribing to Patrophilus a translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek (Sixtus Senens. Biblioth. Sacra,, recensita ab A. G. Masch. pt. 2, vol. 2, div. 1, § 23; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec. 3:716). The scanty notices of the life of Patrophilus have been collected by Tillemont, Memoires, vol. 6 and 7.

## Pattalorynchites[[@Headword:Pattalorynchites]]

             SEE PASSALORYNCHITES.

## Pattee, Cross[[@Headword:Pattee, Cross]]

             in heraldry (Lat. patulus, spreading), also called Cross Forme, a cross with its arms expanding towards the ends, and flat at their outer edges.

## Patten, David, D.D[[@Headword:Patten, David, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister was born at Boston, Massachusetts, October 10, 1810. He graduated at the high school there, went thence to Wilbraham Academy, where he was converted in his eighteenth year, and  afterwards to Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, where he graduated in 1834. In 1832 he was licensed to preach, and employed a supply at Hartford, and also supplied Power Street Church, Providence, R.I., during his last college year. On completing his course at Wesleyan he was at once called to the principalship of Wilbraham, and in 1835 entered the New England Conference. He served as. principal at Wilbraham seven years, then entered the pastoral office, and, receiving a transfer to the Providence Conference, was sent in turn to Chestnut Street,, Boston; Nantucket; Elm Street, Bedford; Fall River, and Mathewson Street, Providence, serving two years in each place, and one year to Warren. In 1852 he was appointed presiding elder of Providence District, which office he filled until his election, in 1854, to the professorship of theology in the Biblical Institute at Concord, N.H. By unceasing efforts he secured an enlarged endowment for the institute, its removal to Boston, its establishment on an assured financial, basis as a department of Boston University, and retained his position in its chair of homiletics and pastoral, theology until 1873. He then, on account of impaired health, relinquished his office and became agent of the university and secretary of the board of trustees, devoting to its interests his unfailing love and unflagging zeal until his death, March 26, 1879. The estimate placed upon Dr. Patten's character and. worth by his conference is made manifest by his three elections to the General Conference in 1848, 1852, and 1864. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1879, page 80;. Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Patten, Robert[[@Headword:Patten, Robert]]

             an English divine, flourished under the reign of queen Anne. He was minister at Allendale, Northumberland, and private chaplain to Mr. Forster. He was the author of a History of the Rebellion of 1715 (Lond. 1745), which is reviewed in the London Retrospective Review, 11 (1825), 220- 239.

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

             D.I., an English divine, was born about the first quarter of the 18th century. He was educated at the University of Cambridge, and was honored with a fellowship by Corpus Christi College of that university. After taking holy orders he became rector at Childrey, in Berkshire. He died in 1790. His Sermons and Theological Treatises were published from 1755-62 at Oxford. He wrote principally on Christian evidences. See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. 2:2309.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born. at Halifax, Massachusetts, about 1760, and graduated from Dartmouth College in 1780. He was ordained pastor of the Second Church at Newport, R.I., May 24, 1786, dismissed April 15, 1833, and died in 1839. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:592.

## Pattern[[@Headword:Pattern]]

             (מִרְאֶה, mareh, Num 8:4, appearance, as often rendered; properly

תִּבְנַית, tabnith, Exo 25:9; Exo 25:40; Jos 22:28; 2Ki 16:10; 1Ch 28:11-12; 1Ch 28:18-19, a structure; once תָּכְנַית, toknith, Eze 43:10, an arrangement; τύπος, a type, Tit 2:7; Heb 8:5; elsewhere “example,” etc.; ὑπόδειγμα, a specimen, Heb 9:23, elsewhere “example;” ὑποτύπωσις, a representation, 1Ti 1:16; “form,” 2Ti 1:13; ὁμοίωμα, resemblance, Ecclesiastes 38:28), a model, as of the Tabernacle, shown to Moses on the Mount (Num 8:4; Heb 8:4), or a life to copy after (Tit 2:7).

## Patterson, A. O[[@Headword:Patterson, A. O]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian clergyman and home missionary, was born in Fayette Co., Pa., July 1, 1794. He graduated at Washington College, Pa., and afterwards at Princeton Theological Seminary, and began to preach in 1820. His labors were varied and his pastorates numerous. First, as a missionary, he traveled from Pittsburgh, through Steubenville, Wheeling, Marietta, Oxford, Hamilton, Zanesville, Cleveland, and intermediate points, preaching the Gospel of Christ. During the succeeding fourteen years he was pastor at Mount Pleasant and Sewickley, Pa., when, after much persuasion, he again engaged in missionary work. He, however, remained in this field only a short time; and returning to his pastoral work, he labored successively at Beaver, Pa., New Lisbon and Bethel, Ohio, and West Newton, Pa. The record of his labors in all these places, and also in connection with the Board of Missions, fully demonstrates his usefulness and efficiency. In 1864 he went to Oxford, Ohio, where he died, Dec. 14, 1868. See Appleton's Amer. An. Cyclop. 8:584.

## Patterson, Andrew Oliphant, D.D[[@Headword:Patterson, Andrew Oliphant, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Fayette County, Pennsylvania, July 1, 1794. He graduated from Washington College in 1814, spent one year in theological study at Princeton, and was ordained by the Presbytery of Redstone, April 18, 1821 preached at Mount Pleasant and Swickley churches until 1834, was agent for the Domestic, Board of Missions until 1836, preached at Beaver Church from 1837 to 1839, and, at New Lisbon  from 1840 to 1851; then became stated supply at Bethel, Ohio, for one year, and settled as pastor from 1853 to 1857. He supplied College Corner for. a short time, and died at Oxford, Ohio, December 14, 1868. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 28.

## Patterson, James[[@Headword:Patterson, James]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Ervina, Bucks Co., Pa., March 17, 1779. His early educational opportunities were very limited, yet, having entered Jefferson College, he graduated in 1804; studied theology at Princeton, and was licensed to preach Oct. 5, 1808. On August 9 following he was ordained, and installed pastor of the Church of Bound Brook, N. J., which charge he resigned in June, 1813. In September following he was unanimously chosen pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of the Northern Liberties, in Philadelphia, where his ministrations were successful, and where he continued until his death, Nov. 17, 1837. His publications consist of a Missionary Sermin and several Tracts. A Memoir of his life was published by Rev. Robert Adair (Phila. 1840, 8vo). See also Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:423 sq.

## Patterson, James Cowan[[@Headword:Patterson, James Cowan]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Abbeville District, S. C., Oct. 26, 1803. He was the child of pious parents, who brought him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. In early life he felt called to the ministry, and obeyed. He graduated among the first of his class at Franklin College, under the presidential care of his early friend and pastor, the Rev. Dr. Moses Waddel. Immediately after graduating he was elected to a tutorship in his alma mater. During the years of his connection with the college he studied theology under Dr. Waddel, and was licensed to preach by Hopewell Presbytery; was ordained Oct. 11, 1828, and called to the care of the Presbyterian churches of Macon and Milledgeville, Ga. He afterwards removed to Forsyth, and associated the duties of teacher with those of the ministry; subsequently he preached at Lawrenceville and Decatur, and was called to the presidency of the Gwinnett Institute, a high school for boys and young men. From Gwinnett he was called as president of the Synodical Female College at Griffin, Ga., which, under his devoted care and management, became a complete success and ornament to society and the Church. His health soon after began to fail, and he died July 18, 1866. Dr. Patterson possessed a mind clear, retentive, and accurate. As a preacher he was direct, instructive, and unimpassioned; as a teacher, faithful and thorough, so uniting decision with kindness as to gain the respect and love of his scholars. His steady, uniform piety was the distinguishing feature of his life, and elicited the confidence of all who knew him. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 449. (J. L. S.)

## Patterson, James H[[@Headword:Patterson, James H]]

             M.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Peru, N. Y., March 16, 1810. His earlier days were spent in Canada and Vermont. He was converted in 1826, licensed to preach in 1829, and received on probation into the New Hampshire Conference shortly after. He was admitted to full Conference connection in 1836. His appointments in the ministry were as follows: South New Market, Peterborough, Francistown, and Greenland, in New Hampshire; Peacham, White River, Corinth, and Linden, in Vermont. While at Linden the Conference was divided, and he became member of the Vermont. His next appointments were to Northfield and Woodstock. During his pastorate at the latter place he studied medicine, and took his degree. His voice failing him in 1848, he practiced medicine until recovered strength permitted his resumption of the pastoral work. He now joined the Vermont Conference, and was in 1851 appointed to Glen's Falls, N. Y. His next appointment was Castleton, Vt., and then he went to Cambridge, N. Y. In 1857 he located at Schenectady to supervise the collegiate education of his sons. In the spring of 1857 he was appointed, as effective, to the City Mission in Albany; in 1858 and 1859, to Amsterdam; in 1860, to Schaghticoke; but in 1861 he was superannuated, and he continued in this relation until his death, Dec. 24, 1873, at Glen's Falls, N. Y., where he had settled in 1863. Dr. Patterson was a man of more than usual ability. Had his early training been collegiate, it is likely that he would have risen to great prominence in any profession. He was much respected as a man, and his Christian virtues are praised by all who were brought into fellowship with him. See Minutes of Conferences, 1874, p. 64, 65.

## Patterson, John Brown[[@Headword:Patterson, John Brown]]

             an English divine, celebrated as a student of antiquities, especially those of Greece, was born at Alnwick, Northumberland. Jan. 29, 1804, of pious parentage. From his earliest years John gave indications of superior talents, of fine taste, and of a pure and elevated tone of moral feeling, qualities which, as he advanced in age, became more and more conspicuously developed in his character. In 1810 his father died, and his mother removed to Edinburgh, and John was entered a student at the high school of that northern Athens. He rose to the first place in his classes, and at graduation carried off the highest honors. At the university he sustained these early acquired distinctions, and, having become deeply convinced of his call to  Gospel labors, he entered, in 1824, the divinity hall, then under the charge of the able and learned Dr. Ritchie. He now considered all other pursuits secondary to the study of theology, and applied the full energies of his mind to the subjects of that sacred science. He endeavored by unremitting application to increase his stock of theological acquirements, and engaged successively in the study of natural history, chemistry, and anatomy, both human and comparative, from an anxiety to render all the talents he possessed and all his acquirements subservient to the duties of that holy profession to which he had dedicated his future life. Mr. Patterson, after becoming a licentiate, deferred all thoughts of an immediate settlement, and accepted a proposal made to him, in 1828, to superintend the studies of the young lord Cranstoun at Oxford. After a brief absence Mr. Patterson returned to Scotland, and had not been long established at home, when Mr. Peel, then the home secretary, made him an unexpected offer of the vacant parish of Falkirk; and from the moment of entering on the duties of the parish, which Patterson did in 1830, his ministry fully realized the highest expectations that had been formed of him. The exquisite beauty, the sparkling imagery, and the fine taste displayed every Sabbath in his pulpit compositions; the laborious visitations he made from house to house, in the town as well as in the country; the lively interest he took in the religious education of the young; and the many judicious plans he formed for the temporal as well as the spiritual well-being of the people, rendered him every day more dear to the affections of all. But his bright career on earth was destined to be brief. He died suddenly, June 29,1835, greatly mourned by all his people. Patterson wrote, besides a prize essay On the National Character of the Athenians (Lond. 1828; new ed. with Memoir by Prof. Pillans, Lond. 1859, cr. 8vo), Lectures on St. John's Gospels (Lond. 1840, 12mo). His other Literary Remains were published with a Life (Edinb. 1837, 2 vols. 8vo). See Jamieson, Cyclop. of Relig. Biogr. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

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

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in the north of Ireland, March 20, 1752. Little is known of his youth. In 1772 he emigrated to this country, taught school for a while, joined the Revolutionary army, from which he retired in 1777, and having gone West, was, in 1785, induced to turn his attention to the study of theology; he was licensed to preach in August, 1788, and for ten or twelve years from the following April had charge of the united churches of Raccoon and Montour's Run, Washington County, O., after  which period he confined himself to the former. At the same time he made frequent missionary tours, spending several months among the Shawnee Indians in 1802. In 1816 his health compelled him to resign his charge, and he retired to Pittsburgh, where he still preached occasionally until his death, Feb. 4, 1832. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:522.

## Patterson, Joseph A[[@Headword:Patterson, Joseph A]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Academia, Juniata County, Pa., in 1833. He received his preparatory education at Tuscarora Academy, and in 1853 entered Lafayette College, Pa. After graduating, he spent a year teaching in Tuscarora Academy, and while there, and during a great revival, he received a fresh baptism, which, along with other influences, determined him to study for the ministry. In 1860 he graduated at the theological seminary at Princeton, N.J., and immediately went into the employ of the Board of Domestic Missions, laboring for several months in the vicinity of Luzerne, Warren County, N.J. Subsequently he accepted a unanimous call from Lick Run Church, Jacksonville, Pa.; was ordained and installed July, 1862; and, after a short pastorate of two years and a half, died Dec. 31, 1864. Mr. Patterson was a systematic, practical, earnest minister. See Wilson, Pesb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 140. (J. L. S.)

## Patterson, Nicholas[[@Headword:Patterson, Nicholas]]

             a Presbyterian minister. was born in Path Valley, Cumberland County, Pa., Oct. 1, 1792. He pursued his preparatory studies first in Chambersburg, Pa., then in the academy at Summersville, N. J.; graduated in the college at Princeton, N. J.; studied theology in the Princeton Theological Seminary; was licensed in 1818, and ordained in 1821. He labored for many years in Delaware, and died in Wilmington, Del., Jan. 7, 1865. Mr. Patterson was a simplehearted, good man, an excellent preacher, and a favorite pastor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 222. (J. L. S.)

## Patterson, Robert[[@Headword:Patterson, Robert]]

             LL.D., an American philanthropist and educator, was born in the north of Ireland, May 30,1743. In 1768 he emigrated to Philadelphia. In 1774 he was appointed principal of the academy at Wilmington, Delaware. In the Revolutionary war he acted as brigade major. In 1779 he was appointed professor of mathematics in the University of Pennsylvania, and then vice- provost. In 1805 he was appointed director of the Mint of the United  States. In 1819 he was chosen president of the American Peace Society, and later president of the American Philosophical Society. He died July 22, 1824. A remarkable trait of Mr. Patterson's character, and its crowning excellence, was his fervent piety. It influenced all his conduct from his youth. He was an elder of the Scotch Presbyterian Church nearly half a century. In the transactions of the Philosophical Society he published many papers.

## Patterson, Robert, D.D[[@Headword:Patterson, Robert, D.D]]

             a Reformed Presbyterian minister, was born at Littlekenny, County Donegal, Ireland. He studied there and at Londonderry, attended the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Presbyterian Church in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, was licensed to preach in 1851 and ordained in 1852; became pastor at Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1854, at Chicago, Illinois, in 1857, of the Jefferson Presbyterian Church in the same city in 1867; removed to California in 1873, became pastor at San Francisco the same year, at Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1878, in 1880 minister at Brooklyn, California, and died at San Francisco, January 17, 1885. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Patterson, Stearns[[@Headword:Patterson, Stearns]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Dunstable, now Nashua, N. H., Jan. 2,1813. He was converted in 1826, and connected himself with the Congregationalist Church, to which his parents belonged. In 1829 he entered the academy at Hopkintown, and a few years later he entered Yale College; but his health failing, he was compelled to relinquish his studies and engage in other pursuits. From 1837 to 1840 he filled a clerkship in the city of New York. In November, 1840, he went to Maryland and engaged in teaching. In August, 1841, Rev. Enos R. Williams held a camp-meeting on Kent Island. Patterson attended, and was inclined towards Methodism. In 1842 he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church on Kent Island. In August of the same year he removed to St. Michaels, Talbot County, Maryland, and took charge of a school. On Dec. 7, 1843, he was licensed to exhort, and on Feb. 15, 1844, he was licensed to preach, and recommended to the Philadelphia Conference. He was admitted in 1844, and appointed to Strasburgh. His subsequent appointments were as follows: Brandywine, Cecil, two years supernumerary, Grove, Mount Zioln, Manayunk, Phoenixville, Marietta, six years professor in Wesleyan Female College in Wilmington, Del., then to Merion Square, and afterwards to Radnor and Bethesda. In 1866 he was granted the relation of superannuate, and so continued until his death, May 19, 1871. He united in himself all the qualifications necessary for success in the ministry. He was devoted to God and the Church, scholarly in his habits of study, systematic in the performance of his duties, and kind towards all with whom he was brought into fellowship. See Minutes of Conferences, 1872, p. 24, 25.

## Patterson, William D[[@Headword:Patterson, William D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Mercersburg, Pa., July 22,1833. He received a careful parental training, graduated at Marshall College, Pa., in  1852, and at the Western Theological Seminary in 1856; was licensed June 17, 1858, and having preached with great acceptance for a year to the churches of Dillsburg and Petersburg, Pa., a call for his services as pastor was presented to him, which being accepted, the Presbytery met, Aug. 14, 1860, to ordain and install him. But his health gave way so seriously about the time of the meeting of the Presbytery that he could not be present to be ordained; nor was he ever able after this to resume his labors. He spent some time in traveling, and died Nov. 24, 1861. Mr. Patterson was a man of deep piety, cultivated mind, and genial disposition, and was more than ordinarily endowed for the work to which he had been called. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 194. (J. L. S.)

## Patterson, William, Mckendree, D.D[[@Headword:Patterson, William, Mckendree, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born near St. Louis, Missouri, September 19, 1838. He graduated from St. Charles College, Missouri, in 1860; in 1861 he joined the St. Louis Conference; next he became a chaplain in the Confederate army; in 1865 an agent for the American Bible Society; in 1868 he again entered the ministry, joining the Memphis Conference; in 1872 he became agent for Vanderbilt University; in 1878 a missionary to Mexico, and met with phenomenal success. He was elected to the General Conference of 1886, and edited the Mexican Evanagelista. In April 1888, he became agent for the American Bible Society in Venezuela, South America. He died at Caracas, of yellow fever, April 19, 1888. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South, 1889, page 35.

## Patteson, John Coleridge[[@Headword:Patteson, John Coleridge]]

             an English divine, whose life was one of remarkable self-denial, unremitting labor, and repeated exposure to perils by land and sea, was born April 1, 1827. His maternal great-uncle was the celebrated Samuel Taylor Coleridge. His father, judge Patteson, was a lawyer, unsurpassed in his day. Under his immediate supervision John Coleridge was trained until ready for Eton. He was then a bright, conscientious, painstaking boy, “ever ready for fun, but never for mischief.” He was the leader in his class and of his playmates. In 1845 he entered Merton College, at Oxford University, and distinguished himself as he had at Eton. In 1849 he obtained at Merton College a classical second-class, and subsequently a fellowship. After the examination for his degree he went abroad and traveled, in the companionship of a family whom he served as tutor, in Germany and Italy. In 1853, after his return home, he was ordained for the priesthood, and was made country parson at Alfington. He had not been there long when he encountered bishop Selwyn, of New Zealand, who was home on a visit, and who induced him to return with him. On March 29, 1855, they sailed from Gravesend together. Patteson went without parade of feeling or many words. First at Auckland (New Zealand), and later at Norfolk Island, and still later at the island of Mota (Banks's Islands), bishop Selwyn was supporting a missionary college, whither he brought youth from Melanesia for civilization and mental and religious training. In this work principally Patteson assisted until 1860. when the Melanesian company was transferred to Kohimarama, near Auckland, and he was placed in charge.

A short time afterwards Patteson was rewarded for his faithfulness by promotion to the episcopal dignity as bishop of the Melanesian islands. From this time he directed and conducted the annual voyages of all the  missionary operations in those islands, though, of course, with the full counsel and support of bishop Selwyn, both as his primate and as the original pioneer. The facility with which Patteson learned the languages of the islands, which is mentioned as remarkable, afforded him blessed opportunities for efficiency, and he lost none of them, as we shall presently see. He reduced the different dialects to writing, obtained a printing-press and types, and printed the grammars of nearly thirty of their. He also prepared translations of portions of the Scriptures, and rendered hymns into the tongue of Mota, which, remarks Sir W. Martin, “are described to me by competent judges as of singular excellence.” He also comprehensively considered, as appears from many passages in his letters, the principles on which the numerous tongues of that region might be placed in mutual relation. Even the eminent philologist, Prof. Max Muller, bears warm testimony to the great attainments and capacities of bishop Patteson, whom he affectionately esteemed. There was no office or function, however high or however humble, to which bishop Patteson could not turn, and turn effectively, his mind or hand. An adept in early life at games, exercises, and amusements, his gift of corporal versatility thus acquired fitted him for handicraft and labor of all kinds. Almost amphibious in his habits, he became, while disliking the physical conditions of sealife, a hardy seaman and an accomplished navigator. When ashore he was farmer, gardener, woodman, porter, carpenter, tailor, cook, or anything else that necessity demanded and his large experience taught. In higher regions of exertion he was, amid the severest trials of epidemic dysentery or typhus, or in the crisis of some dangerous visit to an untried island, physician, surgeon, and the tenderest of nurses, all in one; without ever intermitting his sleepless activity in the most personal duties of a pastor, or the regular maintenance of the more public offices of religion, or abating his readiness to turn to that which was evidently the most laborious and exacting of all his duties, the duty of the schoolmaster, engaged upon the double work of opening the understanding of his pupils, and of applying the mental instrument thus improved to the perception and reception of Christian truth. Mota, one of Banks's Islands, was recognized as the missionary headquarters of Melanesia. From this place excursions were frequently made to the different Melanesian islands for the purpose of reaching their inhabitants, and preparing them for Christianity. Such visitations were always attended with great peril. Besides the danger of shipwreck, was the hazard in approaching islands where the temper of the inhabitants was either unknown or known to be fierce, or islands whose inhabitants had  been recently ill-used by other Europeans. In April, 1871, bishop Patteson set out again on such a voyage of visitation. On Sept. 16 he found himself off the Santa Cruz group. He had long been anxious for the planting of the cross among its savage inhabitants, but he was aware also of the many obstacles in his way. The natives, by reason of the capture of many of their number annually by the traders from Australia, whither they were virtually carried as slaves, had become very distrustful of the whites. But the danger this time was much aggravated, though the bishop was unaware of it. The traders had painted their ship like the bishop's, and had enticed a number of the Melanesians to go on board the vessel, and had thus carried them off. Though the bishop had visited before at Nackapu, the natives mistook the last visit also to have been made by him, and therefore they were no sooner in a position to revenge the loss of their friends than they embraced it. As the missionary party came near to Nackapu four canoes were seen hovering about the coral reef which surrounded the island. The vessel had to feel her way; so, lest the men in the canoes should be perplexed, bishop Patteson ordered the boat to be lowered, and when asked to go into one of the native boats, as this was always found a good mode of disarming suspicion, he did it, and was carried off towards the shore. The boat from the schooner could not get over the reef.

The bishop was seen to land on the beach, and was seen no more alive. Eventually his body was recovered. The placid smile was still on the face; there was a palmleaf fastened over the breast, and when the mat in which the body was wrapped was opened, there were five wounds. All this is an almost certain indication that his death was the vengeance for five of the natives. The sweet, calm smile preached peace to the mourners who had lost his guiding spirit, but they could not look on it long. The next morning, St. Matthew's Day, the body of John Coleridge Patteson was committed to the waters of the Pacific, his “son after the faith,” Joseph Atkin, reading the burial service (Life, 2:569- 571). We are fully conscious that no summary can do justice to the character and career of bishop Patteson, but we trust that enough has been given to set forth an outline of the man. In bishop Patteson were singularly combined the spirit of chivalry, the glorious ornament of a bygone time; the spirit of charity, rare in every age; and the spirit of reverence, so seldom seen in our day. He was eminently and entirely an English Churchman. But, while he was an Anglican, the ductile and thoughtful character of his mind preserved him from all rigidity and narrowness. His indulgence in judgment of men overleaped all boundaries of opinion. He evinced his liberality most clearly in his refusal to set up rival missions. He corresponded with a  Wesleyan missionary on a subject of common interest to both. He declined applications for pastoral care from the people of Lifu, where the agency of the London Missionary Society had existed, but had for some time been suspended, on learning that two missionaries were on the way from Sidney. In that same island, too, he attended (in 1858) the service conducted by a native teacher acting under the society, and only officiated himself when he had found from good authority that there would be no objection. His costume on this occasion was only distinguished by a black coat and white tie, and he pursued the manner of service common among the Presbyterians and Dissenters, though employing freely the language of the Prayer-book in his extempore prayer. “I felt,” he says, in his diary, “quite at my ease while preaching, and Joseph (his companion) told me that it was all very clear” (Life, 1:166). See Miss Yonge, Life of John Coleridge Patteson, Missionary Bishop of the Melanesian Islands (Lond. 1874, 2 vols. 8vo): Life of Bishop Patteson, published by the (London) “Christian Knowledge Society,” and republished at New York in 1873. See also the Spirit of Missions, Jan. 1872, p. 58; The (Lond.) Quart. Rev. Oct, 1874, art. vi.

## Pattison, Dorothy Wyndlow[[@Headword:Pattison, Dorothy Wyndlow]]

             (usually called, Sister Dora), an English philanthropist, was born at Hauxwell, Yorkshire, January 16, 1832, being the daughter of the rector there. In 1864 she joined the "Sisterhood of Good Samaritans," a religious order recognised by the Church of England, and the next year became a nurse in the Cottage Hospital at Walsale, where she devoted herself in the most exemplary manner and with rare skill to the care of the sick, both in body and soul, until, exhausted in strength, she retired in 1876,. and died December 24, 1878. See her Biography, by Margaret Lonsdale (London and Boston, 1880).

## Pattison, Mark, D.D[[@Headword:Pattison, Mark, D.D]]

             an English clergyman,. was born at Hornby, Yorkshire, in 1813, and educated at Oriel College, Oxford. He became a fellow of Lincoln College in 1840 and rector in 1861. He died July 31, 1884, leaving numerous essays and reviews on literary and educational subjects. See Men of the Time, s.v.

## Pattison, Robert Everett[[@Headword:Pattison, Robert Everett]]

             D.D., an American Baptist divine who distinguished himself in the pulpit and the rostrum, was born at Benson, Vt., Aug. 19, 1800, and was educated at Amherst College, Mass., class of 1826. He was at once made tutor in Columbian College, Washington, D. C. He was ordained for the work of the holy ministry at Salem, Mass., in 1829, and in 1830 became pastor of the First Baptist Church in Providence, R. I. — a most important charge. He was elected in 1836 president of Waterville College, Me., holding the position till 1840, when he was recalled to his pastorate in Providence. In 1843 he was appointed one of the corresponding secretaries of the Baptist Board of Foreign Missions. He returned to his educational labors as a professor in the Covington Theological Seminary, Ky., in 1846. But in 1848 the legislature of that state (by an act afterwards declared unconstitutional) reconstructed the board of trustees, compelling his resignation. He was shortly after elected professor of theology in the Newton Theological Institution, Mass., resigning his chair in 1853 to serve a second term as president of Waterville College. He was subsequently at the head of Onead Female Institute, Worcester, Mass., and a professor successively in the theological department of Shurtleff College, Ill., and in the Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago. He died Nov. 21,1874. Dr. Pattison was an eminently pious and modest man. He wrote considerably  for periodicals, and was the author of a Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians (1859). (L. E. S.)

## Pattison, Robert H[[@Headword:Pattison, Robert H]]

             D.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Cambridge, Md., Jan. 22, 1824. He was the child of Methodist parents, at the early are of ten was converted, and at once joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. At fourteen he entered the preparatory department of Dickinson College, and, after passing successfully through the entire curriculum of study, he graduated in the class of 1843. During his residence at Carlisle he was licensed to preach. At the close of his collegiate career he taught for two years at Baltimore. He was admitted into the Philadelphia Conference in April, 1846. His first appointment was Dorchester Circuit as junior preacher. His subsequent appointments were: Seaford, Princess Anne, Church Creek, Quantico, Snow Hill, Middletown, and Cantwell's Bridge, Del.; Asbury, Philadelphia; Kensington; Twelfth Street, Philadelphia; Port Deposit; St. George's, Philadelphia; Tabernacle, Philadelphia; St. Peter's, Reading, Harrisburg District; West Philadelphia, where he died, Feb. 14, 1875. At the conference of 1858 Dr. Pattison was chosen its secretary, and he continued to hold that office until his death. In 1868 he was a delegate to the General Conference, and was chosen by that body as one of its assistant secretaries. He was also associated with the management of most of the various religious and benevolent organizations connected with the Philadelphia Conference, and was for several years a member of the Parent Missionary Board at New York. “Dr. Pattison was a good man a true Methodist, a faithful pastor, an acceptable and earnest preacher, and a Christian gentleman, whom to know was to esteem and love. Less brilliant, perhaps, than some, he was wiser and more consistent than many, while his sound judgment, unswerving integrity, unfailing courtesy, unwearying diligence, kindly sympathy, and unwavering loyalty to religion, friendship, and patriotism, made him a man to honor, trust, and love.” See Minutes of Conferences, 1875, p. 40.

## Patton, Samuel[[@Headword:Patton, Samuel]]

             D.D., a distinguished minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Lancaster District, S. C., Jan. 27, 1797, of Presbyterian parents. His childhood was serious. He was converted in 1816 in a Methodist revival which he happened to attend. He was soon persuaded of  his duty to preach the Gospel, but for a time strove much against these impressions. He emigrated with his parents to Georgia, and from thence to Tennessee, in 1819. Soon after he was licensed to preach, and joined the Tennessee Conference, and was stationed at Sequachy Valley, Tenn.; he was next successively preacher in charge at Glinch, West Va.; Tuscaloosa Circuit, Ala.; and the so-called Alabama Circuit. His health failing him, he located, and finally removed to Holston Conference, East Tennessee, in 1825, and was presiding elder on Abingdon District the same year; was on stations and districts till 1838-9, when he was made agent for Holston College; then on districts and stations till 1847, when he was made editor of the Holston Christian Advocate, in which work he died, August, 1854, in holy peace, trusting in the merits of Christ, and declaring “all is well.” Dr. Patton was a studious and earnest man and preacher. He stood in the first ranks of the ministry of his Church. See Deems, Annals of Southern Methodism for 1855, p. 341.

## Patton, William Weston, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Patton, William Weston, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in New York city, October 19, 1821; graduated from the University of New York in 1839, and from Union Theological Seminary in 1842; was a pastor until 1867; until 1872 editor of the Advance; western secretary of the American Missionary Association, 1873-74; lecturer at Chicago and Oberlin Theological seminaries, 1874-77; president of Howard University, Washington, D.C., 1877-89; and died December 31. 1889. Dr. Patton was a corporate member of the A.B.C. D.F.M. from 1869; one of the founders of the American Missionary Association; vice-president of the Sanitary Commission of the North-west;  member of the Society of the Cincinnati; honorary member of the Society of Science, Literature, and Art (London, 1885). For a list of his published works, see the Congregational Year-book, 1890, page 34.

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

             a Congregational and subsequently a Presbyterian minister, was born at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, August 23, 1798. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1818, attended Princeton Theological Seminary from 1819 to 1820, and in the latter year (June 8) was ordained an evangelist in Charlotte, Vermont. Having gathered a Presbyterian congregation in New York city, named the Central Presbyterian Church, he was installed pastor May 7, 1822, and remained in charge until September 15, 1834. The three years following he was secretary on the Presbyterian Education Society. From October 1837, to October 1847, he was pastor of the Spring Street Church, New York city, sand from 1848 to 1852 was pastor of the Hammond Street Congregational Church. During the next ten years he resided in New York without charge; then removed to New Haven, Conn., where, in 1863, he was acting-pastor of the College Street Church. Subsequently he resided at New Haven without charge, until his  death, September 9, 1879. From 1864 Dr. Patton was one of the vice- presidents of the American Missionary Association.

Besides important articles in various periodicals, he published, in 1833, a revised and enlarged edition of The Cottage Bible, in two volumes. The same year he published The Village Testament, and in 1859 the same work, revised, under the title of The Cottage Testament. His other works are, The Christian Psalmist (1836): — The Laws of Fermentation, etc. (1871): — The Judgment of Jerusalem (1877): — Jesus of Nazareth (1878): — Bible Principles Illustrated by Bible Characters (1879). He also issued editions of Edwards on Revivals and Finney on Revivals, besides a number of pamphlets. He was an ardent advocate of temperance and a powerful lecturer on that subject. He made fourteen voyages to Europe, at first for health, and afterwards as a delegate to various religious bodies. Dr. Patton was a clear, forcible, and copious writer, a bold and impressive speaker, valiant for the truth, an humble and devout Christian. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1880, page 8; Cong. Year-book, 1880, page 25; Filial Tribute, by Dr. William W. Patton (Washington, 1880).

## Pattrick, George, Ll.B.[[@Headword:Pattrick, George, Ll.B.]]

             a pious Calvinistic English divine, was born near Colchester in 1746. He was educated at St. Paul's School; studied the law and practiced at Dedham, but relinquished his profession. received orders in 1770, and entered himself at Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge. He became vicar of Aveley, Essex, in 1772; chaplain of Morden College, Blackheath, in 1787. In 1790 he was suddenly dismissed for being a Methodist, but was finally reinstated as lecturer of Woolwich in 1792, and of St. Bride's, Fleet Street, and of St. Leonard's, London, in 1797. He died in 1800. His Sermon was, with a Help to Prayer; to which are prefixed Memoirs of the Life of the Author (Lond. 1801, 8vo), were published after his death.

## Pau[[@Headword:Pau]]

             (Heb. Pau', פָּעוּ, a bleating, or yawning; but in 1Ch 1:50, PAI, פָּעַי, though some copies agree with the reading in Genesis; Sept. Φογώρ, i.e. chasm; Vulg. Phau), the capital of Hadar, king of Edom (Gen 36:39). The only name that bears any resemblance to it is Phauara, a ruined place in Idumaea mentioned by Seetzen.

## Paul[[@Headword:Paul]]

             (Παῦλος, the Greek form of the common Latin name Paulus), originally (see below) Saul (q.v.), the specially appointed “Apostle to the Gentiles.” (In the following treatment of this important character, we endeavor to weave in the Scripture narrative whatever illustration may be gathered from modern researches and speculations.

I. Preliminary Inquiries. —

1. Original Authorities. Nearly all the authentic materials for the life of the apostle Paul are contained in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Pauline Epistles. Out of a comparison of these authorities the biographer has to construct his account of the really important period of the apostle's life. The early traditions of the Church appear to have left almost untouched the space of time for which we possess those sacred and abundant sources of knowledge; and they aim only at supplying a few particulars in the biography beyond the points at which the narrative of the Acts begins and terminates.

The inspired history and the Epistles lie side by side, and are to all appearance quite independent of one another. It was not the purpose of the historian to write a life of Paul, even as much as the received name of his book would seem to imply. The book called the Acts of the Apostles is an account of the beginnings of the kingdom of Christ on the earth. The large space which the apostle occupies in it is due to the important part which he bore in spreading that kingdom. As to the Epistles, nothing can be plainer than that they were written without reference to the history; and there is no attempt in the canon to combine them with it so as to form what we should call in modern phrase the apostle's “Life and Letters.” What amount of agreement and what amount of discrepancy may be observed between these independent authorities is a question of the greatest interest and importance, and one upon which various opinions are entertained. The most adverse and extreme criticism is ably represented by Dr. Baur of Tubingen (Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi [Stuttg. 1845]), who finds so much opposition between what he holds to be the few authentic Pauline Epistles and the Acts of the Apostles that he pronounces the history to be an interested fiction. But his criticism is the very caricature of captiousness. We have but to imagine it applied to any history and letters of acknowledged authenticity, and we feel irresistibly how arbitrary and  unhistorical it is. Putting aside this extreme view, it is not to be denied that difficulties are to be met with in reconciling completely the Acts and the received Epistles of Paul. What the solutions of such difficulties may be, whether there are any direct contradictions, how far the apparent differences may be due to the purpose of the respective writers, by what arrangement all the facts presented to us may best be dovetailed together — these are the various questions which have given' so much occupation to the critics and expositors of Paul, and upon some of which it seems to be yet impossible to arrive at a decisive conclusion. We shall assume the Acts of the Apostles to be a genuine and authentic work of Luke. the companion of Paul, and shall speak of the Epistles at the places which we believe them to occupy in the history.

2. Name. — There can be no doubt that the apostle's name, as a Jew, was Saul; but when or how he received the Roman name Paul, which he bears in the Acts of the Apostles from Act 13:9, which he uses in his Epistles, and by which he is called by Peter (2Pe 3:15), is unknown. It is quite probable that he had borne the name of Paul as a Roman citizen; and it is no objection to this view that then this name would have appeared first, and that of Saul later (Witsius, Meletem. Leid. p. 47). If it is not merely accidental that Luke first calls him Paul in the passage mentioned, the reason may be that the apostle then first commenced his public and separate ministry; and Paul, a Gentile name, was that which the apostle of the Gentiles always on in Church history (Baur, Paul. p. 93). Even if the Jews still used the old Jewish name, there was afterwards no occasion for Luke to mention it. The account of Jerome that Paul assumed this name upon the conversion by him of Sergius Paulus (Act 13:7; comp. August. Confess. 8:4; Bengel and Olshausen, on Act 13:9) is perhaps not a tradition, but a mere suggestion of that father himself, on the ground that the name Paul first appears in the passage following that account. Indeed, Baur (p. 93) would have us believe that this was the view of Luke himself, and that the whole account of the conversion of Sergius Paulus was built up to illustrate this change of name! But if there had been any connection between the two events, it would have been natural for the writer to indicate it (see Neander, p. 108). It is easy to suppose simply that, in becoming a Christian. according to the Eastern custom, SEE NAME, he assumed the name Paul, as one common among Greeks and Romans, and quite similar in sound to Saul (comp. Chrysost. and Theophyl. in Suicer, Thesaur. 2:648), perhaps with some reference to the etymological  signification of the name (comp. 1Co 15:9; Paulus, Lat. small, little; comp. Gr. Παῦρος). Yet we should then expect that Luke would employ the name Paul from Act 9:19 onward. (For another view, see Kuinol, Comment. ad loc.) SEE SERGIUS PAULUS.

II. Personal History. — We purpose under this head to gather together all the information given either directly or incidentally in the Acts and Epistles concerning the apostle's life, relegating to a subsequent head the various disputes that have been raised on some of them.

1. Youth and Early Career. — Paul was a native of Tarsus, a city of Cilicia (Act 22:3, etc.), and was of Jewish descent, of the tribe of Benjamin (Php 3:5). From his father he inherited the rights of Roman citizenship, which had probably been earned by some of his ancestry through services rendered to the Roman state (Lardner, Works, 1:228, ed. 1788, 8vo; Grotius, ad Acta 22:28). The supposition that he enjoyed them in virtue of being a native of Tarsus is not well founded; for though that city had been created by Augustus an urbs libera (Dion. Chrysost. 2:36, ed. Reiske; Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 27), it does not follow from this that all its natives enjoyed the privilege of Roman citizenship; and besides, from Act 21:39 compared with Act 22:24; Act 22:27, it may be inferred that, as the chief captain knew Paul to be a native of Tarsus, and yet was not aware of his Roman citizenship, the latter of these was not necessarily associated with the former. From his receiving the name Saul it has been supposed that he was the first-born son of his parents, and that they had long desired and often asked for such a favor from God; that he was not their only child, however, appears from the mention made (Act 23:16) of his “sister's son.” Whether Andronicus, Junia, and Herodion, whom he terms, in the Epistle to the Romans (Rom 16:7; Rom 16:11), συγγενεῖς μου, were of the number of his blood relations, or only belonged to the same tribe with him, is a question on which learned men have taken different sides (comp. Lardner, Works, 6:235; Estius, Commn. ad loc.). (See below.)

At that time Tarsus was the rival of Athens and Alexandria as a place of learning and philosophical research (Strabo, 14:5); but to what extent the future “Apostle of the Gentiles” enjoyed the advantage of its schools we have no means of accurately determining. Attempts have been made to show from his writings that he was familiar with Greek literature. and Dr. Bentley has not hesitated to affirm that “as Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, so it is manifest from this chapter alone (Acts  xxvii), if nothing else had been now extant, that Paul was a great master in all the learning of the Greeks” (Boyle Lectures, serm. 3, sub init.). An authority like that of Bentley in a question of Greek literature is not to be lightly set aside; yet on referring to the evidence in support of this opinion it will not be found to justify it. It must be allowed, however, that the mere circumstance of his having spent his early years in such a city as Tarsus could not but exert a very powerful influence on the mind of such a man as Paul, in the way of sharpening his faculties, refining his tastes, and enlarging the circle of his sympathies and affections. “If even to the meanest citizen,” as Eichhorn remarks, “such a circumstance affords — unless he be by nature utterly unobservant — much information which otherwise he could not have obtained, and in consequence of this a certain activity of mind, how much greater may not its effect be supposed to have been on a great mind like that of Paul? To his birth and early residence in Tarsus may be traced the urbanity which the apostle at no time laid aside, and of which he was frequently a perfect model, many insinuating turns which he gives to his epistles, and a more skillful use of the Greek tongue than a Jew born and educated in Palestine could well have attained” (Einleit. ins N.T. 3:5). (See below.)

But whatever uncertainty may hang over the early studies of the apostle in the department of Greek learning, there can be no doubt that, being the son of a Pharisee, and destined, in all probability, from his infancy to the pursuits of a doctor of Jewish law, he would be carefully instructed from his earliest years in the elements of Rabbinical lore. It is probable also that at this time he acquired his skill in that handicraft trade by which in later years he frequently supported himself (Act 17:3; 1Co 4:12, etc.). This trade is described by Luke as that of a σκηνοποιός, a word regarding the meaning of which there has been no small difference of opinion. (See below.) It does not follow that the family were in the necessitous condition which such manual labor commonly implies; for it was a wholesome custom among the Jews to teach every child some trade, though there might be little prospect of his depending upon it for his living. SEE HANDICRAFT.

When Paul made his defense before his countrymen at Jerusalem (Acts 22), he told them that, though born in Tarsus, he had been “brought up” (ἀνατεθραμμένος) in Jerusalem. He must, therefore, have been yet a boy when he was removed, in all probability for the sake of his education, to the Holy City of his fathers. We may imagine him arriving there perhaps at  some age between ten and fifteen, already a Hellenist, speaking Greek and familiar with the Greek version of the Scriptures, possessing, besides the knowledge of his trade, the elements of Gentile learning — to be taught at Jerusalem “according to the perfect manner of the law of the fathers.” He learned, he says, “at the feet of Gamaliel.” He who was to resist so stoutly the usurpations of the law had for his teacher one of the most eminent of all the doctors of the law. Gamaliel is supposed to be the person of that name who is celebrated in the writings of the Talmudists as one of the seven teachers to whom the title “Rabban” was given (Lightfoot, Horace Hebr. in Act. v. 34; Neander, Apostol. Zeitalter, p. 62; Otho, Lex. Rabbinico-Philippians s.v. Rabbi). Besides acquaintance with the Jewish law, and a sincere conviction of the supreme excellence of Judaism, Gamaliel appears to have possessed a singularly calm and judicious mind, and to have exercised a freedom of thought as well as pursued a range of study very unlike what was common among the party to which he belonged (Act 5:34-39; comp. Neander, l.c.). How much the instructions and the example of such a teacher may have influenced the mind of Paul favorably we may imagine, but cannot affirm. SEE GAMALIEL.

It is singular that on the occasion of his well-known intervention in the apostolical history the master's counsels of toleration are in marked contrast to the persecuting zeal so soon displayed by the pupil. The temper of Gamaliel himself was moderate and candid, and he was personally free from bigotry; but his teaching was that of the strictest of the Pharisees, and bore its natural fruit when lodged in the ardent and thoroughgoing nature of Saul. Other fruits, besides that of a zeal which persecuted the Church, may no doubt be referred to the time when Saul sat at the feet of Gamaliel. A thorough training in the Scriptures and in the traditions of the elders under an acute and accomplished master must have done much to exercise the mind of Saul, and to make him feel at home in the subjects in which he was afterwards to be so intensely interested. Nor are we at all bound to suppose that, because his zeal for the law was strong enough to set him upon persecuting the believers in Jesus, he had therefore experienced none of the doubts and struggles which, according to his subsequent testimony, it was the nature of the law to produce (see Romans 7). On the contrary, we can scarcely imagine these as absent from the spiritual life of Saul as he passed from boyhood to manhood. Earnest persecutors are, oftener than not, men who have been tormented by inward struggles and perplexities. The pupil of Gamaliel may have been crushing a multitude of conflicts in  his own mind when he threw himself into the holy work of extirpating the new heresy. SEE MORAL SENSE.

Paul is introduced to our notice by the sacred historian for the first time in connection with the martyrdom of Stephen, in which transaction he was, if not an assistant, something more than a mere spectator. A.D. 29. He is described at this time (Act 7:58) as “a young man” (νεανίας); but this term was employed with so much latitude by the Greeks that it is impossible from the mere use of it to determine whether the party to whom it was applied was under thirty, or between that and forty. The probability is that Paul must have reached the age of thirty at least; for otherwise it is not likely that he would have shared the counsels of the chief priests, or been intrusted by them with the entire responsibility of executing their designs against the followers of Jesus, as we know was the case (Act 26:10; Act 26:12). For such a task he showed a painful aptitude, and discharged it with a zeal which spared neither age nor sex (Act 26:10-11). At that time the Church experienced the sudden expansion which was connected with the ordaining of the Seven appointed to serve tables, and with the special power and inspiration of Stephen. Among those who disputed with Stephen were some “of them of Cilicia.” We naturally think of Saul as having been one of these, when we find him afterwards keeping the clothes of those suborned witnesses who, according to the law (Deu 17:7), were the first to cast stones at Stephenm “Saul,” says the sacred writer, significantly, “was consenting unto his death.” The angelic glory that shone from Stephen's face, and the divine truth of his words, failing to subdue the spirit of religious hatred now burning in Saul's breast, must have embittered and aggravated its rage. Saul was passing through a terrible crisis for a man of his nature. But he was not one to be moved from his stern purpose by the native refinement and tenderness which he must have been stifling within him. He was the most unwearied and unrelenting of persecutors. As for Saul, he made havoc of the Church, entering into every house (κατὰ τοὺς οἴκους, house by house), and haling men and women, committed them to prison” (Act 8:3).

2. Conversion. — But while thus, in his ignorance and unbelief, he was seeking to be “injurious” to the cause of Christ, the great Author of Christianity was about to make him a distinguished trophy of its power, and one of the most devoted and successful of its advocates. The persecutor was to be converted. A.D. 30. What the nature of that conversion was we are now to observe.  Having undertaken to follow up the believers “unto strange cities,” Saul naturally turned his thoughts to Damascus, expecting to find among the numerous Jewish residents of that populous city some adherents of “the way” (τῆς ὁδοῦ), and trusting, we must presume, to be allowed by the connivance of the governor to apprehend them. What befell him as he journeyed thither is related in detail three times in the Acts, first by the historian in his own person, then in the two addresses made by Paul at Jerusalem and before Agrippa. These three narratives are not repetitions of one another: there are differences between them which some critics choose to regard as irreconcilable. Considering that the same author is responsible for all the accounts, we gain nothing, of course, for the authenticity of their statements by bringing them into agreement; but it seems quite clear that the author himself could not have been conscious of any contradictions in the narratives. He can scarcely have had any motive for placing side by side inconsistent reports of Paul's conversion; and that he should have admitted inconsistencies on such a matter through mere carelessness is hardly credible. Of the three narratives, that of the historian himself must claim to be the most purely historical: Paul's subsequent accounts were likely to be affected by the purpose for which he introduced them. Luke's statement is to be read in Act 9:3-19, where, however, the words, “It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks,” included in the Vulgate and English version, ought to be omitted. The sudden light from heaven; the voice of Jesus speaking with authority to his persecutor; Saul struck to the ground, blinded, overcome; the three days' suspense; the coming of Ananias as a messenger of the Lord; and Saul's baptism — these were the leading features, in the eyes of the historian, of the great event, and in these we must look for the chief significance of the conversion.

Let us now compare the historical relation with those which we have in Paul's speeches (Acts 22, 26). The reader will do well to consider each in its place. But we have here to deal with the bare fact of agreement or difference. With regard to the light, the speeches add to what Luke tells us that the phenomenon occurred at mid-day, and that the light shone round, and was visible to Saul's companions as well as to himself. The second speech says that at the shining of this light the whole company (“we all”) fell to the ground. This is not contradicted by what is said (Act 9:7), “The men which journeyed with him stood speechless,” for there is no emphasis on “stood,” nor is the standing antithetical to Saul's falling down. We have but to suppose the others rising before Saul, or standing still  afterwards in greater perplexity, through not seeing or hearing what Saul saw and heard, to reconcile the narratives without forcing either. After the question, Why persecutest thou me?” the second speech adds, “It is hard for thee to kick against the goads.” Then both the speeches supply a question and answer — “I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus (of Nazareth), whom thou persecutest.” In the direction to go into Damascus and await orders there, the first speech agrees with Acts 9. But whereas according to that chapter the men with Saul “heard the voice,” in the first speech it is said “they heard not the voice of him that spake to me.” It seems reasonable to conclude from the two passages that the men actually heard sounds, but not, like Saul, an articulate voice.

With regard to the visit of Ananias, there is no collision between the ninth chapter and the first speech, the latter only attributing additional words to Ananias. The second speech ceases to give details of the conversion after the words, “I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest. But rise, and stand on thy feet.” Paul adds, from the mouth of Jesus, an exposition of the purpose for which he had appeared to him. It is easy to say that in ascribing these words to Jesus, Paul or his professed reporter is violating the order and sequence of the earlier accounts. But, if we bear in mind the nature and purpose of Paul's address before Agrippa, we shall surely not suppose that he is violating the strict truth, when he adds to the words which Jesus spoke to him at the moment of the light and the sound, without interposing any reference to a later occasion, that fuller exposition of the meaning of the crisis through which he was passing, which he was not to receive till afterwards. What Saul actually heard from Jesus on the way as he journeyed was afterwards interpreted, to the mind of Saul, into those definite expressions. For we must not forget that, whatever we hold as to the external nature of the phenomena we are considering, the whole transaction was essentially, in any case, a spiritual communication. That the Lord Jesus manifested himself as a living person to the man Saul, and spoke to him so that his very words could be understood, is the substantial fact declared to us.

The purport of the three narratives is that an actual conversation took place between Saul and the Lord Jesus. It is remarkable that in none of them is Saul said to have seen Jesus. The grounds for believing that he did so are the two expressions of Ananias (Act 9:17), “‘The Lord Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way,” and (Act 22:14) ‘ That thou shouldest see the Just One,” and the statement of Paul (1Co 15:8), “Last of all he was seen of me also.” Comparing these passages with the narratives, we conclude either that Saul had an  instantaneous vision of Jesus as the flash of light blinded him, or that the “seeing” was that apprehension of his presence which would go with a real conversation. How it was that Saul “saw” and “heard,” we are quite unable to determine. That the light, and the sound or voice, were both different from any ordinary phenomena with which Saul and his companions were familiar, is unquestionably implied in the narrative. It is also implied that they were specially significant to Saul, and not to those with him. We gather therefore that there were real outward phenomena, through which Saul was made inwardly sensible of a presence revealed to him alone. (See below.) Externally, there was a flash of light. Spiritually, “the light of the Gospel of the glory of the Christ, who is the image of God,” shone upon Saul, and convicted the darkness of the heart which had shut out love and knew not the glory of the cross. Externally, Saul fell to the ground. Spiritually, he was prostrated by shame, when he knew whom he had been persecuting. Externally, sounds issued out of heaven. Spiritually, the Crucified said to Saul, with tender remonstrance, “I am Jesus. why persecutest thou me?” Whether audibly to his companions, or audibly to the Lord Jesus only, Saul confessed himself in the spirit the servant of him whose name he had hated. He gave himself up, without being able to see his way, to the disposal of him whom he now knew to have vindicated his claim over him by the very sacrifice which formerly he had despised. The Pharisee was converted, once for all, into a disciple of Jesus the Crucified.

The only mention in the Epistles of Paul of the outward phenomena attending his conversion is that in 1Co 15:8,” Last of all he was seen of me also.” But there is one important passage in which he speaks distinctly of his conversion itself. Dr. Baur (Paul. p. 64), with his readiness to find out discrepancies, insists that this passage represents quite a different process from that recorded in the Acts. It is manifestly not a repetition of what we have been reading and considering, but it in the most perfect harmony with it. In the Epistle to the Galatians (Gal 1:15-16) Paul has these words, “When it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen” ... (ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί). What words could express more exactly than these the spiritual experience which occurred to Saul on the way to Damascus? The manifestation of Jesus as the Son of God is clearly the main point in the narrative. This manifestation was brought about through a removal of the veils of prejudice and ignorance which blinded the eyes of Saul to a  crucified Deliverer conquering through sacrifice. Whatever part the senses may have played in the transaction, the essence of it in any case must have been Saul's inward vision of a spiritual Lord close to his spirit, from whom he could not escape, whose every command he was henceforth to obey in the spirit.

It would be groundless to assume that the new convictions of that mid-day immediately cleared and settled themselves in Saul's mind. It is sufficient to say that he was then converted, or turned round. For a while. no doubt, his inward state was one of awe and expectation. He was “led by the hand” spiritually by his Master, as well as bodily by his companions. Thus entering Damascus as a servant of the Lord Jesus, he sought the house of one whom he had, perhaps, intended to persecute. Judas may have been known to his guest as a disciple of the Lord. Certainly the fame of Saul's coming had preceded him; and Ananias, “a devout man according to the law,” but a believer in Jesus, when directed by the Lord to visit him, wonders at what he is told concerning the notorious persecutor. He obeys, however; and going to Saul in the name of the Lord Jesus, who had appeared to him in the way,” he puts his hands on him that he may receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. Thereupon Saul's eyes are immediately purged, and his sight is restored. “The same hour,” says Paul (Act 22:13), “I looked up upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see the Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth. For thou shalt be his witness unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.” Every word in this address strikes some chord which we hear sounded again and again in Paul's Epistles. The new convert is not, as it is so common to say, converted from Judaism to Christianity of the God of the Jewish fathers chooses him. He is chosen to know God's will. That will is manifested in the Righteous One. Him Saul sees and hears, in order that he may be a witness of him to all men. The eternal will of the God of Abraham; that will revealed in a righteous Son of God; the testimony concerning him, a Gospel to mankind-these are the essentially Pauline principles which are declared in all the teaching of the apostle, and illustrated in all his actions.

3. Sojourn in Damascus and Arabia. — After the recovery of his sight, Saul received the external symbol of the washing away of his sins in baptism. He then broke his three days' fast, and was strengthened — an image, again, of the strengthening of his faint and hungering spirit through a participation in the divine life of the Church at Damascus. He was at once  received into the fellowship of the disciples, and began without delay the work to which Ananias had designated him; and to the astonishment of all his hearers he proclaimed Jesus in the synagogues, declaring him to be the Son of God. This was the natural sequel to his conversion: he was to proclaim Jesus the Crucified, first to the Jews as their own Christ, afterwards to the world as the Son of the living God.

The narrative in the Acts tells us simply that he was occupied in this work, with increasing vigor, for “many days,” up to the time when imminent danger drove him from Damascus. From the Epistle to the Galatians (Gal 1:17-18) we learn that the many days were at least a good part of “three years,” and that Saul, not thinking it necessary to procure authority to preach from the apostles that were before him, went after his conversion into Arabia, and returned from thence to Damascus. We know nothing whatever of this visit to Arabia — to what district Saul went, how long he stayed, or for what purpose he went there. (Stanley suggests, Sin. and Pal. p. 50, that he may even have visited Mount Sinai.) From the antithetical way in which it is opposed to a visit to the apostles at Jerusalem, we infer that it took place before he deliberately committed himself to the task of proclaiming Jesus as the Christ; and also, with some probability, that he was seeking seclusion, in order that, by conferring “not with flesh and blood,” but with the Lord in the Spirit, he might receive more deeply into his mind the commission given him at his conversion. That Saul did not spend the greater portion of the “three years” at Damascus seems probable, for these two reasons:

(1) that the anger of the Jews was not likely to have borne with two or three years of such a life as Saul's now was without coming to a crisis; and

(2) that the disciples at Jerusalem would not have been likely to mistrust Saul as they did if they had heard of him as preaching Jesus at Damascus for the same considerable period. We can hardly resist the conviction that the time was spent in private preparation, perhaps in receiving those remarkable disclosures which he afterwards called “my gospel” (2Ti 2:8), analogous to the corresponding period of the other apostles personal intercourse with the Lord. Thus we may venture to suppose he received that Gospel which afterwards he preached “by revelation” from Christ (Gal 1:12). Neander (l.c. sec. 121) and Anger (De Tempp. in Actis App. Ratione. p. 123) have endeavored to show that Paul went  into Arabia to preach the Gospel; but the reasons they adduce have little weight (comp. Olshausen, on Act 9:20-25).

Now that we have arrived at Saul's departure from Damascus, we are again upon historical ground (A.D. 33), and have the double evidence of Luke in the Acts (Act 9:21 sq.) and of the apostle in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians (2Co 11:32). According to the former, the Jews lay in wait for Saul, intending to kill him, and watched the gates of the city that he might not escape from them. Knowing this, the disciples took him by night and let him down in a basket from the wall. According to Paul (2Co 11:32), it was the ethnarch under Aretas the king who watched for him, desiring to apprehend him. There is no difficulty in reconciling the two statements. We might similarly say that our Lord was put to death either by the Jews or by the Roman governor. There is more difficulty in ascertaining how an officer of king Aretas should be governing in Damascus, and why he should lend himself to the designs of the Jews. But we learn from secular history that the affairs of Damascus were, at the time, in such an unsettled state as to make the narrative not improbable. SEE ARETAS.

Having escaped from Damascus, Saul betook himself to Jerusalem, and there “assayed to join himself to the disciples; but they were all afraid of him, and believed not that he was a disciple.” In this natural but trying difficulty Saul was befriended by one whose name was henceforth closely associated with his. Barnabas became his sponsor to the apostles and Church at Jerusalem. assuring them-from some personal knowledge, we must presume-of the facts of Saul's conversion and subsequent behavior at Damascus. It is noticeable that the seeing and hearing are still the leading features in the conversion, and the name of Jesus in the preaching. Barnabas declared how “Saul had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how that he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.” Barnabas's introduction removed the fears of the apostles, and Paul “was with them coming in and going out at Jerusalem.” His Hellenistical education made him. like Stephen, a successful disputant against the “Grecians;” and it is not strange that the former persecutor was singled out from the other believers as the object of a murderous hostility. He was therefore again urged to flee; and by way of Caesarea took himself to his native city, Tarsus (Act 9:26-30. In Gal 1:20, the order of the localities is not strictly observed).

In the Epistle to the Galatians (Gal 1:17-23) Paul adds certain particulars, in which only a perverse and captious criticism could see  anything contradictory to the facts just related. He tells us that his motive for going up to Jerusalem rather than anywhere else was that he might see Peter; that he abode with him fifteen days; that the only apostles he saw were Peter and James the Lord's brother; and that afterwards he came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia, remaining unknown by face, though well known for his conversion, to the churches in Judaea which were in Christ. Paul's object in referring to this connection of his with those who were apostles before him was to show that he had never accepted his apostleship as a commission from them. On this point the narrative in the Acts entirely agrees with Paul's own earnest asseverations in his Epistles. He received his commission from the Lord Jesus, and also mediately through Ananias. This commission included a special designation to preach Christ to the Gentiles. Upon the latter designation he did not act until circumstances opened the way for it. But he at once began to proclaim Jesus as the Christ to his own countrymen. Barnabas introduced him to the apostles, not as seeking their sanction, but as having seen and heard the Lord Jesus, and as having boldly spoken already in his name.

4. Ministry at Antioch. — During this stay of Paul at Tarsus, which lasted several years, occupied doubtless with those elsewhere unrecorded labors to some of which he occasionally alludes (2Co 11:24-25), a movement was going on at Antioch which raised that city to an importance second only to that of Jerusalem itself in the early history of the Church. In the life of the apostle of the Gentiles Antioch claims a most conspicuous place. It was there that the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles first took root, and from thence that it was afterwards propagated. Its geographical position, its political and commercial importance, and the presence of a large and powerful Jewish element in its population, were the more obvious characteristics which adapted it for such a use. There came to Antioch, when the persecution which arose about Stephen scattered upon their different routes the disciples who had been assembled at Jerusalem, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, eager to tell all who would hear them the good news concerning the Lord Jesus. Until Antioch was reached, the word was spoken “to none but unto Jews only” (Act 11:19). ‘But here the Gentiles also (οἱ ῞Ελληνες) — not, as in the A.V., “the Grecians” — were among the hearers of the word.

A great number believed; and when this was reported at Jerusalem, Barnabas was sent on a special mission to Antioch.  As the work grew under his hands, and “much people was added unto the Lord,” Barnabas felt the need of help, and went himself to Tarsus to seek Saul. Possibly at Damascus, certainly at Jerusalem, he had been a witness of Saul's energy and devotedness, and skill in disputation. He had been drawn to him by the bond of a most brotherly affection. He therefore longed for him as a helper, and succeeded in bringing him to Antioch. There they labored together unremittingly for “a whole year,” mixing with the constant assemblies of the believers, and “teaching much people.” All this time, as Luke would give us to understand, Saul was subordinate to Barnabas. Until “Saul” became “Paul,” we read of Barnabas and Saul” (Act 11:30; Act 12:25; Act 13:2; Act 13:7). Afterwards the order changes to “Paul and Barnabas.” It seems reasonable to conclude that there was no marked peculiarity in the teaching of Saul during the Antioch period. He held and taught, in common with the other Jewish believers, the simple faith in Jesus the Christ, crucified and raised from the dead. Nor did he ever afterwards depart from the simplicity of this faith. But new circumstances stirred up new questions; and then it was to Saul of Tarsus that it was given to see, more clearly than any others saw, those new applications of the old truth, those deep and world-wide relations of it, with which his work was to be permanently associated. In the mean time, according to the usual method of the divine government, facts were silently growing, which were to suggest and occasion the future developments of faith and practice, and of these facts the most conspicuous was the unprecedented accession of Gentile proselytes at Antioch.

An opportunity soon occurred, of which Barnabas and Saul joyfully availed themselves, for proving the affection of these new disciples towards their brethren at Jerusalem, and for knitting the two communities together in the bonds of practical fellowship. A manifest impulse from the Holy Spirit began this work. There came “prophets” from Jerusalem to Antioch: “and there stood up one of them, named Agabus, and signified by the Spirit that there should be great dearth throughout all the world.” The “prophets” who now arrived may have been the Simeon and Lucius and Manaen mentioned in 13:1, besides Agabus and others. The prediction of the dearth need not have been purposeless; it would naturally have a direct reference to the needs of the poorer brethren and the duty of the richer. It is obvious that the fulfillment followed closely upon the intimation of the coming famine. For the disciples at Antioch determined to send contributions immediately to Jerusalem; and the gift was conveyed to the elders of that  Church by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. The time of this dearth is vaguely designated in the Acts as the reign of Claudius. It is ascertained from Josephus's history that a severe famine did actually prevail in Judaea, and especially at Jerusalem, at the very time fixed by the event recorded in Acts 12, the death of Herod Agrippa. This was in A.D. 44. SEE AGABUS.

It could not have been necessary for the mere safe conduct of the contribution that Barnabas and Saul should go in person to Jerusalem. We are bound to see in the relations between the Mother-Church and that of Antioch, of which this visit is illustrative, examples of the deep feeling of the necessity of union which dwelt in the heart of the early Church. The apostles did not go forth to teach a system, but to enlarge a body. The spirit which directed and furthered their labors was essentially the spirit of fellowship. By this spirit Saul of Tarsus was practically trained in strict cooperation with his elders in the Church. The habits which he learned now were to aid in guarding him at a later time from supposing that the independence which he was bound to claim should involve the slightest breach or loosening of the bonds of the universal brotherhood.

Having discharged their errand, Barnabas and Saul returned to Antioch, bringing with them another helper, John surnamed Mark, sister's son to Barnabas. The work of prophesying and teaching was resumed. Several of the oldest and most honored of the believers in Jesus were expounding the way of God and organizing the Church in that busy metropolis. Travelers were incessantly passing to and fro. Antioch was in constant communication with Cilicia, with Cyprus, with all the neighboring countries. The question must have forced itself upon hundreds of the “Christians” at Antioch, “What is the meaning of this faith of ours, of this baptism, of this incorporation, of this kingdom of the Son of God, for the world? The Gospel is not for Judaea alone: here are we called by it at Antioch. Is it meant to stop here?” The Church was pregnant with a great movement, and the time of her delivery was at hand. We forget the whole method of the divine work in the nurture of the Church if we ascribe to the impulses of the Holy Ghost any theatrical suddenness, and disconnect them from the thoughts which were brooding in the minds of the disciples. At every point we find both circumstances and inward reasonings preparing the crisis. Something of direct expectation seems to be implied in what is said of the leaders of the Church at Antioch, that they were “ministering to the Lord, and fasting,” when the Holy Ghost spoke to them. Without doubt  they knew it for a seal set upon previous surmises, when the voice came clearly to the general mind, “Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.” That “work” was partially known already to the Christians of Antioch: who could be so fit for it as the two brothers in the faith and in mutual affection, the son of exhortation, and the highly accomplished and undaunted convert who had from the first been called “a chosen vessel, to bear the name of the Lord before the Gentiles, and kings, and the people of Israel?”

When we look back, from the higher ground of Paul's apostolic activity, to the years that passed between his conversion and the first missionary journey, we cannot observe without reverence the patient humility with which Saul waited for his Master's time. He did not say for once only, “Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?” Obedience to Christ was thenceforth his ruling principle. Submitting, as he believed, to his Lord's direction, he was content to work for a long time as the subordinate colleague of his seniors in the faith. He was thus the better prepared, when the call came, to act with the authority which that call conferred upon him. He left Antioch, however, still the second to Barnabas. Everything was done with orderly gravity in the sending forth of the two missionaries. Their brethren, after fasting and prayer, laid their hands on them, and so they departed. A.D. 44.

5. First Missionary Journey. — Much must have been hidden from Barnabas and Saul as to the issues of the journey on which they embarked. But one thing was clear to them, that they were sent forth to speak the Word of God. They did not go in their own name or for their own purposes; they were instruments for uttering what the Eternal God himself was saying to men. We shall find in the history a perfectly definite representation of what Paul announced and taught as he journeyed from city to city. But the first characteristic feature of his teaching was the absolute conviction that he was only the bearer of a heavenly message. It is idle to discuss Paul's character or views without recognising this fact. We are compelled to think of him as of a man who was capable of cherishing such a conviction with perfect assurance. We are bound to bear in mind the unspeakable influence which that conviction must have exerted upon his nature. The writer of the Acts proceeds upon the same assumption. He tells us that as soon as Barnabas and Saul reached Cyprus, they began to “announce the Word of God.”

The second fact to be observed is, that for the present they delivered their message in the synagogues of the Jews only. They trod the old path till they should be drawn out of it. But when they had gone through the island, from Salamis to Paphos, they were called upon to explain their doctrine to an eminent Gentile. Sergius Paulus, the proconsul. This Roman officer, like so many of his countrymen, had already come under the influence of Jewish teaching; but it was in the corrupt form of magical pretensions, which throve so luxuriantly upon the godless credulity of that age. A Jew, named Barjesus, or Elymas, a magus and false prophet, had attached himself to the governor, and had no doubt interested his mind, for he was an intelligent man, with what he had told him of the history and hopes of the Jews. SEE ELYMAS.

Accordingly, when Sergius Paulus heard of the strange teachers who were announcing to the Jews the advent of their true Messiah, he wished to see them, and sent for them. The impostor, instinctively hating the apostles, and seeing his influence over the proconsul in danger of perishing, did what he could to withstand them. Then Saul, “who is also called Paul,” denouncing Elymas in remarkable terms, declared against him God's sentence of temporary blindness. The blindness immediately fell upon him; and the proconsul, moved by the scene and persuaded by the teaching of the apostle, became a believer.

There is a singular parallelism in several points between the history of Paul and that of Peter in the Acts. Baur presents it in a highly effective form (Paul. p. 91 etc.), to support his theory of the composition of this book; and this is one of the services which he has incidentally rendered to the full understanding of the early history of the Church. Thus Paul's discomfiture of Elymas reminds us of Peter's denunciation of Simon Magus. The two incidents bring strongly before us one of the great adverse elements with which the Gospel had to contend in that age. Everywhere there were counterfeits of the spiritual powers which the apostles claimed and put forth. It was necessary for the preachers of Christ, not so much to prove themselves stronger than the magicians and soothsayers, as to guard against being confounded with them. One distinguishing mark of the true servants of the Spirit would be that of not trading upon their spiritual powers (Act 8:20). Another would be that of shunning every sort of concealment and artifice, and courting the daylight of open truth. Paul's language to Elymas is studiously directed to the reproof of the tricks of the religious impostor. The apostle, full of the Holy Ghost, looked steadily on  the deceiver, spoke in the name of a God of light and righteousness and straightforward ways, and put forth the power of that God for the vindication of truth against delusion. The punishment of Elymas was itself symbolical, and conveyed “teaching of the Lord.” He had chosen to create a spiritual darkness around him; and now there fell upon him a mist and a darkness, and he went about seeking some one to lead him by the hand. If on reading this account we refer to Peter's reproof of Simon Magus, we shall be struck by the differences as well as the resemblance which we shall observe. But we shall undoubtedly gain a stronger impression of this part of the apostolic work, viz. the conflict to be waged between the Spirit of Christ and of the Church and the evil spirits of a dark superstition to which men were surrendering themselves as slaves. We shall feel the worth and power of that candid and open temper in which alone Paul would commend his cause; and in the conversion of Sergius Paulus we shall see an exemplary type of many victories to be won by truth over falsehood.

This point is made a special crisis in the history of the apostle by the writer of the Acts. Saul now becomes Paul, and begins to take precedence of Barnabas. Nothing is said to explain the change of name. No reader could resist the temptation of supposing that there must be some connection between Saul's new name and that of his distinguished Roman convert. But on reflection it does not seem probable that Paul would either have wished, or have consented, to change his own name for that of a distinguished convert. If we. put Sergius Paulus aside, we know that it was exceedingly common for Jews to bear, besides their own Jewish name, another borrowed from the country with which they had become connected (see Conybeare and Howson, 1:163, for full illustrations). Thus we have Simeon also named Niger, Barnabas also named Justus, John also named Marcus. There is no reason therefore why Saul should not have borne from infancy the other name of Paul. In that case he would be Saul among his own countrymen, Paulus among the Gentiles. We must understand Luke as wishing to mark strongly the transition point between Saul's activity among his own countrymen and his new labors as the apostle of the Gentiles, by calling him Saul only during the first, and Paul only afterwards. (See above.)

The conversion of Sergius Paulus may be said, perhaps, to mark the beginning of the work among the Gentiles; otherwise, it was not in Cyprus that any change took place in the method hitherto followed by Barnabas and Saul in preaching the Gospel. Their public addresses were as yet  confined to the synagogues; but it was soon to be otherwise. From Paphos “Paul and his company” set sail for the mainland, and arrived at Perga in Pamphylia. Here the heart of their companion John failed him, and he returned to Jerusalem, From Perga they traveled on to a place, obscure in secular history, but most memorable in the history of the kingdom of Christ — Antioch in Pisidia (q.v.). Here “they went into the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and sat down.” Small as the place was, it contained its colony of Jews, and with them proselytes who worshipped the God of the Jews. The degree to which the Jews had spread and settled themselves over the world, and the influence they had gained over the more respectable of their Gentile neighbors, and especially over the women of the better class, are facts difficult to appreciate justly, but are proved by undoubted evidence, and are very important for us to bear in mind. This Pisidian Antioch may have been more Jewish than most similar towns, but it was not more so than many of much greater size and importance. What took place here in the synagogue and in the city is interesting to us not only on account of its bearing on the history, but also because it represents more or less exactly what afterwards occurred in many other places. It cannot be without design that we have single but detailed examples given us in the Acts of the various kinds of addresses which Paul used to deliver in appealing to his different audiences. He had to address himself, in the course of his missionary labors, to Jews, knowing and receiving the Scriptures; to ignorant barbarians; to cultivated Greeks; to mobs enraged against him personally; to magistrates and kings. It is an inestimable help in studying the apostle and his work that we have specimens of the tone and the arguments he was accustomed to use in all these situations. These will be noticed in their places. In what he said at the synagogue in Antioch we recognize the type of the addresses in which he would introduce his message to his Jewish fellow-countrymen.

The apostles sat silent with the rest of the assembly, while the Law and the Prophets were read. They and their audience were united in reverence for the sacred books. Then the rulers of the synagogue sent to invite them, as strangers but brethren, to speak any word of exhortation which might be in them to the people. Paul stood up, and beckoning with his hand, he spoke. (The speech is given in Act 13:16-41.) The characteristics we observe in it are these: The speaker begins by acknowledging “the God of this people Israel.” He ascribes to him the calling out of the nation and the conduct of its subsequent history. He touches on the chief points of that  history up to the reign of David, whom he brings out into prominence. He then names JESUS as the promised Son of David. To convey some knowledge of Jesus to the minds of his hearers, he recounts the chief facts of the Gospel history; the preparatory preaching and baptism of John (of which the rumor had spread perhaps to Antioch); the condemnation of Jesus by the rulers “who knew neither him nor the prophets,” and his resurrection. That Resurrection is declared to be the fulfillment of all God's promises of life, given to the fathers. Through Jesus, therefore, is now proclaimed by God himself the forgiveness of sins and full justification. The apostle concludes by drawing from the prophets a warning against unbelief. If this is an authentic example of Paul's preaching, it was impossible for Peter or John to start more exclusively from the Jewish covenant and promises than did the apostle of the Gentiles.

How entirely this discourse resembles those of Peter and of Stephen in the earlier chapters of the Acts! There is only one specially Pauline touch in the whole-the words in Act 13:39, “By Him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.” “Evidently foisted in,” says Baur (p. 103), who thinks we are dealing with a mere fiction, to prevent the speech from appearing too Petrine, and to give it a slightly Pauline air.” Certainly, it sounds like an echo of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. But is there therefore the slightest incongruity between this and the other parts of the address? Does not that “forgiveness of sins” which Peter and Paul proclaimed with the most perfect agreement connect itself naturally, in the thoughts of one exercised by the law as Saul of Tarsus had been, with justification not by the law but by grace? If we suppose that Saul had accepted just the faith which the older apostles held in Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah of the Jews, crucified and raised from the dead according to the teaching of the prophets, and in the remission of sins through him confirmed by the gift of the Holy (host; and that he had also had those experiences, not known to the older apostles, of which we see the working in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, this speech, in all its parts, is precisely what we might expect: this is the very teaching which the apostle of the Gentiles must have everywhere and always set forth, when he was speaking “God's Word” for the first time to an assembly of his fellow- countrymen.

The discourse thus epitomized produced a strong impression; and the hearers (not “the Gentiles,” which the best MSS. omit) requested the apostles to repeat their message on the next Sabbath. During the week so  much interest was excited by the teaching of the apostles that on the Sabbath-day “almost the whole city came together to hear the Word of God.” It was this concern of the Gentiles which appears to have first alienated the minds of the Jews from what they had heard. They were filled with envy. They probably felt that there was a difference between those efforts to gain Gentile proselytes in which they had themselves been so successful and this new preaching of a Messiah in whom a justification which the law could not give was offered to men. The eagerness of the Gentiles to hear may have confirmed their instinctive apprehensions. The Jewish envy once roused became a power of deadly hostility to the Gospel; and these Jews at Antioch set themselves to oppose bitterly the words which Paul spoke. We have here, therefore, a new phase in the history of the Gospel. In these foreign countries it is not the cross or Nazareth which is most immediately repulsive to the Jews in the proclaiming of Jesus. It is the wound given to Jewish importance in the association of Gentiles with Jews as the receivers of the good tidings. If the Gentiles had been asked to become Jews, no offense would have been taken. But the proclamation of the Christ could not be thus governed and restrained. It overleaped, by its own force, these narrowing methods. It was felt to be addressed not to one nation only, but to mankind.

The new opposition brought out new action on the part of the apostles. Rejected by the Jews, they became bold and outspoken, and turned from them to the Gentiles. They remembered and declared what the prophets had foretold of the enlightening and deliverance of the whole world. In speaking to the Gentiles, therefore, they were simply fulfilling the promise of the Covenant. The gift, we observe, of which the Jews were depriving themselves, and which the Gentiles who believed were accepting, is described as “eternal life” (ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή). It was the life of which the risen Jesus was the fountain, which Peter and John had declared at Jerusalem, and of which all acts of healing were set forth as signs. This was now poured out largely upon the Gentiles. The Word of the Lord was published widely, and had much fruit. Henceforth Paul and Barnabas knew it to be their commission, not the less to present their message to Jews first, but in the absence of an adequate Jewish medium to deal directly with the Gentiles. But this expansion of the Gospel work brought with it new difficulties and dangers. At Antioch now, as in every city afterwards, the unbelieving Jews used their influence with their own adherents among the Gentiles, and especially the women of the higher class, to persuade the  authorities or the populace to persecute the apostles, and to drive them from the place.

With their own spirits raised, and amid much enthusiasm of their disciples, Paul and Barnabas now traveled on to Iconium, where the occurrences at Antioch were repeated, and from thence to the Lycaonian country, which contained the cities Lystra and Derbe. Here they had to deal with uncivilized heathens. At Lystra the healing of a cripple took place, the narrative of which runs very parallel to the account of the similar act done by Peter and John at the gate of the Temple. The agreement becomes closer, if we insert here, with Lachmann, before “Stand upright on thy feet,” the words, “I say unto thee in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” The parallel leads us to observe more distinctly that every messenger of Jesus Christ was a herald of life. The spiritual life-the ζωὴ αἰώνιος— which was of faith, is illustrated and expounded by the invigoration of impotent limbs. The same truth was to be conveyed to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the heathens of Lycaonia. The act was received naturally by these pagans. They took the apostles for gods, calling Barnabas, who was of the more imposing presence, Zeus (Jupiter), and Paul, who was the chief speaker, Hermes (Mercurius). This mistake, followed up by the attempt to offer sacrifices to them, gives occasion to the recording of an address in which we see a type of what the apostles would say to an ignorant pagan audience. Appeals to the Scriptures, references to the God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, would have been out of place.

The apostles name the living God, who made heaven and earth and the sea, and all things therein: the God of the whole world, and all the nations in it. They declare themselves to be his messengers. They expatiate upon the tokens of himself which the Father of men had not withheld, in that he did them good, sending rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, the supporters of life and joy. They protest that in restoring the cripple they had only acted as instruments of the living God. They themselves' were not gods, but human beings of like passions with the Lycacinians. The living God was now manifesting himself more clearly to men, desiring that henceforth the nations should not walk in their own ways, but his. They therefore call upon the people to give up the vanities of idol worship, and to turn to the living God (comp. 1Th 1:9-10). In this address the name of Jesus does not occur. It is easy to understand that the apostles preached him as the Son of that living God to whom they bore witness, telling the people of his death and resurrection, and announcing his coming again.  Although the people of Lystra had been so ready to worship Paul and Barnabas, the repulse of their idolatrous instincts appears to have provoked them, and they allowed themselves to be persuaded into hostility by Jews who came from Antioch and Iconium, so that they attacked Paul with stones, and thought they had killed him. He recovered, however, as the disciples were standing round him, and went again into the city. The next day he left it with Barnabas, and went to Derbe, and thence they returned once more to Lystra, and so to Iconium and Antioch, renewing their exhortations to the disciples, bidding them not to think their trials strange, but to recognize them as the appointed door through which the kingdom of heaven, into which they were called, was to be entered. In order to establish the churches after their departure, they solemnly appointed “elders” in every city. Then they came down to the coast, and from Attalia they sailed home to Antioch in Syria, where they related the successes which had been granted to them, and especially the “opening of the door of faith to the Gentiles.” Thus the First Missionary Journey ended.

6. Apostolic Council at Jerusalem (Acts 15; Galatians 2). — Upon that missionary journey follows most naturally the next important scene which the historian sets before us-the council held at Jerusalem to determine the relations of Gentile believers to the law of Moses. A.D. 47. In following this portion of the history, we encounter. two of the greater questions which the biographer of Paul has to consider. One of these is historical. What were the relations between the apostle Paul and the twelve? The other is critical. How is Galatians 2 to be connected with the narrative of the Acts?

The relations of Paul and the twelve will best be set forth in the narrative. But we must explain here why we accept Paul's statements in the Galatian epistle as additional to the history in Acts 15. The first impression of any reader would be a supposition that the two writers might be referring to the same event. The one would at least bring the other to his mind. In both he reads of Paul and Barnabas going up to Jerusalem, reporting the Gospel preached to the uncircumcised, and discussing with the older apostles the terms to be imposed upon Gentile believers. In both the conclusion is announced that these believers should be entirely free from the necessity of circumcision. These are main points which the narratives have in common. On looking more closely into both, the second impression upon the reader's mind may possibly be that of a certain incompatibility between the two. Many joints and members of the transaction as given by Luke do not  appear in the account of Paul. Others in one or two cases are substituted. Further, the visit to Jerusalem is the third mentioned in the Acts, after Saul's conversion; in Galatians, it is apparently mentioned as the second. Supposing this sense of incompatibility to remain, the reader will go on to inquire whether the visit to Jerusalem mentioned in Galatians coincides better with any other mentioned in the Acts as the second (11:30) or the fourth (18:22). He will, in all probability, conclude without hesitation that it does not. Another view will remain, that Paul refers to a visit not recorded in the Acts at all. This is a possible hypothesis; and it is recommended by the vigorous sense of Paley. But where are we to place the visit? The only possible place for it is some short time before the visit of ch. 15. But it can scarcely be denied that the language of ch. 15 decidedly implies that the visit there recorded was the first paid by Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem after their great success in preaching the Gospel among the Gentiles. We suppose the reader, therefore, to recur to his first impression. He will then have to ask himself, “Granting the considerable differences, are there after all any plain contradictions between the two narratives, taken to refer to the same occurrences?” The answer must be, “There are no plain contradictions.” This, he will perceive, is a very weighty fact. When it is recognized, the resemblance first observed will return with renewed force to the mind. (The chronological question will be considered below.)

We proceed then to combine the two narratives. While Paul and Barnabas were staying at Antioch, “certain men from Judaea” came there and taught the brethren that it was necessary for the Gentile converts to be circumcised. This doctrine was vigorously opposed by the two apostles, and it was determined that the question should be referred to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. Paul and Barnabas themselves, and certain others, were selected for this mission. In Gal 2:2 Paul says that he went up “by revelation” (κατ᾿ ἀποκάλυψιν), so that we are to understand him as receiving a private intimation from the Divine Spirit, as well as a public commission from the Church at Antioch. On their way to Jerusalem, they announced to the brethren in Phoenicia and Samaria the conversion of the Gentiles; and the news was received with great joy. “When they were come to Jerusalem, they were received by the Church, and by the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them” (Act 15:4). Paul adds that he communicated his views “privately to them which were of reputation,” through anxiety as to the success of his work  (Gal 2:2). The apostles and the Church in general, it appears, would have raised no difficulties; but certain believers who had been Pharisees thought fit to maintain the same doctrine which had caused the disturbance at Antioch. In either place, Paul would not give way to such teaching for a single hour (Gal 2:5). It became necessary, therefore, that a formal decision should be reached upon the question. The apostles and elders came together, and there was much disputing. Arguments would be used on both sides; but when the persons of highest authority spoke, they appealed to what was stronger than arguments — the course of facts, through which the will of God had been manifestly shown. Peter, reminding his hearers that he himself had been first employed to open the door of faith to Gentiles, points out that God had himself bestowed on the uncircumcised that which was the seal of the highest calling and fellowship in Christ, the gift of the Holy Ghost. “Why do you not acquiesce in this token of God's will? Why impose upon Gentile believers ordinances which we ourselves have found a heavy burden? Have not we Jews left off trusting in our law, to depend only on the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ?”-Then, carrying out the same appeal to the will of God as shown in facts, Barnabas and Paul relate to the silent multitude the wonders with which God had accompanied their preaching among the Gentiles. After they had done, James, with incomparable simplicity and wisdom, binds up the testimony of recent facts with the testimony of ancient prophecy, and gives a practical judgment upon the question.

The judgment was a decisive one. The injunction that the Gentiles should abstain from pollutions of idols and from fornication explained itself. The abstinence from things strangled and from blood is desired as a concession to the customs of the Jews who were to be found in every city, and for whom it was still right, when they had believed in Jesus Christ, to observe the law. Paul had completely gained his point. The older apostles, James, Ce'phas, and John, perceiving the grace which had been given him (his effectual apostleship), gave to him and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. At this point it is very important to observe precisely what was the matter at stake between the contending parties (comp. Prof. Jowett on “St. Paul and the Twelve,” in St. Paul's Epistles, 1:417). Peter speaks of a heavy yoke; James of troubling the Gentile converts. But we are not to suppose that they mean merely the outward trouble of conforming to the law of Moses. That was not what Paul was protesting against. The case stood thus: Circumcision and the ordinances of the law were witnesses of a  separation of the chosen race from other nations. The Jews were proud of that separation. But the Gospel of the Son of Man proclaimed that the time had come in which the separation was to be done away, and God's good- will manifested to all nations alike. It spoke of a union with God, through trust, which gave hope of a righteousness that the law had been powerless to produce. Therefore to insist upon Gentiles being circumcised would have been to deny the Gospel of Christ. If there was to be simply an enlarging of the separated nation by the receiving of individuals into it, then the other nations of the world remained as much on the outside of God's covenant as ever. Then there was no Gospel to mankind; no justification given to men. The loss, in such a case, would have been as much to the Jew as to the Gentile. Paul felt this the most strongly; but Peter also saw that if the Jewish believers were thrown back on the Jewish law, and gave up the free and absolute grace of God, the law became a mere burden, just as heavy to the Jew as it would be to the Gentile. The only hope for the Jew was in a Savior who must be the Savior of mankind. It implied therefore no difference of belief when it was agreed that Paul and Barnabas should go to the heathen, while James and Cephas and John undertook to be the apostles of the circumcision. Paul, wherever he went, was to preach “to the Jew first;” Peter was to preach to the Jews as free a Gospel, was to teach the admission of the Gentiles without circumcision as distinctly as Paul himself. The unity of the Church was to be preserved unbroken; and in order to nourish this unity the Gentiles were requested to remember their poorer brethren in Palestine (Gal 2:10). How zealously Paul cherished this beautiful testimony of the common brotherhood we have seen in part already (Act 11:29-30), but it is yet to appear more strikingly.

The judgment of the Church was immediately recorded in a letter addressed to the Gentile brethren in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia. That this letter might carry greater authority, it was entrusted to “chosen men of the Jerusalem Church, Judas surnamed Barnabas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren.” The letter speaks affectionately of Barnabas and Paul (with the elder Church Barnabas still retained the precedence, Act 15:12; Act 15:25) as “men who have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.” So Judas and Silas came down with Paul and Barnabas to Antioch, and comforted the Church there with their message, and when Judas returned “it pleased Silas to abide there still.”  It is usual to connect with this period of the history that rebuke of Peter which Paul records in Gal 2:11-14. The connection of subject makes it convenient to record the incident in this place, although it is possible that it took place before the meeting at Jerusalem, and perhaps most probable that it did not occur till later, when Paul returned from his long tour in Greece to Antioch (Act 18:22-23). (The presence of Peter, and the growth of Jewish prejudice, are more easily accounted for, if we suppose Paul in the meanwhile to have left Antioch for a long time; and there was but a very short interval between the council at Jerusalem and his second missionary tour.) Peter was at Antioch, and had shown no scruple about “eating with the Gentiles,” until “certain came from James.” These Jerusalem Christians brought their Jewish exclusiveness with them, and Peter's weaker and more timid mood came upon him, and through fear of his stricter friends he too began to withdraw himself from his former free association with the Gentiles. Such an example had a dangerous weight, and Barnabas and the other Jews at Antioch were partly seduced by it. It was an occasion for the intrepid faithfulness of Paul. He did not conceal his anger at such weak dissembling, and he publicly remonstrated with his elder fellow-apostle. “If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?” (Gal 2:14). Peter had abandoned the Jewish exclusiveness, and deliberately claimed common ground with the Gentile: why should he, by separating himself from the uncircumcised, require the Gentiles to qualify themselves for full communion by accepting circumcision? This “withstanding” of Peter was no opposition of Pauline to Petrine views; it was a faithful rebuke of blamable moral weakness.

7. Second Missionary Journey. — The most resolute courage, indeed, was required for the work to which Paul was now publicly pledged. He would not associate with himself in that work one who had already shown a want of constancy. This was the occasion of what must have been a most painful difference between him and his comrade in the faith and in past perils, Barnabas. After remaining a while at Antioch, Paul proposed to Barnabas to revisit the brethren in the countries of their former journey. Hereupon Barnabas desired that his nephew John Mark should go with them. But John had deserted them in Pamphylia, and Paul would not try him again. “And the contention was so sharp between them that they departed asunder one from the other; and so Barnabas took Mark, and sailed unto  Cyprus; and Paul chose Silas, and departed.” A.D. 47. Silas. or Silvanus, now becomes a chief companion of the apostle. The two went together through Syria and Cilicia, visiting the churches, aid so came to Derbe and Lystra. Here they found Timotheus, who had become a disciple on the former visit of the apostle, and who so attracted the esteem and love of Paul that “he would have him go forth with him.” Him Paul took and circumcised. If this fact had been omitted here and stated in another narrative, how utterly irreconcilable it would have been, in the eyes of some critics, with the history in the Acts! Paul and Silas were actually delivering the Jerusalem decree to all the churches they visited. They were no doubt triumphing in the freedom secured to the Gentiles. Yet at this very time our apostle had the wisdom and largeness of heart to consult the feelings of the Jews by circumcising Timothy. There were many Jews in those parts, who knew that Timothy's father was a Greek, his mother a Jewess. That Paul should have had, as a chief companion, one who was uncircumcised, would of itself have been a hinderance to him in preaching to Jews; but it would have been a still greater stumbling-block if that companion were half a Jew by birth, and had professed the Jewish faith. Therefore in this case Paul “became unto the Jews as a Jew that he might gain the Jews.”

Luke now steps rapidly over a considerable space of the apostle's life and labors. “They went throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia” (Act 16:6). At this time Paul was founding “the churches of Galatia” (Gal 1:2). He himself gives us hints of the circumstances of his preaching in that region, of the reception he met with, and of the ardent though unstable character of the people, in the following words: “Ye know how through infirmity of the flesh (ὅτι δἰ ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός) I preached the Gospel unto you at the first (τὸ πρότερον), and my temptation which was in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus. Where is then the blessedness ye spake of (ὁμακαρισμὸς ὑμῶν, q. d. your beautfication of me)? for I bear you record that, if it had been possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and have given them to me” (4:13). It is not easy to decide as to the meaning of the words δἰ ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός. Undoubtedly their grammatical sense implies that “weakness of the flesh” — an illness — was the occasion of Paul's preaching in Galatia; and De Wette and Alford adhere to this interpretation, understanding Paul to have been detained by illness, when otherwise he would have gone rapidly  through the country. On the other hand, the form and order of the words are not what we should have expected if the apostle meant to say this; and professor Jowett prefers to assume an inaccuracy of grammar, and to understand Paul as saying that it was in weakness of the flesh that he preached to the Galatians. In either case Paul must be referring to a more than ordinary pressure of that bodily infirmity of which he speaks elsewhere as detracting from the influence of his personal address. It is hopeless to attempt to determine positively what this infirmity was. But we may observe here (1) that Paul's sensitiveness may have led him to exaggerate this personal disadvantage; and (2) that, whatever it was, it allowed him to go through sufferings and hardships such as few ordinary men could bear. It certainly did not repel the Galatians; it appears rather to have excited their sympathy and warmed their affection towards the apostle. (See below.)

Paul at this time had not indulged the ambition of preaching his Gospel in Europe. His views were limited to the peninsula of Asia Minor. Having gone through Phrygia and Galatia, he intended to visit the western coast, SEE ASIA; but “they were forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the Word” there. Then, being on the borders of Mysia, they thought of going back to the north-east into Bithvnia; but again “the Spirit of Jesus (so the best MSS. read in Act 16:6) suffered them not.” So they passed by Mysia, and came down to Troas. A.D. 48. Here the Spirit of Jesus, having checked them on other sides, revealed to them in what direction they were to go. Paul saw in a vision a man of Macedonia, who besought him, saying, “Come over into Macedonia and help us.” The vision was at once accepted as a heavenly intimation; the help wanted by the Macedonians was believed to be the preaching of the Gospel. It is at this point that the historian, speaking of Paul's company, substitutes “we” for ‘ they.” He says nothing of himself; we can only infer that Luke, to whatever country he belonged, became a companion of Paul at Troas. It is perhaps not too arbitrary a conjecture that the apostle, having recently suffered in health, derived benefit from the medical skill and attendance of” the beloved physician.” The party, thus reinforced, immediately set sail from Troas, touched at Samothrace, then landed on the continent at Neapolis, and from thence journeyed to Philippi. They hastened to carry the “help” that had been asked to the first considerable city in Macedonia. Philippi was no inapt representative of the Western world.

A Greek city, it had received a body of Roman settlers, and was politically a Colonia. We must not assume that  to Saul of Tarsus, the Roman citizen, there was anything very novel or strange in the world to which he had now come. But the name of Greece must have represented very imposing ideas to the Oriental and the Jew; and we may silently imagine what it must have been to Paul to know that he was called to be the herald of his Master, the crucified Jesus, in the center of tie world's highest culture, and that he was now to begin his task. He began, however, with no flourish of trumpets, but as quietly as ever, and in the old way. There were a few Jews, if not many, at Philippi; and when the Sabbath came round, the apostolic company joined their countrymen at the place by the river-side where prayer was wont to be made (ου ἐνομίζετο προσευχὴ ειναι) el'vat, where was the usual proseucha or chapel which supplied the purpose of a synagogue). The narrative in this part is very graphic: “We sat down,” says the writer (Act 16:13), “and spoke to the women who had come together.” Among these women was a proselyte from Thyatira (σεβομένη τὸν θεόν), named Lydia, a dealer in purple. As she listened “the Lord opened her heart” to attend to what Paul was saying. The first convert in Macedonia was but an Asiatic woman who already worshipped the God of the Jews; but she was a very earnest believer, and besought the apostle and his friends to honor her by staying in her house. They could not resist her urgency, and during their stay at Philippi they were the guests of Lydia (Act 16:40).

But a proof was given before long that the preachers of Christ had come to grapple with the powers in the spiritual world to which heathenism was then doing homage. A female slave, who brought gain to her masters by her powers of prediction when she was in the possessed state, beset Paul and his company, following them as they went to the place of prayer, and crying out, “These men are servants of the Most High God, who publish to you (or to us) the way of salvation.” Paul was vexed by her cries, and addressing the spirit in the girl, he said, “I command thee in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her.” Comparing the confession of this “spirit of divination” with the analogous confessions made by evil spirits to our Lord, we see the same singular character of a true acknowledgment extorted as if by force, and rendered with a certain insolence which implied that the spirits, though subject, were not willingly subject. The cries of the slave-girl may have sounded like sneers, mimicking what she had heard from the apostles themselves, until Paul's exorcism, ‘“in the name of Jesus Christ,” was seen to be effectual. Then he might be recognisea as in truth a servant of the Most High God, giving an example of the salvation which he  brought, in the deliverance of this poor girl herself from the spirit which degraded her. SEE PYTHONESS.

But the girl's masters saw that now the hope of their gains was gone. Here at Philippi, as afterwards at Ephesus, the local trade in religion began to suffer from the manifestation of the Spirit of Christ, and an interested appeal was made to local and national feelings against the dangerous innovations of the Jewish strangers. Paul and Silas were dragged before the magistrates, the multitude clamoring loudly against them, upon the vague charge of “troubling the city,” and introducing observances which were unlawful for Romans. If the magistrates had desired to act justly they might have doubted how they ought to deal with the charge. On the one hand Paul and Silas had abstained carefully, as the preachers of Christ always did, from disturbing public order, and had as yet violated no express law of the state. But on the other hand, the preaching of Jesus as King and Lord was unquestionably revolutionary, and aggressive upon the public religion in its effects; and the Roman law was decided, in general terms, against such innovations (see in Conybeare and Howson, 1:324). But the praetors or duumviri of Philippi were very unworthy representatives of the Roman magistracy. They yielded without inquiry to the clamor of the inhabitants, caused the clothes of Paul and Silas to be torn from them, and themselves to be beaten, and then committed them to prison. The jailer, having received their commands, thrust them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks.” This cruel wrong was to be the occasion of a signal appearance of the God of righteousness and deliverance. It was to be seen which were the true servants of such a God, the magistrates or these strangers. In the night Paul and Silas, sore and sleepless, but putting their trust in God, prayed and sang praises so loudly that the other prisoners could hear them. Then suddenly the ground beneath them was shaken, the doors were opened, and every prisoner's bands were struck off (compare the similar openings of prison-doors in Act 12:6-10; Act 5:19). The jailer awoke and sprang up, saw with consternation that the prison-doors were open, and, concluding that the prisoners had all fled, drew his sword to kill himself. But Paul called to him loudly, “Do thyself no harm; we are all here.” The jailer's fears were then changed to an overwhelming awe. What could this be? He called for lights, sprang in and fell trembling before the feet of Paul and Silas. Bringing them out from the inner dungeon, he exclaimed, “Sirs, what must I do to be saved?” (τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθῶ). They answered, “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt  be saved, and thy house.” And they went on to speak to him and to all in his house “the Word of the Lord.” The kindness he now showed them reminds us of their miseries. He washed their wounds, took them into his own house, and spread a table before them. The same night he received baptism, “he and all his,” and rejoiced in his new-found faith in God.

In the morning the magistrates, either having heard of what had happened, or having repented of their injustice, or having done all they meant to do by way of pacifying the multitude, sent word to the prison that the men might be let go. But legal justice was to be more clearly vindicated in the persons of these men, who had been charged with subverting public order. Paul denounced plainly the unlawful acts of the magistrates, informing them moreover that those whom they had beaten and imprisoned without trial were Roman citizens. “And now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily, but let them come themselves and fetch us out.” The magistrates, in great alarm, saw the necessity of humbling themselves (“ Facinus est vinciri civem Romanum, scelus verberari,” Cicero, in Verrem, v. 66). SEE CITIZENSHIP. They came and begged them to leave the city. Paul and Silas consented to do so, and, after paying a visit to “the brethren” in the house of Lydia, they departed.

The Church thus founded at Philippi, as the firstfruits of the Gospel in Europe (save the nucleus already formed at Rome, Act 2:10), was called, as we have seen, in the name of a spiritual deliverer, of a God of justice, and of an equal Lord of freemen and slaves. That a warm and generous feeling distinguished it from the first we learn from a testimony of Paul in the Epistle written long after to this Church. “In the beginning of the Gospel,” as soon as he left them, they began to send him gifts, some of which reached him at Thessalonica, others afterwards (Php 4:15-16). Their partnership in the Gospel (κοινωνία εἰς εὐαγγέλιον) had gladdened the apostle from the first day (Php 1:5).

Leaving Luke, and perhaps Timothy for a short time, at Philippi, Paul and Silas traveled through Amphipolis and Apollonia, and stopped again at Thessalonica. At this important city there was a synagogue of the Jews. True to his custom, Paul went in to them, and for three Sabbath-days proclaimed Jesus to be the Christ, as he would have done in a city of Judaea. As usual, the proselytes were those who heard him most gladly, and among them were many women of station, Again, as in Pisidian Antioch, the envy of the Jews was excited. They contrived to stir up the  lower class of the city to tumultuous violence by representing the preachers of Christ as revolutionary disturbers, who had come to proclaim one Jesus as king instead of Caesar. The mob assaulted the house of Jason, with whom Paul and Silas were staying as guests, and, not finding them, dragged Jason himself and some other brethren before the magistrates. In this case the magistrates, we are told, and the people generally, were “troubled” by the rumors and accusations which they heard. But they seem to have acted wisely and justly, in taking security of Jason and the rest, and letting them go. After these signs of danger the brethren immediately sent away Paul and Silas by night.

The Epistles to the Thessalonians, written soon after the apostle's visit, contain more particulars of his work in founding that Church than we find in any other Epistle. The whole of these letters ought to be read for the information they thus supply. Paul speaks to the Thessalonian Christians as being mostly Gentiles. He reminds them that they had turned from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the (lead, “Jesus who delivers us from the coming wrath” (1Th 1:9-10). The apostle had evidently spoker much of the coming and presence of the Lord Jesus Christ, and of that wrath which was already descending upon the Jews (1Th 2:16; 1Th 2:19, etc.). His message had had a wonderful power among them, because they had known it to be really the word of a God who also wrought in them, having had helps towards this conviction. in the zeal and disinterestedness and affection with which Paul (notwithstanding his recent shameful treatment at Philippi) proclaimed his Gospel among them (1Th 2:2; 1Th 2:8-13). He had purposely wrought with his own hands, even night and day, that his disinterestedness might be more apparent (1Th 2:9; 2Th 3:8). He exhorted them not to be drawn away from patient industry by the hopes of the kingdom into which they were called, but to work quietly, and to cultivate purity and brotherly love (1Th 4:3; 1Th 4:9; 1Th 4:11). , Connecting these allusions with the preaching in the synagogue (Act 17:3), we see clearly how the teaching of Paul turned upon the person of Jesus Christ as the Son of the living God, prophesied of in the Scriptures, suffering and dying, raised up and exalted to a kingdom, and about to appear as the Giver of light and life, to the destruction of his enemies and the saving of those who trusted in him. (See below.)

When Paul and Silas left Thessalonica they came to Beroea. Here they found the Jews more noble (εὐγενέστεροι) — more disposed to receive  the news of a rejected and crucified Messiah, and to examine the Scriptures with candor, than those at Thessalonica had been. Accordingly they gained many converts, both Jews and Greeks; but the Jews of Thessalonica, hearing of it, sent emissaries to stir up the people, and it was thought best that Paul should himself leave the city, while Silas and Timothy remained behind. Some of” the brethren” went with Paul (probably by sea) as far as Athens, where they left him, carrying back a request to Silas and Timothy that they would speedily join him. He apparently did not like to preach alone, and intended to rest from his apostolic labor until they should rejoin him; but how could he refrain, with all that was going on at Athens round him? There he witnessed the most profuse idolatry side by side with the most pretentious philosophy. Either of these would have been enough to stimulate his spirit. To idolaters and philosophers he felt equally urged to proclaim his Master and the living God. So he went to his own countrymen and the proselytes in the synagogue and declared to them that the Messiah had come; but he also spoke, like another Socrates, with people in the market, and with the followers of the two great schools of philosophy, Epicureans and Stoics, naring to all Jesus and the Resurrection. The philosophers encountered him with a mixture of curiosity and contempt. The Epicurean, teaching himself to seek for tranquil enjoyment as the chief object of life, heard of One claiming to be the Lord of men, who had shown them the glory of dying to self, and had promised to those who fought the good fight bravely a nobler bliss than the comforts of life could yield. The Stoic, cultivating a stern and isolated moral independence, heard of One whose own righteousness was proved by submission to the Father in heaven, and who had promised to give his righteousness to those who trusted not in themselves, but in him. To all, the announcement of a Person was much stranger than the publishing of any theories would have been. So far as they thought the preacher anything but a silly trifler, he seemed to them, not a philosopher, but a “setter forth of strange gods” (ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελεύς). But any one with a novelty was welcome to those who “spent their time in nothing else but either to hear or to tell some new thing.” They brought him therefore to the Areopagus, that he might make a formal exposition of his doctrine to an assembled audience. SEE AREOPAGUS.

We are not to think here of the council or court, renowned in the oldest Athenian history, which took its name from Mars' Hill, but only of the elevated spot where the council met, not covered in, but arranged with  benches and steps of stone, so as to form a convenient place for a public address. Here the apostle delivered that wonderful discourse reported in Act 17:22-31, which seems as fresh and instructive for the intellect of the 19th century as it was for the intellect of the 1st. In this we have the Pauline Gospel as it addressed itself to the speculative mind of the cultivated Greeks. How the “report” was obtained by the writer of the history we have no means of knowing. Possibly we have it in notes written down before or after the delivery of this address by Paul himself. Short as it is, the form is as perfect as the matter is rich. The loftiness and breadth of the theology, the dignity and delicacy of the argument, the absence of self, the straightforward and reverent nature of the testimony delivered — all the characteristics so strikingly displayed in this speech — help us to understand what kind of a teacher had now appeared in the Grecian world. Paul, it is well understood, did not begin with calling the Athenians “too superstitious.” “I perceive you,” he said, “to be eminently religious” (εὐδαιμονεστέροι, see Conybeare and Howson, ad loc.). He had observed an altar inscribed Α᾿γνώστῳ θεῷ, “To an unknown God.” It meant, no doubt, “To some unknown God.” “I come,” he said, “as the messenger of that unknown God.” He then proceeded to speak of God in terms which were not altogether new to Grecian ears. They had heard of a God who had made the world and all things therein, and even of One who gave to all life, and breath, and all things. But they had never learned the next lesson which was now taught them. It was a special truth of the new dispensation that “God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation, that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him.” SEE UNKNOWN GOD.

Comparing this with the teaching given to other audiences, we perceive that it laid hold of the deepest convictions which had ever been given to Greeks, while at the same time it encountered the strongest prejudices of Greeks. We see, as at Lystra, that an apostle of Christ had no need to refer to the Jewish Scriptures when he spoke to those who had not received them. He could speak to men as God's children, and subjects of God's educating discipline, and was only bringing them further tidings of him whom they had been always feeling after. He presented to them the Son of Man as acting in the power of him who had made all nations, and who was not far from any single man. He began to speak of him as risen from the  dead, and of the power of a new life which was in him for men; but his audience would not hear of him who thus claimed their personal allegiance. Some mocked, others, more courteously, talked of hearing him again another time. The apostle gained but few converts at Athens, and he soon took his departure and came to Corinth. A.D. 49. SEE ATHENS.

Athens still retained its old intellectual predominance; but Corinth was the political and commercial capital of Greece. It was in places of living activity that Paul labored longest and most successfully, as formerly at Antioch, now at Corinth, and afterwards at Ephesus. The rapid spread of the Gospel was obviously promoted by the preaching of it in cities where men were continually coming and going; but, besides this consideration, we may be sure that the apostle escaped gladly from dull ignorance on the one side, and from philosophical dilettanteism on the other, to places in which the real business of the world was done. The Gospel, though unworldly, was yet a message to practical and inquiring men, and it had more affinity to work of any kind than to torpor or to intellectual frivolity. One proof of the wholesome agreement between the following of Christ and ordinary labor was given by Paul himself during his stay at Corinth. Here, as at Thessalonica, he chose to earn his own subsistence by working at his trade of tent-making. This trade brought him into close connection with two persons who became distinguished as believers in Christ, Aquila and Priscilla. They were Jews, and had lately left Rome in consequence of an edict of Claudius, SEE CLAUDIUS; and as they also were tent-makers, Paul “abode with them and wrought.” Laboring thus on the six days, the apostle went to the synagogue on the Sabbath, and there by expounding the Scriptures sought to win both Jews and proselytes to the belief that Jesus was the Christ.

He was testifying with unusual effort and anxiety (συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ), when Silas and Timothy came from Macedonia and joined him. We are left in some uncertainty as to what the movements of Silas and Timothy had been since they were with Paul at Bercea. From the statements in the Acts (Act 17:15-16) that Paul, when he reached Athens, desired Silas and Timotheus to come to him with all speed, and waited for them there, compared with those in 1 Thessalonians (1Th 3:1-2), “When we could no longer forbear, we thought it good to be left at Athens alone, and sent Timotheus, our brother and minister of God, and our fellow-laborer in the Gospel of Christ, to establish you and to comfort you concerning your faith,” Paley (Horoe Paulinae, 1 Thessalonians No. iv)  reasonably argues that Silas and Timothy had come to Athens, but had soon been despatched thence, Timothy to Thessalonica, and Silas to Philippi, or elsewhere. From Macedonia they came together, or about the same time, to Corinth, and their arrival was the occasion of the writing of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians.

This is the first extant example of that work by which the apostle Paul has served the Church of all ages in as eminent a degree as he labored at the founding of it in his lifetime. All commentators upon the New Testament have been accustomed to notice the points of coincidence between the history in the Acts and these Letters. Paley's Horoe Paulinae is famous as a special work upon this subject. But more recently important attempts have been made to estimate the Epistles of Paul more broadly, by considering them in their mutual order and relations, and in their bearing upon the question of the development of the writer's teaching. Such attempts must lead to a better understanding of the Epistles themselves, and to a finer appreciation of the apostle's nature and work. It is notorious that the order of the Epistles in the book of the N.T. is not their real, or chronological order. The mere placing of them in their true sequence throws considerable light upon the history; and happily the time of composition of the more important Epistles can be stated with sufficient certainty. The two Epistles to the Thessalonians belong — and these alone — to the present missionary journey. The Epistles to the Galatians, Romans, and Corinthians were written during the next journey. Those to Philemon, the Colossians, the Ephesians, the Philippians, and the Hebrews belong to the captivity at Rome. With regard to the Pastoral Epistles, there are considerable difficulties, which require to be discussed separately.

The First Epistle to the Thessalonians was probably written soon after Paul's arrival at Corinth, and before he turned from the Jews to the Gentiles. It was drawn from Paul by the arrival of Silas and Timothy. The largest portion of it consists of an impassioned recalling of the facts and feelings of the time when the apostle was personally with them. But we perceive gradually that those expectations which he had taught them to entertain of the appearing and presence of the Lord Jesus Christ had undergone some corruption. There were symptoms in the Thessalonian Church of a restlessness which speculated on the times and seasons of the future, and found present duties flat and unimportant. This evil tendency Paul seeks to correct, by reviving the first spirit of faith and hope and mutual fellowship, and by setting forth the appearing of Jesus Christ-not  indeed as distant, but as the full shining of a day of which all believers in Christ were already children. The ethical characteristics apparent in this Letter, the degree in which Paul identified himself with his friends, the entire surrender of his existence to his calling as a preacher of Christ, his anxiety for the good fame and well-being of his converts, are the same which will reappear continually. SEE THESSALONIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO THE.

What interval of time separated the Second Letter to the Thessalonians from the First we have no means of judging, except that the later one was certainly written before Paul's departure from Corinth. The Thessalonians had been disturbed by announcements that those convulsions of the world which all Christians were taught to associate with the coming of Christ were immediately impending. To meet these assertions, Paul delivers express predictions in a manner not usual with him elsewhere; and while reaffirming all he had ever taught the Thessalonians to believe respecting the early coming of the Savior and the blessedness of waiting patiently for it, he informs them that certain events, of which he had spoken to them, must run their course before the full manifestation of Jesus Christ could come to pass. At the end of this epistle Paul guards the Thessalonians against pretended letters from him, by telling them that every genuine letter, even if not written by his hand throughout, would have at least an autograph salutation at the close of it. SEE THESSALONIANS, SECOND EPISTLE TO.

We now return to the apostle's preaching at Corinth. When Silas and Timotheus came, he was testifying to the Jews with great earnestness, but with little success. So “when they opposed themselves and blasphemed, he shook out his raiment,” and said to them, in words of warning taken from their own prophets (Eze 33:4), “Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean, and henceforth will go to the Gentiles.” The experience of Pisidian Antioch was repeating itself. The apostle went, as he threatened, to the Gentiles, and began to preach in the house of a proselyte named Justus. Already one distinguished Jew had become a believer, Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, mentioned (1Co 1:14) as baptized by the apostle himself: and many of the Gentile inhabitants were accepting the Gospel and receiving baptism. The envy and rage of the Jews were consequently excited in an unusual degree, and seem to have pressed upon the spirit of Paul. He was therefore encouraged by a vision of the Lord, who appeared to him by night, and said, “Be not afraid, but speak,  and hold not thy peace: for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee, to hurt thee; for I have much people in this city.” Corinth was to be an important seat of the Church of Christ, distinguished, not only by the number of believers, but also by the variety and the fruitfulness of the teaching to be given there. At this time Paul himself stayed there for a year and six months, “teaching the Word of God among them.”

Corinth was the chief city of the province of Achaia, and the residence of the proconsul. During Paul's stay, we find the proconsular office held by Gallio, a brother of the philosopher Seneca. SEE GALLIO. Before him the apostle was summoned by his Jewish enemies, who hoped to bring the Roman authority to bear upon him as an innovator in religion. But Gallio perceived at once, before Paul could “open his mouth” to defend himself, that the movement was due to Jewish prejudice, and refused to go into the question. “If it be a question of words and names and of your law,” he said to the Jews, speaking with the tolerance of a Roman magistrate, “look ye to it; for I will be no judge of such matters.” Then a singular scene occurred. The Corinthian spectators, either favoring Paul, or actuated only by anger against the Jews, seized on the principal person of those who had brought the charge, and beat him before the judgment-seat. (See on the other hand Ewald, Geschichte, 6:463-466.) Gallio left these religious quarrels to settle themselves. The apostle therefore was not allowed to be “hurt,” and remained some time longer at Corinth unmolested. SEE CORINTH.

We do not gather from the subsequent Epistles to the Corinthians many details of the founding of the Church at Corinth. The main body of the believers consisted of Gentiles (“Ye know that ye were Gentiles,” 1Co 12:2). But, partly from the number who had been proselytes, partly from the mixture of Jews, it had so far a Jewish character that Paul could speak of “our fathers” as having been under the cloud (1Co 10:1). The tendency to intellectual display, and the traffic of Sophists in philosophical theories, which prevailed at Corinth, made the apostle more than usually anxious to be independent in his life and simple in bearing his testimony. He wrought for his living, that he might not appear to be taking fees of his pupils (1Co 9:18); and he put the person of Jesus Christ, crucified and risen, in the place of all doctrines (1Co 2:1-5; 1Co 15:3-4). What gave infinite significance to his simple statements was the nature of the Christ who had been crucified, and his relation to men. Concerning these mysteries Paul had uttered a wisdom,  not of the world, but of God, which had commended itself chiefly to the humble and simple. Of these God had chosen and called not a few “into the fellowship of his Son Jesus Christ the Lord of men” (1Co 2:6-7; 1Co 1:2; 1Co 1:7; 1Co 1:9).

Having been the instrument of accomplishing this work, Paul took his departure for Jerusalem, wishing to attend a festival there. A.D. 51. Before leaving Greece, he cut off his hair at Cenchrea, in fulfillment of a vow (Act 18:18. The act may be that of Aquila, but the historian certainly seems to be speaking not of him, but of Paul). We are not told where or why he had made the vow; and there is considerable difficulty in reconciling this act with the received customs of the Jews. SEE VOW.

A passage in Josephus, if rightly understood (War, 2:15, 1), mentions a vow which included, besides a sacrifice, the cutting of the hair and the beginning of an abstinence from wine thirty days before the sacrifice. If Paul's was such a vow, he was going to offer up a sacrifice in the Temple at Jerusalem, and the “shearing of his head” was a preliminary to the sacrifice. The principle of the vow, whatever it was, must have been the same as that of the Nazaritish vow, which Paul afterwards countenanced at Jerusalem. There is therefore no difficulty in supposing him to have followed in this instance, for some reason not explained to us, a custom of his countrymen. — When he sailed from the Isthmus, Aquila and Priscilla went with him as far as Ephesus. Paul paid a visit to the synagogue at Ephesus, but would not stay. He was anxious to be at Jerusalem for the approaching feast, but he promised, God willing, to return to them again. Leaving Ephesus, he sailed to Casarea, and from thence went up to Jerusalem, and “saluted the Church.” It is argued (Wieseler, p. 48-50), from considerations founded on the suspension of navigation during the winter months, that the festival was probably the Pentecost. From Jerusalem, almost immediately, the apostle went down to Antioch, thus returning to the same place from which he had started with Silas.

8. Third Missionary Journey, including the Stay at Ephesus (Act 18:23 to Act 21:17). — Without inventing facts or discussions for which we have no authority, we may connect with this short visit of Paul to Jerusalem a very serious raising of the whole question, What was to be the relation of the new kingdom of Christ to the law and covenant of the Jews? Such a Church as that at Corinth, with its affiliated communities, composed chiefly  of Gentile members, appeared likely to overshadow by its importance the Mother-Church in Judaea. The jealousy of the more Judaical believers, not extinguished by the decision of the council at Jerusalem, began now to show itself everywhere in the form of an active and intriguing party-spirit. This disastrous movement could not indeed alienate the heart of Paul from the law or the calling or the people of his fathers — his antagonism is never directed against these; but it drew him into the great conflict of the next period of his life, and must have been a sore trial to the intense loyalty of his nature. To vindicate the freedom, as regarded the Jewish law, of believers in Christ — but to do this for the very sake of maintaining the unity of the Church — was to be the earnest labor of the apostle for some years. In thus laboring he was carrying out completely the principles laid down by the elder apostles at Jerusalem; and may we not believe that, in deep sorrow at appearing, even, to disparage the law and the covenant, he was the more anxious to prove his fellowship in spirit with the Church in Judaea, by “remembering the poor,” as “James, Cephas, and John” had desired that he would? (Gal 2:10). The prominence given, during the journeys upon which we are now entering, to the collection to be made among his churches for the benefit of the poor at Jerusalem, seems to indicate such an anxiety. The great Epistles which belong to this period — those to the Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans-show how the “Judaizing” question exercised at this time the apostle's mind.

Paul “spent some time” at Antioch, and during this stay, as we are inclined to believe, his collision with Peter (Gal 2:11-14), of which we have spoken above, took place. When he left Antioch, he “went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples,” and giving directions concerning the collection for the saints (1Co 16:1). A.D. 51. It is probable that the Epistle to the Galatians was written soon after this visit. SEE GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO.

When he was with them he had found the Christian communities infested by Judaizing teachers. He had “told them the truth” (Gal 4:16), he had warned them against the deadly tendencies of Jewish exclusiveness, and had reaffirmed the simple Gospel, concerning Jesus Christ the Son of God, which he had preached to them on his first visit (τὸ πρότερον, Gal 4:13). But after he left them the Judaizing doctrine raised its head again. The only course left to its advocates was to assail openly the authority of Paul; and this they did. They represented him as having derived his commission from the older apostles, and as therefore acting  disloyally if he opposed the views ascribed to Peter and James. The fickle minds of the Galatian Christians were influenced by these hardy assertions; and the apostle heard, when he had come down to Ephesus, that his work in Galatia was nearly undone, and his converts were partially seduced from the true faith in Christ. He therefore wrote the Epistle to remonstrate with them-an Epistle full of indignation, of warning, of direct and impassioned teaching. He recalls to their minds the Gospel which he had preached among them, and asserts in solemn and even awful language its absolute truth (Gal 1:8-9). He declares that he had received it directly from Jesus Christ the Lord, and that his position towards the other apostles had always been that, not of a pupil, but of an independent fellow- laborer. He sets before them Jesus the Crucified, the Son of God, as the fulfillment of the promise made to the fathers, and as the pledge and giver of freedom to men. He declares that in him, and by the power of the Spirit of sonship sent down through him, men have inherited the rights of adult sons of God; that the condition represented by the law was the inferior and preparatory stage of boyhood. He then, most earnestly and tenderly, impresses upon the Galatians the responsibilities of their fellowship with Christ the Crucified, urging them to fruitfulness in all the graces of their spiritual calling, and especially to brotherly consideration and unity.

This Letter was, in all probability, sent from Ephesus. This was the goal of the apostle's journeyings through Asia Minor. He came down upon Ephesus from the upper districts (τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη) of Phrygia. What Antioch was for “the region of Syria and Cilicia,” what Corinth was for Greece, what Rome was, we may add, for Italy and the West — that Ephesus was for the important province called Asia. Indeed, with reference to the spread of the Church Catholic, Ephesus occupied the central position of all. This was the meeting-place of Jew, of Greek, of Roman, and of Oriental. Accordingly the apostle of the Gentiles was to stay a long time here, that he might found a strong Church, which should be a kind of Mother Church to Christian communities in the neighboring cities of Asia. SEE EPHESUS.

A new element in the preparation of the world for the kingdom of Christ presents itself at the beginning of the apostle's work at Ephesus. He finds there certain disciples (τινὰς μαθητάς) — about twelve in number — of whom he is led to inquire, “Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed? They answered, No, we did not even hear of there being a Holy Ghost. Unto what then, asked Paul, were ye baptized? And they said, Unto  John's baptism. Then said Paul, John baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe on him who was coming after him, that is, on Jesus. Hearing this, they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus, and when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them, and they began to speak with tongues and to prophesy” (Act 19:1-7). — It is obvious to compare this incident with the apostolic act of Peter and John in Samaria, and to see in it an assertion of the full apostolic dignity of Paul. But besides this bearing of it, we see in it indications which suggest more than they distinctly express, as to the spiritual movements of that age. These twelve disciples are mentioned immediately after Apollos, who also had been at Ephesus just before Paul's arrival, and who had taught diligently concerning Jesus (τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ι᾿ησοῦ), knowing only the baptism of John. But Apollos was of Alexandria, trained in the intelligent and inquiring study of the Hebrew Scriptures, which had been fostered by the Greek culture of that capital. We are led to suppose therefore that a knowledge of the baptism of John and of the ministry of Jesus had spread widely, and had been received with favor by some of those who knew the Scriptures most thoroughly, before the message concerning the exaltation of Jesus and the descent of the Holy Ghost had been received. What the exact belief of Apollos and these twelve “disciples” was concerning the character and work of Jesus, we have no means of knowing; but we gather that it was wanting in a recognition of the full lordship of Jesus and of the gift of the Holy Ghost. The Pentecostal faith was communicated to Apollos by Aquila and Priscilla, to the other disciples of the Baptist by Paul.

The apostle now entered upon his usual work. He went into the synagogue, and for three months he spoke openly, disputing and persuading concerning “the kingdom of God.” At the end of that time the obstinacy and opposition of some of the Jews led him to give up frequenting the synagogue, and he established the believers as a separate society, meeting “in the school of Tyrannus.” This continued (so closely as not to allow any considerable absence of Paul) for two years. During this time occurred the triumph over magical arts, and the great disturbance raised by the silversmiths who made shrines for Artemis; also the writing of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

“God wrought special miracles” (δυνάμεις οὐ τὰς τυχούσας), we are told, “by the hands of Paul.” “It is evident that the arts of sorcery and magic — all those arts which betoken the belief in the presence of a spirit,  but not of a Holy Spirit — were flourishing here in great luxuriance. Everything in the history of the Old or New Testament would suggest the thought that the exhibitions of Divine power took a more startling form where superstitions grounded mainly on the reverence for diabolical power were prevalent; that they were the proclamations of a beneficent and orderly government, which had been manifested to counteract and overcome one that was irregular and malevolent” (Maurice, Unity of the New Testament, p. 515). The powers of the new kingdom took a form more nearly resembling the wonders of the kingdom of darkness than was usually adopted, when handkerchiefs and aprons from the body of Paul (like the shadow of Peter, Act 5:15), were allowed to be used for the healing of the sick and the casting out of daemons. But it was to be clearly seen that all was done by the healing power of the Lord Jesus himself. Certain Jews, and among them the seven sons of one Sceva (not unlike Simon Magus in Samaria), fancied that the effect was due to a magic formula, an ἐπῳδή. They therefore attempted to exorcise, by saying, “We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul preacheth.” But the evil spirit, having a voice given to it, cried out, “Jesus I know, and Paul I know, but who are ye?” And the man who was possessed fell furiously upon the exorcists and drove them forth. The result of this testimony was that fear fell upon all the inhabitants of Ephesus, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified. The impression produced bore striking practical fruits. The city was well known for its Ε᾿φέσια γράμματα, forms of incantation, which were sold at a high price. Many of those who had these books brought them together and burned them before all men, and when the cost of them was computed it was found to be 50,000 drachme =$8850. “So mightily grew the word of the Lord, and prevailed.”

While Paul was at Ephesus his communications with the Church in Achaia were not altogether suspended. There is no good reason, however, to believe that a personal visit to Corinth was made by him, nor any lost letter sent, of which there is no mention in the Acts. (See below.) The first of the extant epistles to that place, however, dates at this time. Whether the First Epistle to the Corinthians was written before or after the tumult excited by Demetrius cannot be positively asserted. He makes an allusion in that Epistle to “a battle with wild beasts” fought at Ephesus (ἐθηριομάχησα ἐν Ε᾿φέσῳ, 1Co 15:32), which it is usual to understand figuratively, and which is by many connected with that tumult. But such a connection is arbitrary, and without much reason. As it would seem from  Act 20:1, that Paul departed immediately after the tumult, it is probable that the Epistle was written before, though not long before, the raising of this disturbance. Here then, while the apostle is so earnestly occupied with the teaching of believers and inquirers at Ephesus and from the neighboring parts of “Asia,” we find him throwing all his heart and soul into the concerns of the Church at Corinth.

There were two external inducements for writing this Epistle.

(1.) Paul had received information from members of Chloe's household (ἐδηλώθη μοι ὑπὸ τῶν Χλόης, 1Co 1:11) concerning the state of the Church at Corinth.

(2.) That Church had written him a letter, of which the bearers were Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus, to ask his judgment upon various points which were submitted to him (1Co 7:1; 1Co 16:17). He had learned that there were divisions in the Church; that parties had been formed which took the names of Paul, of Apollos, of Cephas, and of Christ (1Co 1:11-12); and also that moral and social irregularities had begun to prevail, of which the most conspicuous and scandalous example was that a believer had taken his father's wife, without being publicly condemned by the Church (1Co 5:1; 1Co 6:7; 1Co 11:17-22; 1Co 14:33-40). To these evils we must add one doctrinal error, of those who said “that there was no resurrection of the dead” (1Co 15:12). It is probable that the teaching of Apollos the Alexandrian, which had been characteristic and highly successful (Act 18:27-28), had been the first occasion of the “divisions” in the Church. We may take it for granted that his adherents did not form themselves into a party until he had left Corinth, and therefore that he had been some time with Paul at Ephesus. But after he was gone, the special Alexandrian features of his teaching were remembered by those who had delighted to hear him. Their Grecian intellect was captivated by his broader and more spiritual interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures. The connection which he taught them to perceive between the revelation made to Hebrew rulers and prophets and the wisdom by which other nations, and especially their own, had been enlightened, dwelt in their minds. That which especially occupied the Apollos school must have been a philosophy of the Scriptures. It was the tendency of this party which seemed to the apostle particularly dangerous among the Greeks. He hardly seems to refer specially in his letter to the other parties, but we can scarcely doubt that in what he says about “the wisdom which the Greeks sought” (1:22), he is referring not only to the  general tendency of the Greek mind, but to that tendency as it had been caught and influenced by the teaching of Apollos. It gives him an occasion of delivering his most characteristic testimony. He recognises wisdom, but it is the wisdom of God; and that wisdom was not only a Σοφία or a Λόγος through which God had always spoken to all men; it had been perfectly manifested in Jesus the Crucified. Christ crucified was both the Power of God and the Wisdom of God. To receive him required a spiritual discernment unlike the wisdom of the great men of the world; a discernment given by the Holy Spirit of God, and manifesting itself in sympathy with humiliation and in love.

For a detailed description of the Epistles the reader is referred to the special articles upon each. But it belongs to the history of Paul to notice the personal characteristics which appear in them. We must not omit to observe therefore, in this Epistle, how loyally the apostle represents Jesus Christ the Crucified as the Lord of men, the Head of the body with many members, the Centre of Unity, the Bond of men to the Father. We should mark at the same time how invariably he connects the Power of the Spirit with the name of the Lord Jesus. He meets all the evils of the Corinthian Church-the intellectual pride, the party spirit, the loose morality, the disregard of decency and order, the false belief about the resurrection-by recalling their thoughts to the person of Christ and to the Spirit of God as the Breath of a common life to the whole body.

We observe also here, more than elsewhere, the tact, universally recognised and admired, with which the apostle discusses the practical problems brought before him. The various questions relating to marriage (ch. 7), the difficulty about meats offered to idols (ch. 8, 10), the behavior proper for women (ch. 11, 14), the use of the gifts of prophesying and speaking with tongues (ch. 14), are made examples of a treatment which may be applied to all such questions. We see them all discussed with reference to first principles; the object, in every practical conclusion, being to guard and assert some permanent principle. We see Paul no less a lover of order and subordination than of freedom. We see him claiming for himself, and prescribing to others, great variety of conduct in varying circumstances, but under the strict obligation of being always true to Christ, and always seeking the highest good of men. Such a character, so steadfast in motive and aim, so versatile in action, it would be difficult indeed to find elsewhere in history.  What Paul here tells us of his own doings and movements refers chiefly to the nature of his preaching at Corinth (ch. 1, 2); to the hardships and dangers of the apostolic life (1Co 4:9-13); to his cherished custom of working for his own living (ch. 9); to the direct revelations he had received (1Co 11:23; 1Co 15:8); and to his present plans (ch. 16). He bids the Corinthians raise a collection for the Church at Jerusalem by laying by something on the first day of the week, as he had directed the churches in Galatia to do. He says that he shall tarry at Ephesus till Pentecost, and then set out on a journey towards Corinth through Macedonia, so as perhaps to spend the winter with them. He expresses his joy at the coming of Stephanas and his companions, and commends them to the respect of the Church. SEE CORINTHIANS, FIRST EPISTLE TO.

Having despatched this Epistle, he stayed on at Ephesus, where “a great door and effectual was opened to him, and there were many adversaries.” The affairs of the Church at Corinth continued to be an object of the gravest anxiety to him, and to give him occupation at Ephesus: but it may be most convenient to put off the further notice of these till we come to the time when the Second Epistle was written. We have now no information as to the work of Paul at Ephesus until that tumult occurred which is described in Act 19:24-41. The whole narrative may be read there. We learn that “this Paul” had been so successful, not only in Ephesus, but “almost throughout all Asia,” in turning people from the worship of gods made with hands, that the craft of silversmiths, who made little shrines for Artemis, were alarmed for their manufacture. — They raised a great tumult. and not being able, apparently, to find Paul, laid hands on two of his companions and dragged them into the theater. Paul himself, not willing that his friends should suffer in his place, wished to go in among the people; but the disciples, supported by the urgent request of certain magistrates called Asiarchs, dissuaded him from his purpose. The account of the proceedings of the mob is highly graphic, and the address with which the town-clerk finally quiets the people is worthy of a discreet and experienced magistrate. His statement that “these men are neither robbers of churches nor yet blasphemers of your goddess” is an incidental testimony to the temperance of the apostle and his friends in their attacks on the popular idolatry. But Paul is only personally concerned in this tumult in so far as it proves the deep impression which his teaching had made at Ephesus, and the daily danger in which he lived.  Paul had been anxious to depart from Ephesus, and this interruption of the work which had kept him there determined himn to stay no longer. He set out therefore for Macedonia, and proceeded first to Troas (2Co 2:12), where he might have preached the Gospel with good hope of success. But a restless anxiety to obtain tidings concerning the Church at Corinth urged him on, and he advanced into Macedonia, where he met Titus, who brought him the news for which he was thirsting. The receipt of this intelligence drew from him a letter, the Second to the Corinthians, which reveals to us what manner of man Paul was when the fountains of his heart were stirred to their inmost depths. How the agitation which expresses itself in every sentence of this letter was excited is one of the most interesting questions we have to consider. Every reader may perceive that, on passing from the First Epistle to the Second, the scene is almost entirely changed. In the First, the faults and difficulties of the Corinthian Church are before us. The apostle writes of these, with spirit indeed and emotion, as he always does, but without passion or disturbance. He calmly asserts his own authority over the Church, and threatens to deal severely with offenders. In the Second, he writes as one whose personal relations with those whom he addresses have undergone a most painful shock. The acute pain given by former tidings, the comfort yielded by the account which Titus brought, the vexation of a sensitive mind at the necessity of self-assertion, contend together for utterance. What had occasioned this excitement?

We have seen that Timothy had been sent from Ephesus to Macedonia and Corinth. He had rejoined Paul when he wrote this Second Epistle; for he is associated with him in the salutation (2Co 1:1). We have no account, either in the Acts or in the Epistles, of this journey of Timothy, and some have thought it probable that he never reached Corinth. Let us suppose, however, that he arrived there soon after the First Epistle, conveyed by Stephanlas and others, had been received by the Corinthian Church. He found that a movement had arisen in the heart of that Church which threw (let us suppose) the case of the incestuous person (1Co 5:1-5) into the shade. This was a deliberate and sustained attack upon the apostolic authority and personal integrity of the apostle of the Gentiles. The party-spirit which, before the writing of the First Epistle, had been content with underrating the powers of Paul compared with those of Apollos, and with protesting against the laxity of his doctrine of freedom, had been fanned into a flame by the arrival of some person or  persons who came from the Judaean Church, armed with letters of commendation, and who openly questioned the commission of him whom they proclaimed to be a self-constituted apostle (2Co 3:1; 2Co 11:4; 2Co 11:12-15). As the spirit of opposition and detraction grew strong, the tongue of some member of the Church (more probably a Corinthian than the stranger himself) seems to have been loosed. He scoffed at Paul's courage and constancy, pointing to his delay in coming to Corinth, and making light of his threats (2Co 1:17; 2Co 1:23). He demanded proofs of his apostleship (2Co 12:11-12). He derided the weakness of his personal presence and the simplicity of his speech (2Co 10:10). He even threw out insinuations touching the personal honesty and self devotion of Paul (2Co 1:12; 2Co 12:17-18). When some such attack was made openly upon the apostle, the Church had not immediately called the offender to account; the better spirit of the believers being cowed, apparently, by the confidence and assumed authority of the assailants of Paul. A report of this melancholy state of things was brought to the apostle by Timothy or by others; and we can imagine how it must have wounded his sensitive and most affectionate nature, and also how critical the juncture must have seemed to him for the whole Western Church.

He immediately sent off Titus to Corinth, with a verbal message reenforcing his former letter with the sharpest rebukes (see 1Co 4:18-21), using the authority which had been denied, and threatening to enforce it speedily by his personal presence (2Co 2:2-3; 2Co 7:8). As soon as the messenger was gone — how natural a trait!-he began to repent of having sent him. He must have hated the appearance of claiming homage to himself; his heart must have been sore at the requital of his love; he must have felt the deepest anxiety as to the issue of the struggle. We can well believe him therefore when he speaks of what he had suffered: “Out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote to you with many tears” (2Co 2:4); “I had no rest in my spirit” (2Co 2:13); “Our flesh had no rest, but we were troubled on every side; without were fightings, within were fears” (2Co 7:5). It appears that he could not bring himself to hasten to Corinth so rapidly as he had intended (2Co 1:15-16); he would wait till he heard news which might make his visit a happy instead of a painful one (2Co 2:1). When he had reached Macedonia, Titus, as we have seen, met him with such reassuring tidings. The offender had been rebuked by the Church, and had made submission (2Co 2:6-7); the old spirit of love and reverence towards Paul had  been awakened, and had poured itself forth in warm expressions of shame and grief and penitence. The cloud was now dispelled; fear and pain gave place to hope and tenderness and thankfulness. But even now the apostle would not start at once for Corinth. He may have had important work to do in Macedonia. But another letter would smooth the way still more effectually for his personal visit; and he accordingly wrote the Second Epistle, and sent it by the hands of Titus and two other brethren to Corinth.

When the Epistle is read in the light of the circumstances we have supposed, the symptoms it displays of a highly wrought personal sensitiveness, and of a kind of ebb and flow of emotion, are as intelligible as they are noble and beautiful. Nothing but a temporary interruption of mutual regard could have made the joy of sympathy so deep and fresh. If he had been the object of a personal attack, how natural for the apostle to write as he does in 2Co 2:5-10. In 2Co 7:12, “he that suffered wrong” is Paul himself. All his protestations relating to his apostolic work, and his solemn appeals to God and Christ, are in place; and we enter into his feelings as he asserts his own sincerity and the openness of the truth which he taught in the Gospel (ch. 3, 4). We see what sustained him in his self-assertion; he knew that he did not preach himself, but Christ Jesus the Lord. His own weakness became an argument to him, which he could use to others also, of the power of God working in him. Knowing his own fellowship with Christ, and that this fellowship was the right of other men too, he would be persuasive or severe, as the cause of Christ and the good of men might require (ch. 4, 5). If he was appearing to set himself up against the churches in Judaea, he was the more anxious that the collection which he was making for the benefit of those churches should prove his sympathy with them by its largeness. Again he would recur to the maintenance of his own authority as an apostle of Christ against those who impeached it. He would make it understood that spiritual views, spiritual powers, were real; that if he knew no man after the flesh, and did not war after the flesh, he was not the less able for the building up of the Church (ch. 10). He would ask them to excuse his anxious jealousy, his folly and excitement, while he gloried in the practical proofs of his apostolic commission, and in the infirmities which made the power of God more manifest; and he would plead with them earnestly that they would give him no occasion to find fault or to correct them (ch. 11, 12, 13).  The hypothesis upon which we have interpreted this Epistle is not precisely that which is most commonly received. According to the more common view, the offender is the incestuous person of 1 Corinthians 5, and the message which proved so sharp but wholesome a medicine was simply the First Epistle. But this view does not account so satisfactorily for the whole tone of the Epistle, and for the particular expressions relating to the offender; nor does it find places so consistently for the missions of Timothy and Titus. It does not seem likely that Paul would have treated the sin of the man who took his father's wife as an offense against himself, nor that he would have spoken of it by preference as a wrong (ἀδικία) done to another (supposed to be the father). The view we have adopted is said, in DeWette's Exegetisches Handbuch, to have been held, in whole oi in part, by Bleek, Credner, Olshausen, and Neander. More recently it has been advocated with great force by Ewald, in his Sendschreiben des A. P. p. 223-232. The ordinary account is retained by Stanley, Alford, and Davidson, and with some hesitation by Conybeare and Howson. SEE CORINTHIANS, SECOND EPISTLE TO.

The particular nature of this Epistle, as an appeal to facts in favor of his own apostolic authority, leads to the mention of many interesting features of Paul's life. His summary, in 11:23-28, of the hardships and dangers through which he had gone, may probably be referred, as above suggested, to the period of his first labors at Tarsus. Of the particular facts stated in the following words, “Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one; thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I have been in the deep” — we know only of one, the beating by the magistrates at Philippi, from the Acts. The daily burden of “the care of all the churches” seems to imply a wide and constant range of communication, by visits, messengers, and letters, of which we have found it reasonable to assume examples in his intercourse with the Church of Corinth. The mention of “visions and revelations of the Lord,” and of the “thorn (or rather stake) in the flesh,” side by side, is peculiarly characteristic both of the mind and of the experiences of Paul. As an instance of the visions, he alludes to a trance which had befallen him fourteen years before, in which he had been caught up into paradise, and had heard unspeakable words. Whether this vision may be identified with any that is recorded in the Acts must depend on chronological considerations; but the very expressions of Paul in this place would rather lead us not to think of an occasion in which words that could be reported  were spoken. We observe that he speaks with the deepest reverence of the privilege thus granted to him; but he distinctly declines to ground anything upon it as regards other men. Let them judge him, he says, not by any such pretensions, but by facts which were cognizable to them (12:1-6). He would not, even inwardly with himself, glory in visions and revelations without remembering how the Lord had guarded him from being puffed up by them. A stake in the flesh (σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί) was given him, a messenger of Satan to buffet him, lest he should be exalted above measure. The different interpretations which have prevailed of this σκόλοψ have a certain historical significance.

(1) Roman Catholic divines have inclined to understand by it strong sensual temptation.

(2) Luther and his followers take it to mean temptation to unbelief. But neither of these would be “infirmities” in which Paul could “glory.”

(3) It is almost the unanimous opinion of modern divines and the authority of the ancient fathers on the whole is in favor of it-that the σκόλοψ represents some vexatious bodily. infirmity (see especially Stanley, ad loc.). It is plainly what Paul refers to in Gal 4:14 : “My temptation in my flesh ye despised not nor rejected.” This infirmity distressed him so much that he besought the Lord thrice that it might depart from him. But the Lord answered, “My grace is sufficient for thee; for my strength is made perfect in weakness.” We are to understand therefore the affliction as remaining; but Paul is more than resigned under it, he even glories in it as a means of displaying more purely the power of Christ in him. That we are to understand the apostle,, in accordance with this passage, as laboring under some degree of ill-health, is clear enough. But we must remember that his constitution was at least strong enough, as a matter of fact. to carry him through the hardships and anxieties and toils which he himself describes to us, and to sustain the pressure of the imprisonment at Caesarea and in Rome. SEE THORN IN THE FLESH.

After writing this Epistle, Paul traveled through Macedonia (A.D. 54), perhaps to the borders of Illyricum (Rom 15:19), and then carried out the intention of which he had spoken so often, and arrived himself at Corinth. The narrative in the Acts tells us that “when he had gone over those parts (Macedonia), and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece, and there abode three months” (Act 20:2-3). A.D. 55. There is only one incident which we can connect with this visit to Greece,  but that is a very important one — the writing of another great Epistle, addressed to the Church at Rome. That this was written at this time from Corinth appears from passages in the Epistle itself, and has never been doubted.

It would be unreasonable to suppose that Paul was insensible to the mighty associations which connected themselves with the name of Rome. The seat of the imperial government to which Jerusalem itself, with the rest of the world, was then subject, must have been a grand object to the thoughts of the apostle from his infancy upward. He was himself a citizen of Rome; he had come repeatedly under the jurisdiction of Roman magistrates; he had enjoyed the benefits of the equity of the Roman law, and the justice of Roman administration. And, besides its universal supremacy, Rome was the natural head of the Gentile world, as Jerusalem was the head of the Jewish world. In this august city Paul had many friends and brethren. Romans who had traveled into Greece and Asia, strangers from Greece and Asia who had gone to settle at Rome, had heard of Jesus Christ and the kingdom of heaven from Paul himself or from other preachers of Christ, and had formed themselves into a community, of which a good report had gone forth throughout the Christian world. We are not surprised therefore to hear that the apostle was very anxious to visit Rome. It was his fixed intention to go to Rome, and from Rome to extend his journeys as far as Spain (Rom 15:24; Rom 15:28). He would thus bear his testimony both in the capital and to the extremities of the Western or Gentile world. For the present he could not go on from Corinth to Rome, because he was drawn by a special errand to Jerusalem — where indeed he was likely enough to meet with dangers and delays (Rom 15:25-32). But from Jerusalem he proposed to turn towards Rome. In the meanwhile he would write them a letter from Corinth.

The letter is a substitute for the personal visit which he had longed “for many years” to pay; and, as he would have made the visit, so now he writes the letter, because he is the apostle of the Gentiles. Of this office, to speak in common language, Paul was proud. All the labors and dangers of it he would willingly encounter; and he would also jealously maintain its dignity and its powers. He held it of Christ, and Christ's commission should not be dishonored. He represents himself grandly as a priest, appointed to offer up the faith of the Gentile world as a sacrifice to God (Rom 15:16). He then proceeds to speak with pride of the extent and independence of his apostolic labors. It is in harmony with this language that he should address  the Roman Church as consisting mainly of Gentiles: but we find that he speaks to them as to persons deeply interested in Jewish questions. To the Church thus composed, the apostle of the Gentiles writes to declare and commend the Gospel which he everywhere preaches. That Gospel was invariably the announcement of Jesus Christ the Son of God, the Lord of men, who was made man, died, and was raised again, and whom his heralds present to the faith and obedience of mankind. Such a κήρυγμα might be variously commended to different hearers. In speaking to the Roman Church, Paul represents the chief value of it as consisting in the fact that, through it, the righteousness of God, as a righteousness not for God only, but also for men, was revealed. It is natural to ask what led him to choose and dwell upon this aspect of his proclamation of Jesus Christ. The following answers suggest themselves:

(1.) As he looked upon the condition of the Gentile world, with that coup d'ail which the writing of a letter to the Roman Church was likely to suggest, he was struck by the awful wickedness, the utter dissolution of moral ties, which has made that age infamous. His own terrible summary (Rom 1:21-32) is well known to be confirmed by other contemporary evidence. The profligacy which we shudder to read of was constantly under Paul's eye, especially at Corinth. Along with the evil he saw also the beginnings of God's judgment upon it. He saw the miseries and disasters, begun and impending, which proved that God in heaven would not tolerate the unrighteousness of men.

(2.) As he looked upon the condition of the Jewish people, he saw them claiming an exclusive righteousness, which, however, had manifestly no power to preserve them from being really unrighteous.

(3.) Might not the thought also occur to him, as a Roman citizen, that the empire which was now falling to pieces through unrighteousness had been built up by righteousness, by that love of order and that acknowledgment of rights which were the great endowment of the Roman people? Whether we lay any stress upon this or not, it seems clear that to one contemplating the world from Paul's point of view, no thought would be so naturally suggested as that of the need of the true Righteousness for the two divisions of mankind. How he expounds that God's own righteousness was shown, in Jesus Christ, to be a righteousness which men might trust in — sinners though they were — and by trusting in it submit to it, and so receive it as to show forth the fruits of it in their own lives; how he  declares the union of men with Christ as subsisting in the divine idea and as realized by the power of the Spirit may be seen in the Epistle itself. The remarkable exposition contained in ch. 9, 10, 11 illustrates the personal character of Paul, by showing the intense love for his nation which he retained through all his struggles with unbelieving Jews and Judaizing Christians, and by what hopes he reconciled himself to the thought of their unbelief and their punishment. Having spoken of this subject, he goes on to exhibit in practical counsels the same love of Christian unity, moderation, and gentleness, the same respect for social order, the same tenderness for weak consciences, and the same expectation of the Lord's coming and confidence in the future which appear more or less strongly in all his letters. SEE ROMANS, EPISTLE TO.

Before his departure from Corinth, Paul was joined again by Luke, as we infer from the change in the narrative from the third to the first person. We have already seen that he was bent on making a journey to Jerusalem, for a special purpose and within a limited time. With this view he was intending to go by sea to Syria. But he was made aware of some plot of the Jews for his destruction, to be carried out through this voyage; and he determined to evade their malice by changing his route. Several brethren were associated with him in this expedition, the bearers, no doubt, of the collections made in all the churches for the poor at Jerusalem. These were sent on by sea, and probably the money with them, to Troas, where they were to await Paul. He, accompanied by Luke, went northwards through Macedonia. The style of an eyewitness again becomes manifest. “From Philippi,” says the writer, “we sailed away after the days of unleavened bread, and came unto them to Troas in five days, where we abode seven days.” The marks of dime throughout this journey have given occasion to much chronological and geographical discussion, which brings before the reader's mind the difficulties and uncertainties of travel in that age, and leaves the precise determination of the dates of this history a matter for reasonable conjecture rather than for positive statement. But no question is raised as to the times mentioned which need detain us in the course of the narrative. During the stay at Troas there was a meeting on the first day of the week “to break bread,” and Paul was discoursing earnestly and at length with the brethren. He was to depart the next morning, and midnight found them listening to his earnest speech, with many lights burning in the upper chamber in which they had met, and making the atmosphere oppressive. A youth named Eutychus was sitting in the window, and was gradually overpowered by  sleep, so that at last he fell into the street or court from the third story, and was taken up dead. The meeting was interrupted by this accident, and Paul went down and fell upon him and embraced him, saying, “Be not disturbed, his life is in him.” His friends then appear to have taken charge of him, while Paul went up again, first presided at the breaking of bread, afterwards took a meal, and continued conversing until daybreak, and so departed.

While the vessel which conveyed the rest of the party sailed from Troas to Assos, Paul gained some time by making the journey by land. At Assos he went on board again. Coasting along by Mitylene, Chios, Samos, and Trogyllium, they arrived at Miletus. The apostle was thus passing by the chief Church in Asia; but if he had gone to Ephesus he might have arrived at Jerusalem too late for the Pentecost, at which festival he had set his heart upon being present. At Miletus, however, there was time to send to Ephesus; and the elders of the Church were invited to come down to him there. This meeting is made the occasion for recording another characteristic and representative address of Paul (Act 20:18-35). This spoken address to the elders of the Ephesian Church may be ranked with the Epistles, and throws the same kind of light upon Paul's apostolical relations to the churches. Like several of the Epistles, it is in great part an appeal to their memories of him and of his work. He refers to his labors in “serving the Lord” among them, and to the dangers he incurred from the plots of the Jews, and asserts emphatically the unreserve with which he had taught them. He then nlentions a fact which will come before us again presently, that he was receiving inspired warnings, as he advanced from city to city, of the bonds and afflictions awaiting him at Jerusalem. It is interesting to observe that the apostle felt it to be his duty to press on in spite of these warnings. Having formed his plan on good grounds and in the sight of God, he did not see, in dangers which might even touch his life, however clearly set before him, reasons for changing it. Other arguments might move him from a fixed purpose — not dangers. His one guiding principle was to discharge the ministry which he had received of the Lord Jesus, to testify the Gospel of the grace of God. Speaking to his present audience as to those whom he was seeing for the last time, he proceeds to exhort them with unusual earnestness and tenderness, and expresses in conclusion that anxiety as to practical industry and liberality which has been increasingly occupying his mind. In terms strongly resembling the language of the Epistles to the Thessalonians and Corinthians, he pleads his  own example, and entreats them to follow it, in “laboring for the support of the weak.” “And when he had thus spoken, he kneeled down and prayed with them all: and they all wept sore, and fell on Paul's neck, and kissed him, sorrowing most of all for the words which he spake, that they should see his face no more. And they accompanied him to the ship.” This is the kind of narrative in which some learned men think they can detect the signs of a moderately clever fiction.

The course of the voyage from Miletus was by Cos and Rhodes to Patara, and from Patara in another vessel past Cyprus to Tyre. Here Paul and his company spent seven days; and there were disciples “who said to Paul through the Spirit that he should not go up to Jerusalem.” Again there was a sorrowful parting: “They all brought us on our way, with wives and children, till we were out of the city; and we kneeled down on the shore and prayed.” From Tyre they sailed to Ptolemais, where they spent one day, and from Ptolemais proceeded, apparently by land, to Caesarea. In this place was settled Philip the Evangelist, one of the seven, and he became the host of Paul and his friends. Philip had four unmarried daughters, who “prophesied,” and who repeated, no doubt, the warnings already heard. Caesarea was within an easy journey of Jerusalem, and Paul may have thought it prudent not to be too long in Jerusalem before the festival; otherwise it might seem strange that, after the former haste, they now “tarried many days” at Caesarea. During this interval the prophet Agabus (Act 11:28) came down from Jerusalem, and crowned the previous intimations of danger with a prediction expressively delivered. It would seem as if the approaching imprisonment were intended to be conspicuous in the eyes of the Church, as an agency for the accomplishment of God's designs. At this stage a final effort was made to dissuade Paul from going up to Jerusalem, by the Christians of Caesarea, and by his travelling companions. But “Paul answered, What mean ye to weep and to break mine heart? for I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus. And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased, saying, The will of the Lord be done.” So, after a while, they went up to Jerusalem, and were gladly received by the brethren. This is Paul's fifth and last visit to Jerusalem.

9. First Imprisonment. —

(1.) Arrest at Jerusalem (A.D. 55). He who was thus conducted into Jerusalem by a company of anxious friends had become by this time a man  of considerable fame among his countrymen. He was widely known as one who had taught with pre-eminent boldness that a way into God's favor was opened to the Gentiles, and that this wan did not lie through the door of the Jewish law. He had moreover actually founded numerous and important communities, composed of Jews and Gentiles together, which stood simply on the name of Jesus Christ, apart from circumcision and the observance of the law. He had thus roused against himself the bitter enmity of that unfathomable Jewish pride which was almost as strong in some of those who had professed the faith of Jesus as in their unconverted brethren. This enmity had for years been vexing both the body and the spirit of the apostle. He had no rest from its persecutions; and his joy in proclaiming the free grace of God to the world was mixed with a constant sorrow that in so doing he was held to be disloyal to the calling of his fathers. He was now approaching a crisis in the long struggle, and the shadow of it had been made to rest upon his mind throughout his journey to Jerusalem. He came “ready to die for the name of the Lord Jesus,” but he came expressly to prove himself a faithful Jew, and this purpose emerges at every point of the history.

Luke does not mention (except incidentally. Act 24:17) the contributions brought by Paul and his companions for the poor at Jerusalem. But it is to be assumed that their first act was to deliver these funds into the proper hands. This might be done at the interview which took place on the following day with “James and all the elders.” As on former occasions, the believers at Jerusalem could not but glorify God for what they heard; but they had been alarmed by the prevalent feeling concerning Paul. They said to him, “Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law; and they are informed of thee that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.” This report, as James and the elders assume, was not a true one; it was a perversion of Paul's real teaching, which did not, in fact, differ from theirs. In order to dispel such rumors, they ask him to do publicly an act of homage to the law and its observances. They had four men who were under the Nazaritish vow. The completion of this vow involved (Num 6:13-21) a considerable expense for the offerings to be presented in the Temple; and it was a meritorious act to provide these offerings for the poorer Nazarites. Paul was requested to put himself under the yow with those other four, and  to supply the cost of their offerings. He at once accepted the proposal, and on the next day, having performed some ceremony which implied the adoption of the vow, he went into the Temple. announcing that the due offerings for each Nazarite were about to be presented and the period of the vow terminated. It appears that the whole process undertaken by Paul required seven days to complete it. Towards the end of this time certain Jews from “Asia,” who had come up for the Pentecostal feast, and who had a personal knowledge both of Paul himself and of his companion Trophimus, a Gentile from Ephesus, saw Paul in the Temple. They immediately set upon him, and stirred up the people against him, crying out, “Men of Israel, help: this is the man that teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place; and further brought Greeks also into the Temple, and hath polluted this holy place.” The latter charge had no more truth in it than the first: it was only suggested by their having seen Trophimus with him, not in the Temple, but in the city. They raised, however, a great commotion: Paul was dragged out of the Temple, of which the doors were immediately shut, and the people, having him in their hands, were proposing to kill him. But tidings were soon carried to the commander of the force which was serving as a garrison in Jerusalem, that “all Jerusalem was in an uproar;” and he, taking with him soldiers and centurions, hastened to the scene of the tumult. Paul was rescued from the violence of the multitude by the Roman officer, who made him his own prisoner, causing him to be chained to two soldiers, and then proceeded to inquire who he was and what he had done. The inquiry only elicited confused outcries, and the “chief captain” seems to have imagined that the apostle might perhaps be a certain Egyptian pretender who had recently stirred up a considerable rising of the people, apparently the same impostor mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 20:7, 6; War, 2:13, 5). The account in the Acts (Act 21:34-40) tells us with graphic touches how Paul obtained leave and opportunity to address the people in a discourse which is related at length.

This discourse was spoken in Hebrew — that is, in the native dialect of the country — and was on that account listened to with the more attention. It is described by Paul himself, in his opening words, as his “defense,” addressed to his brethren and fathers. It is in this light that it ought to be regarded. As we have seen, the desire which occupied the apostle's mind at this time was that of vindicating his message and work as those of a faithful Jew. The discourse spoken to the angry people at Jerusalem is his own justification of himself. He adopts the historical method, after which all the  recorded appeals to Jewish audiences are framed. He is a servant of facts. He had been from the first a zealous Israelite like his hearers. He had changed his course because the God of his fathers had turned him from one path into another. It is thus that he is led into a narrative of his conversion. We have already noticed the differences, in the statement of bare facts, between this narrative and that of the 9th chapter. The business of the student, in this place, is to see how far the purpose of the apostle will account for whatever is special to this address. That purpose explains the detailed reference to his rigorously Jewish education, and to his history before his conversion. It gives point to the announcement that it was by a direct operation from without upon his spirit, and not by the gradual influence of other minds upon his, that his course was changed. Incidentally we may see a reason for the admission that his companions “heard not the voice of him that spake to me” in the fact that some of them, not believing in Jesus with their former leader, may have been living at Jerusalem, and possibly present among the audience. In this speech the apostle is glad to mention, what we were not told before, that the Ananias who interpreted the will of the Lord to him more fully at Damascus was “a devout man according to the law, having a good report of all the Jews which dwelt there,” and that he made his communication in the name of Jehovah, the God of Israel, saying “The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see the Righteous One, and hear a voice out of his mouth; for thou shalt be a witness for him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard.” Having thus claimed, according to his wont, the character of a simple instrument and witness, Paul goes on to describe another revelation of which we read nothing elsewhere. He had been accused of being an enemy to the Temple. He relates that after the visit to Damascus he went up again to Jerusalem, and was praying once in the Temple itself, till he fell into a trance. Then he saw the Lord, and was bidden to leave Jerusalem quickly, because the people there would not receive his testimony concerning Jesus. His own impulse was to stay at Jerusalem, and he pleaded with the Lord that there it was well known how he had persecuted those of whom he was now one-implying, it would appear, that at Jerusalem his testimony was likely to be more impressive and irresistible than elsewhere; but the Lord answered with a simple command, “Depart; for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles.”

Until this hated word, of a mission to the Gentiles, had been spoken, the Jews had listened to the speaker. They could bear the name of the  Nazarene, though they despised it; but the thought of that free declaration of God's grace to the Gentiles, of which Paul was known to be the herald, stung them to fury. Jewish pride was in that generation becoming hardened and embittered to the utmost; and this was the enemy which Paul had come to encounter in its stronghold. “Away with such a fellow from the earth.” the multitude now shouted; “it is not fit that he should live.” The Roman commander, seeing the tumult that arose, but not understanding the language ‘of the speech, might well conclude that Paul had committed some heinous offense; and, carrying him off, he gave orders that he should be forced by scourging to confess his crime. Again the apostle took advantage of his Roman citizenship to protect himself from such an outrage. To the rights of that citizenship he, a free-born Roman, had a better title than the chief captain himself; and if he had chosen to assert it before, he might have saved himself from the indignity of being manacled.

The Roman officer was bound to protect a citizens and to suppress tumult; but it was also a part of his policy to treat with deference the religion and the customs of the country. Paul's present history is the resultant of these two principles. The chief captain set him free from bonds, but on the next day called together the chief priests and the Sanhedrim, and brought Paul as a prisoner before them. We need not suppose that this was a regular legal proceeding: it was probably an experiment of policy and courtesy. If, on the one hand, the commandant of the garrison had no power to convoke the Sanhedrim, on the other hand he would not give up a Roman citizen to their judgment. As it was, the affair ended in confusion, and with no semblance of a judicial termination. The incidents selected by Luke from the history of this meeting form striking points in the biography of, Paul, but they are not easy to understand. The difficulties arising here, not out of a comparison of two independent narratives, but out of a single narrative which must at least have appeared consistent and intelligible to the writer himself, are a warning to the student not to draw unfavorable inferences from all apparent discrepancies. Paul appears to have been put upon his defense, and with the peculiar habit, mentioned elsewhere also (Act 13:9), of looking steadily when about to speak (ἀτενίσας), he began to say, “Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience (or, to give the force of πεπολίτευμαι, I have lived a conscientiously loyal life) unto God, until this day.”

Here the high-priest Ananias commanded them that stood by him to smite him on the mouth. With a fearless indignation, Paul exclaimed, “God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: for sittest thou to  judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?” The bystanders said, “Revilest thou God's high-priest?” Paul answered, “I knew not, brethren, that he was the high-priest; for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people.” The evidence furnished by this admission of Paul's respect both for the law and for the high-priesthood was probably the reason for relating the outburst which it followed. Whether the writer thought that outburst culpable or not does not appear. St. Jerome (contra Pelag. iii, quoted by Baur) draws an unfavorable contrast between the vehemence of the apostle and the meekness of his Master; and he is followed by many critics, as, among others, De Wette and Alford. But it is to be remembered that He who was led as a lamb to the slaughter was the same who spoke of “whited sepulchres,” and exclaimed, “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how shall ye escape the damnation of hell?” It is by no means certain, therefore, that Paul would have been a truer follower of Jesus if he had held his tongue under Ananias's lawless outrage. But what does his answer mean? How was it possible for him not to know that he who spoke was the high- priest? Why should he have been less willing to rebuke an iniquitous high- priest than any other member of the Sanhedrim, “sitting to judge him after the law?” These are difficult questions to answer. It is possible that Ananias was personally unknown to Paul; or that the high-priest was not distinguished by dress or place from the other members of the Sanhedrim. The least objectionable solution seems to be that for some reason or other- either because of some defect in his eyesight, or if some obstruction or confusion, or temporary inadvertance — he did not at the moment recognize the rank of the person who ordered him to be smitten; and that he wished to correct the impression which he saw was made upon some of the audience by his threatening protest, and therefore took advantage of the fact that he really did not know the speaker to be the high-priest, to explain the deference he felt to be due to the person holding that office. That Paul's language cannot have been a mere apology for a sudden outburst of passion is clear from his own direct assertion that he did not at the time know whom he was addressing, and is confirmed by the apparently prophetic impulse under which he spoke. SEE ANANIAS, 13.

The next incident which Luke records seems to some, who cannot think of the apostle as remaining still a Jew, to cast a shadow upon his rectitude. He perceived, we are told, that the council was divided into two parties, the Sadducees and Pharisees, and therefore he cried out, “Men and brethren, I  am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; concerning the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question.” This declaration, whether so intended or not, had the effect of stirring up the party spirit of the assembly to such a degree that a fierce dissension arose, and some of the Pharisees actually took Paul's side, saying, “We find no evil in this man: suppose a spirit or an angel has spoken to him?” — Those who impugn the authenticity of the Acts point triumphantly to this scene as an utterly impossible one; others consider that the apostle is to be blamed for using a disingenuous artifice. But it is not so clear that Paul was using an artifice at all, at least for his own interest in identifying himself as he did with the professions of the Pharisees. He had not come to Jerusalem to escape out of the way of danger, nor was the course he took on this occasion the safest he could have chosen. Two objects, we must remember, were dearer to him than his life: (1) to testify of Him whom God had raised from the dead, and (2) to prove that in so doing he was a faithful Israelite. He may well have thought that both these objects might be promoted by an appeal to the nobler professions of the Pharisees. The creed of the Pharisee, as distinguished from that of the Sadducee, was unquestionably the creed of Paul. His belief in Jesus seemed to him to supply the ground and fulfillment of that creed. He wished to lead his brother Pharisees into a deeper and more living apprehension of their own faith.

Whether such a result was in any degree attained we do not know: the immediate consequence of the dissension which occurred in the assembly was that Paul was like to be torn in pieces, and was carried off by the Roman soldiers. In the night he had a vision, as at Corinth (Act 18:9-10) and on the voyage to Rome (Act 27:23-24), of the Lord standing by him, and encouraging him. ‘Be of good cheer, Paul,” said his Master; “for as thou hast testified of me in Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome.” It was not safety that the apostle longed for, but opportunity to bear witness of Christ.

Probably the factious support which Paul had gained by his manner of bearing witness in the council died away as soon as the meeting was dissolved. On the next day a conspiracy was formed, which the historian relates with a singular fullness of details. More than forty of the Jews bound themselves under a vow neither to eat nor to drink until they had killed Paul. Their plan was to persuade the Roman commandant to send down Paul once more to the council, and then to set upon him by the way and kill him. This conspiracy became known in some way to a nephew of  Paul. his sister's son, who was allowed to see his uncle and inform him of it, and by his desire was taken to the captain, who was thus put on his guard against the plot. This discovery baffled the conspirators, and it is to be presumed that they obtained some dispensation from their vow. The consequence to Paul was that he was hurried away from Jerusalem. The chief captain, Claudius Lysias, determined to send him to Caesarea, to Felix, the governor or procurator of Judaea. He therefore put him in charge of a strong guard of soldiers, who took him by night as far as Antipatris. Thence a smaller detachment conveyed him to Caesarea, where they delivered up their prisoner into the hands of the governor, together with a letter, in which Claudius Lysias explained to Felix his reason for sending Paul, and announced that his accusers would follow. Felix, Luke tells us, with that particularity which marks this portion of his narrative, asked of what province the prisoner, was; and being told that he was of Cilicia, he promised to give him a hearing when his accusers should come. In the mean time he ordered him to be guarded — chained, probably, to a soldier — in the government-house, which had been the palace of Herod the Great.

(2.) Detention at Caesarea. — Paul was henceforth, to the end of the period embraced in the Acts, if not to the end of his life, in Roman custody. This custody was in fact a protection to him, without which he would have fallen a victim to the animosity of the Jews. He seems to have been treated throughout with humanity and consideration. His own attitude towards Roman magistrates was invariably that of a respectful but independent citizen; and while his franchise secured him from open injustice, his character and conduct could not fail to win him the good-will of those into whose hands he came. The governor before whom he was now to be tried, according to Tacitus and Josephus, was a mean and dissolute tyrant. SEE FELIX. “Per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exercuit” (Tacitus, Hist. v. 9). But these characteristics, except perhaps the servile ingenium, do not appear in our history. The orator or counsel retained by the Jews, and brought down by Ananias and the elders, when they arrived in the course of five days at Caesarea, begins the proceedings of the trial professionally by complimenting the governor. The charge he goes on to set forth against Paul shows precisely the light in which he was regarded by the fanatical Jews. He is a pestilent fellow (λοιμός); he stirs up divisions among the Jews throughout the world; he is a ringleader of the sect (αἱρέσεως) of the Nazarenes. His last offense had been an attempt to  profane the Temple. Paul met the charge in his usual manner. He was glad that his judge had been for some years governor of a Jewish province; “because it is in thy power to ascertain that, not more than twelve days since, I came up to Jerusalem to worship.” The emphasis is upon his coming up to worship. He denied positively the charges of stirring up strife and of profaning the Temple.

But he admitted that “after the way (τὴν ὁδόν) which they call a sect, or a heresy” so he worshipped the God of his fathers, believing all things written in the law and in the prophets. Again he gave prominence to the hope of a resurrection, which he held, as he said, in common with his accusers. His loyalty to the faith of his fathers he had shown by coming up to Jerusalem expressly to bring alms for his nation and offerings, and by undertaking the ceremonies of purification in the Temple. What fault, then, could any Jew possibly find in him? — The apostle's answer was straightforward and complete. He had not violated the law of his fathers; he was still a true and loyal Israelite. Felix, it appears, knew a good deal about “the way” (τῆς ὁδοῦ), as well as about the customs of the Jews, and was probably satisfied that Paul's account was a true one. He made an excuse for putting off the matter, and gave orders that the prisoner should be treated with indulgence, and that his friends should be allowed free access to him. After a while Felix heard him again. His wife, Drusilla, was a Jewess, and they were both curious to hear the eminent preacher of the new faith in Christ. But Paul was not a man to entertain an idle curiosity. He began to reason concerning righteousness, temperance, and the coming judgment, in a manner which alarmed Felix, and caused him to put an end to the conference. He frequently saw him afterwards, however, and allowed him to understand that a bribe would procure his release. But Paul would not resort to this method of escape, and he remained in custody until Felix left the province. The unprincipled governor had good reason to seek to ingratiate himself with the Jews; and to please them he handed over Paul, as an untried prisoner, to his successor Festus.

At this point, as we shall hereafter see, the history of Paul comes into its closest contact with external chronology. Festus, like Felix, has a place in secular history, and he bears a much better character. Upon his arrival in the province he went up without delay from Caesarea to Jerusalem, and the leading Jews seized the opportunity of asking that Paul might be brought up there for trial, intending to assassinate him by the way. But Festus would not comply with their request. He invited them to follow him on is  speedy return to Caesarea, and a trial took place there, closely resembling that before Felix. Festus saw clearly enough that Paul had committed no offense against the law, but he was anxious at the tame time, if he could, to please the Jews, “They had certain questions against him,” Festus says to Agrippa, “of their own superstition (or religion), and of one Jesus, who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. And being puzzled for my part as to such inquiries, I asked him whether he would go to Jerusalem to be tried there.” This proposal, not a very likely one to be accepted, was the occasion of Paul's appeal to Caesar. In dignified and independent language he claimed his rights as a Roman citizen. We can scarcely doubt that the prospect of being forwarded by this means to Rome, the goal of all his desires, presented itself to him and drew him onwards, as he virtually protested against the indecision and impotence of the provincial governor, and exclaimed, “I appeal unto Caesar.” Having heard this appeal, Festus consulted with his assessors, found that there was no impediment in the way of its prosecution, and then replied, “Hast thou appealed to Caesar? To Caesar thou shalt go.” Properly speaking, an appeal was made from the sentence of an inferior court to the jurisdiction of a higher. But in Paul's case no sentence had been pronounced. We must understand, therefore, by his appeal, a demand to be tried by the imperial court, and we must suppose that a Roman citizen had the right of electing whether he would be tried in the province or at Rome. SEE APPEAL.

The appeal having been allowed, Festus reflected that he must send with the prisoner a report of “the crimes laid against him.” But he found that it was no easy matter to put the complaints of the Jews in a form which would be intelligible at Rome. He therefore took advantage of an opportunity which offered itself in a few days to seek some help in the matter. The Jewish prince Agrippa arrived with his sister Berenice on a visit to the new governor. To him Festus communicated his perplexity, together with an account of what had occurred before him in the case. Agrippa, who must have known something of the sect of the Nazarenes, and had probably heard of Paul himself, expressed a desire to hear him speak. The apostle therefore was now called upon to bear the name of his Master “before Gentiles and kings.” The audience which assembled to hear him was the most dignified which he had yet addressed, and the state and ceremony of the scene proved that he was regarded as no vulgar criminal. Festus, when Paul had been brought into the council-chamber, explained to Agrippa and the rest of the company the difficulty in which he found  himself, and then expressly referred the matter to the better knowledge of the Jewish king. Paul, therefore, was to give an account of himself to Agrippa; and when he had received from him a courteous permission to begin, he stretched forth his hand and made his defense.

In this discourse (Acts 26) we have the second explanation from Paul himself of the manner in which he had been led, through his conversion, to serve the Lord Jesus instead of persecuting his disciples; and the third narrative of the conversion itself. Speaking to Agrippa as to one thoroughly versed in the customs and questions prevailing among the Jews, Paul appeals to the well-known Jewish and even Pharisaical strictness of his youth and early manhood. He reminds the king of the great hope which sustained continually the worship of the Jewish nation — the hope of a deliverer, promised by God himself, who should be a conqueror of death. He had been led to see that this promise was fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth; he proclaimed his resurrection to be the pledge of a new and immortal life. What was there in this of disloyalty to the traditions of his fathers? Did his countrymen disbelieve in this Jesus as the Messiah? So had he once disbelieved in him; and had thought it his duty to be earnest in hostility against his name. But his eyes had been opened: he would tell how and when.

The story of the conversion is modified in this address, as we might fairly expect it to be. We have seen that there is no absolute contradiction between the statements of this and the other narratives. The main points — the light, the prostration, the voice from heaven, the instructions from Jesus — are found in all three. But in this account, the words “I am Jesus whom thou persecutest” are followed by a fuller explanation, as if then spoken by the Lord, of what the work of the apostle was to be. The other accounts defer this explanation to a subsequent occasion. But when we consider how fully the mysterious communication made at the moment of the conversion included what was afterwards conveyed, through Ananias and in other ways, to the mind of Paul; and how needless it was for Paul, in his present address before Agrippa, to mark the stages by which the whole lesson was taught, it seems merely captious to base upon the method of this account a charge of disagreement between the different parts of this history. They bear, on the contrary, a striking mark of genuineness in the degree in which they approach contradiction without reaching it. It is most natural that a story told on different occasions should be told differently; and if in such a case we find no contradiction as to the facts, we gain all the firmer impression of the substantial truth of the story. The particulars  added to the former accounts by the present narrative are, that the words of Jesus were spoken in Hebrew, and that the first question to Saul was followed by the saying, “It is hard for thee to kick against the goads.” (This saying is omitted by the best authorities in the 9th chapter.) The language of the commission which Paul says he received from Jesus deserves close study, and will be found to bear a striking resemblance to a passage in Colossians (Col 1:12-14). The ideas of light, redemption, forgiveness, inheritance, and faith in Christ, belong characteristically to the Gospel which Paul preached among the Gentiles, Not less striking is it to observe the older terms in which he describes to Agrippa his obedience to the heavenly vision. He had made it his business, he says, to proclaim to all men “that they should repent and turn to God, and do works meet for repentance” — words such as John the Baptist uttered, but not less truly Pauline. He finally reiterates that the testimony on account of which the Jews sought to kill him was in exact agreement with Moses and the prophets. They had taught men to expect that the Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show light unto the people and to the Gentiles. Of such a Messiah Saul was the servant and preacher.

At this point Festus began to apprehend what seemed to him a manifest absurdity. He interrupted the apostle discourteously, but with a compliment contained iii his loud remonstrance: “Paul, thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad.” The phrase τὰ πολλὰ γράμματα may possibly have been suggested by the allusion to Moses and the prophets; but it probably refers to the books with which Paul had been supplied, and which he was known to study during his imprisonment. As a biographical hint, this phrase is not to be overlooked. “I am not' mad, most noble Festus,” replied Paul; “but speak forth the words of truth and soberness.” Then, with an appeal of mingled dignity and solicitude, he turns to the king. He was sure the king understood him. “King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest.” The answer of Agrippa can hardly have been the serious and encouraging remark of our English version. Literally rendered, it appears to be, You are briefly persuading me to become a Christian; and it is generally supposed to have been spoken ironically. It rather signifies, You are slightly (ἐν ὀλίγῳ) successful. “I would to God,” is Paul's earnest answer, “that not only thou, but also all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether (καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ) such as I am, except these bonds.” He was wearing a  chain upon the hand he held up in addressing them. With this prayer, it appears, the conference ended. Festus and the king, and their companions, consulted together, and came to the conclusion that the accused was guilty of nothing that deserved death or imprisonment. Agrippa's final answer to the inquiry of Festus was, “This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Caesar.”

(3.) Voyage to Rome. — No formal trial of Paul had yet taken place. It appears from Act 28:18 that he knew how favorable the judgment of the provincial government was likely to be. But the vehement opposition of the Jews, together with his desire to be conveyed to Rome, might well induce him to claim a trial before the imperial court. After a while arrangements were made to carry “Paul and certain other prisoners,” in the custody of a centurion named Julius, into Italy; and among the company, whether by favor or from any other reason, we find the historian of the Acts. The narrative of this voyage is accordingly minute and circumstantial in a degree which has excited much attention. The nautical and geographical details of Luke's account have been submitted to an apparently thorough investigation by several competent critics, especially by Mr. Smith, of Jordanhill, in an important treatise devoted to the subject, and by Mr. Howson. The result of this investigation has been that several errors in the received version have been corrected, that the course of the voyage has been laid down to a very minute degree with great certainty, and that the account in the Acts is shown to be written by an accurate eye- witness, not himself a professional seaman, but well acquainted with nautical matters. We shall hasten lightly over this voyage, referring the reader to the works above mentioned, and to the articles on the names of places and the nautical terms which occur in the narrative. SEE SHIPWRECK.

The centurion and his prisoners, among whom Aristarchus (Col 4:10) is named, embarked at Caesarea on board a ship of Adramyttium, and set sail for the coast of Asia. On the next day they touched at Sidon, and Julius began a course of kindly and respectful treatment by allowing Paul to go on shore to visit his friends. The westerly winds, still usual at the time of year (late in the summer), compelled the vessel to run northwards under the lee of Cyprus. Off the coast of Cilicia and Pamphylia they would find northerly winds, which enabled them to reach Myra in  Lycia. Here the voyagers were put on board another ship, which had come from Alexandria and was bound for Italy. In this vessel they worked slowly to windward, keeping near the coast of Asia Minor, till they came over against Cnidus. The wind being still contrary, the only course now was to run southwards, under the lee of Crete, passing the headland of Salmone. They then gained the advantage of a weather shore, and worked along the coast of Crete as far as Cape Matala, near which they took refuge in a harbor called Fair Havens, identified with one bearing the same name to this day.

It now became a serious question what course should be taken. It was late in the year for the navigation of those days. The fast of the day of expiation (Lev 23:27-29), answering to the autumnal equinox, was past, and Paul gave it as his advice that they should winter where they were. But the master and the owner of the ship were willing to run the risk of seeking a more commodious harbor, and the centurion followed their judgment. It was resolved, with the concurrence of the majority, to make for a harbor called Phoenix, sheltered from the south-west winds, as well as from the northwest. (The phrase βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα is rendered either “looking down the south-vest [Smith and Alford], or “looking towards the south- west,” when observed from the sea and towards the land enclosing it [Howson].) SEE PHOENICE.

A change of wind occurred which favored the plan, and by the aid of a light breeze from the south they were sailing towards Phoenix (now Lutro), when a violent north-east wind, SEE EUROCLYDON came down from the land (κατ᾿ αὐτῆς, scil. Κρήτης), caught the vessel, and compelled them to let her drive before the wind. In this course they arrived under the lee of a small island called Clauda, about twenty miles from Crete, where they took advantage of comparatively smooth water to get the boat on board, and to undergird, or frap, the ship. There was a fear lest they should be driven upon the Syrtis on the coast of Africa, and they therefore “lowered the gear,” or sent down upon deck the gear connected with the fair-weather sails, and stood out to sea “with storm-sails set and on the starboard tack” (Smith). The bad weather continued, and the ship was lightened on the next day of her way-freight, on the third of her loose furniture and tackling. For many days neither sun nor stars were visible to steer by, the storm was violent, and all began to despair of safety. The general discouragement was aggravated by the abstinence caused by the difficulty of preparing food, and the spoiling of it; and in order to raise the spirits of the whole company, Paul stood forth one  morning to relate a vision which had occurred to him in the night. An angel of the God “whose he was and whom he served” had appeared to him and said, “Fear not, Paul: thou must be brought before Caesar; and lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee.” At the same time he predicted that the vessel would be cast upon an island and be lost.

This shipwreck was to happen speedily. On the fourteenth night, as they were drifting through the sea, SEE ADRIA, about midnight, the sailors perceived indications, probably the roar of breakers, that land was near. Their suspicion was confirmed by soundings. They therefore cast four anchors out of the stern, and waited anxiously for daylight. After a while the sailors lowered the boat with the professed purpose of laying out anchors from the bow, but intending to desert the ship, which was in imminent danger of being dashed to pieces. Paul, aware of their intention, informed the centurion and the soldiers of it, who took care, by cutting the ropes of the boat, to prevent its being carried out. He then addressed himself to the task of encouraging the whole company, assuring them that their lives would be preserved, and exhorting them to refresh themselves quietly after their long abstinence with a good meal. He set the example himself, taking bread, giving thanks to God, and beginning to eat in presence of them all. After a general meal, in which there were two hundred and seventy-six persons to partake, they further lightened the ship by casting overboard the cargo (τὸν σῖτον, the “wheat” with which the vessel was laden). When the light of the dawn revealed the land, they did not recognize it, but they discovered a creek with a smooth beach, and determined to run the ship aground in it. So they cut away the anchors, unloosed the rudder-paddles, raised the foresail to the wind, and made for the beach. When they came close to it they found a narrow channel between the land on one side, which proved to be an islet, and the shore; and at this point, where the “two seas met,” they succeeded in driving the fore part of the vessel fast into the clayey beach. The stern began at once to go to pieces under the action of the breakers; but escape was now within reach. The soldiers suggested to their commander that the prisoners should be effectually prevented from gaining their liberty by being killed; but the centurion, desiring to save Paul, stopped this proposition, and gave orders that those who could swim should cast themselves first into the sea and get to land, and that the rest should follow with the aid of such spars as might be available. By this creditable combination of humanity and discipline the  deliverance was made as complete as Paul's assurances had predicted it would be.

The land on which they had been cast was found to belong to Malta. SEE MALTA. The very point of the stranding is made out with great probability by Mr. Smith. The inhabitants of the island received the wet and exhausted voyagers with no ordinary kindness, and immediately lighted a fire to warm them. This particular kindness is recorded on account of a curious incident connected with it. The apostle was helping to make the fire, and had gathered a bundle of sticks and laid them on the fire, when a viper came out of the heat, and fastened on his hand. When the natives saw the creature hanging from his hand they believed him to be poisoned by the bite, and said among themselves, “No doubt this man is a murderer, whom, though he has escaped from the sea, yet Vengeance suffers not to live.” But when they saw no harm come of it, they changed their minds and said he was a god. This circumstance, as well as the honor in which he was held by Julius, would account for Paul being invited with some others to stay at the house of the chief man of the island, whose name was Publius. By him they were courteously entertained for three days. The father of Publius happened to be ill of fever and dysentery, and was cured by Paul; and when this was known many other sick persons were brought to him and were cured. So there was a pleasant interchange of kindness and benefits. The people of the island showed the apostle and his company much honor, and when they were about to leave loaded them with such things as they would want. The Roman soldiers would carry with them to Rome a deepened impression of the character and the powers of the kingdom of which Paul was the herald.

After a three months' stay in Malta the soldiers and their prisoners left in an Alexandrian ship for Italy. A.D. 56. They touched at Syracuse, where they stayed three days, and at Rhegium, from which place they were carried with a fair wind to Puteoli, where they left their ship and the sea. At Puteoli they found “brethren,” for it was an important place, and especially a chief port for the traffic between Alexandria and Rome; and by these brethren they were exhorted to stay awhile with them. Permission seems to have been granted by the centurion; and while they were spending seven days at Puteoli news of the apostle's arrival was sent on to Rome. The Christians at Rome, on their part, sent forth some of their number, who met Paul at Appii Forum and Tres Tabernae; and on this first introduction  to the Church at Rome the apostle felt that his long desire was fulfilled at last. “He thanked God and took courage.”

(4.) Confinement at Rome. — On their arrival at Rome the centurion doubtless delivered up his prisoners into the proper custody, that of the praetorian prefect. Paul was at once treated with special consideration, and was allowed to dwell by himself with the soldier who guarded him. He was not released from this galling annoyance of being constantly chained to a keeper; but every indulgence compatible with this necessary restraint was readily allowed him. He was now therefore free “to preach the Gospel to them that were at Rome also;” and proceeded without delay to act upon his rule — “to the Jew first.” He invited the chief persons among the Jews to come to him, and explained to them that though he was brought to Rome to answer charges made against him by the Jews in Palestine, he had really done nothing disloyal to his nation or the law, nor desired to be considered as hostile to his fellow-countrymen. On the contrary, he was in custody for maintaining that “the hope of Israel” had been fulfilled. The Roman Jews replied that they had received no tidings to his prejudice. The sect of which he had implied he was a member they knew to be everywhere spoken against; but they were willing to hear what he had to say. It has been thought strange that such an attitude should be taken towards the faith of Christ by the Jews at Rome, where a flourishing branch of the Church had existed for some years; and an argument has been drawn from this representation against the authenticity of the Acts. But it may be accounted for without violence from what we know and may probably conjecture.

(1.) The Church at Rome consisted mainly of Gentiles, although it must be supposed that they had previously been for the most part Jewish proselytes.

(2.) The real Jews at Rome had been persecuted and sometimes entirely banished, and their unsettled state may have checked the contact and collision which would have been otherwise likely.

(3.) Paul was possibly known by name to the Roman Jews, and curiosity may have persuaded them to listen to him.

Even if he were not known to them, yet here, as in other places, his courteous bearing and strong expressions of adhesion to the faith of his fathers would win a hearing from them. A day was therefore appointed, on  which a large number came expressly to hear him expound his belief; and from morning till evening he bore witness to the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the prophets. So the apostle of the Gentiles had not yet unlearned the original apostolic method. The hope of Israel was still his subject. But, as of old, the reception of his message by the Jews was not favorable. They were slow of heart to believe at Rome as at Pisidian Antioch. The judgment pronounced by Isaiah had come, Paul testified, upon the people. They had made themselves blind and deaf and gross of heart. The Gospel must be proclaimed to the Gentiles, among whom it would find a better welcome. He turned therefore again to the Gentiles, and for two years he dwelt in his own hired house, and received all who came to him, proclaiming the kingdom of God, and teaching concerning the Lord Jesus Christ with all confidence, no man forbidding him.

These are the last words of the Acts. This history of the planting of the kingdom of Christ in the world brings us down to the time when the Gospel was openly proclaimed by the great apostle in the Gentile capital, and stops short of the mighty convulsion which was shortly to pronounce that kingdom established as the divine commonwealth for all men. The work of Paul belonged to the preparatory period. He was not to live through the time when the Son of Man calme in the destruction of the Holy City and Temple, and in the throes of the New Age. The most significant part of his work was accomplished when in the Imperial City he had declared his Gospel, “to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile.” But his career is not abruptly closed. Before he himself fades out of our sight in the twilight of ecclesiastical tradition, we have letters written by himself, which contribute some particulars to his external biography, and give us a far more precious insight into his convictions and sympathies.

10. Subsequent History. —

(1.) Later Epistles. — We might naturally expect that Paul, tied down to one spot at Rome, and yet free to speak and write to whom he pleased, would pour out in letters his love and anxiety for distant churches. It has hence been supposed by some that the author of the extant Epistles wrote very many which are not extant. But of this there is not a particle of evidence; nor were the circumstances of Paul after all very favorable for extended epistolary correspondence. It is difficult enough to connect in our minds the writing of the known Epistles with the external conditions of a  human life; to think of Paul, with his incessant chain and soldier, sitting down to write or dictate, and producing for the world an inspired epistle. But it is almost more difficult to imagine the Christian communities of these days, samples of the population of Macedonia or Asia Minor, receiving and reading such letters. Yet the letters were actually written; and they must of necessity be accepted as representing the kind of communications which marked the intercourse of the apostle and his fellow-Christians. When he wrote, he wrote out of the fullness of his heart; and the ideas on which he dwelt were those of his daily and hourly thoughts. To that imprisonment to which Luke has introduced us the imprisonment which lasted for such a tedious time, although tempered by much indulgence — belongs certainly the noble group of Letters to Philemon, to the Colossians, to the Ephesians, and to the Philippians, and probably also that peculiar one, the Letter to the Hebrew Christians. The first three of these were written at one time and sent by the same messengers. Whether that to the Philippians was written before or after these we cannot determine; but the tone of it seems to imply that a crisis was approaching, and therefore it is commonly regarded as the latest of the four.

Paul had not himself founded the Church at Colossae. But during his imprisonment at Rome he had for an associate — he calls him a “fellow- prisoner” (Phm 1:23) — a chief teacher of the Colossian Church named Epaphras. He had thus become deeply interested in the condition of that Church. It happened that at the same time a slave named Onesimus came within the reach of Paul's teaching, and was converted into a zealous and useful Christian. This Onesimus had run away from his master; and his master was a Christian of Colossae. Paul determined to send back Onesimus to his master; and with him he determined also to send his old companion Tychicus (Act 20:4), as a messenger to the Church at Colossee and to neighboring churches. This was the occasion of the letter to Philemon, which commended Onesimus, in language of singular tenderness and delicacy, as a faithful and beloved brother, to his injured master; and also of the two letters to the Colossians and Ephesians. That to the Colossians, being drawn forth by the most special circumstances, may be reasonably supposed to have been written first. It was intended to guard the Church at Colossse from false teaching, which the apostle knew to be infesting it. For the characteristics of this Epistle we must refer to the special article. The end of it (Col 4:7-18) names several friends  who were with Paul at Rome, as Aristarchus, Marcus (Mark), Epaphras, Luke, and Demas. SEE COLOSSIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.

For the writing of the Epistle to the Ephesians there seems to have been no more special occasion than that Tychicus was passing through Ephesus. The highest characteristic which these two Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians have in common is that of a presentation of the Lord Jesus Christ, fuller and clearer than we find in previous writings, as the Head of creation and of mankind. All things created through Christ, all things coherent in him, all things reconciled to the Father by him, the eternal purpose to restore and complete all things in him — such are the ideas which grew richer and more distinct in the mind of the apostle as he meditated on the Gospel which he had been preaching, and the truths implied in it. In the Epistle to the Colossians this divine Headship of Christ is maintained as the safeguard against the fancies which filled the heavens with secondary divinities, and which laid down rules for an artificial sanctity of men upon the earth. In the Epistle to the Ephesians the eternity and universality of God's redeeming purpose in Christ, and the gathering of men unto him as his members, are set forth as gloriously revealed in the Gospel. In both, the application of the truth concerning Christ as the Image of God and the Head of men to the common relations of human life is dwelt upon in detail. SEE EPHESIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.

The Epistle to the Philippians resembles the Second to the Corinthians in the effusion of personal feeling, but differs from it in the absence of all soreness. The Christians at Philippi had regarded the apostle with love and reverence from the beginning, and had given him many proofs of their affection. They had now sent him a contribution towards his maintenance at Rome, such as we must suppose him to have received from time to time for the expenses of “his own hired house.” The bearer of this contribution was Epaphroditus, an ardent friend and fellow-laborer of Paul, who had fallen sick on the journey or at Rome (Php 2:27). The Epistle was written to be conveyed by Epaphroditus on his return, and to express the joy with which Paul had received the kindness of the Philippians. He dwells therefore upon their fellowship in the work of spreading the Gospel, a work in which he was even now laboring, and scarcely with less effect on account of his bonds. His imprisonment had made him known, and had given him fruitful opportunities of declaring his Gospel among the imperial guard (Php 1:13), and even in the household of the Caesar (Php 4:22). He professes his undiminished sense of the glory of following Christ, and his expectation  of an approaching time in which the Lord Jesus should be revealed from heaven as a deliverer. There is a gracious tone running through this Epistle, expressive of humility, devotion, kindness, delight in all things fair and good, to which the favorable circumstances under which it was written gave a natural occasion, and which helps us to understand the kind of ripening which had taken place in the spirit of the writer. SEE PHILIPPIANS, EPISTLE TO THE.

To the close of this imprisonment apparently also belongs the Epistle to the Hebrews (q.v.).

(2.) Last Labors and Martyrdom. — In both these last Epistles Paul expresses a confident hope that before long he may be able to visit the persons addressed in person (Php 1:25, οιδα, κ. τ.; Php 2:24, πέποιθα, κ. τ. λ.; Heb 13:19, ἵνα τάχιον, κ. τ. λ.; Heb 13:23, ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς). Whether this hope were fulfilled or not belongs to a question which now presents itself to us, and which has been the occasion of much controversy. According to the general opinion, the apostle was liberated from his imprisonment and left Rome soon after the writing of the letter to the Philippians, spent some time in visits to Greece, Asia Minor, and Spain, returned again as a prisoner to Rome, and was put to death there. In opposition to this view it is maintained by some that he was never liberated, but was put to death at Rome at an earlier period than is commonly supposed. The arguments adduced in favor of the common view are: (1) the hopes expressed by Paul of visiting Philippi (already named) and Colossae (Phm 1:22); (2) a number of allusions in the Pastoral Epistles, and their general character; and (3) the testimony of ecclesiastical tradition. The arguments in favor of the single imprisonment appear to be wholly negative, and to aim simply at showing that there is no proof of a liberation or departure from Rome. It is contended that Paul's expectations were not always realized, and that the passages from Philemon and Philippians are effectually neutralized by Act 20:25, “I know that ye all (at Ephesus) shall see my face no more;” inasmuch as the supporters of the ordinary view hold that Paul went again to Ephesus. This is a fair answer, but inconsistent, inasmuch as it assumes the certainty of Paul's expectations, which this theory had just denied. The argument from the Pastoral Epistles is met most simply by a denial of their genuineness. The tradition of ecclesiastical antiquity is affirmed to have no real weight.  The decision must turn mainly upon the view taken of the Pastoral Epistles. It is true that there are many critics, including Wieseler and Dr. Davidson, who admit the genuineness of these Epistles, and yet, by referring 1 Timothy and Titus to an earlier period, and by strained explanations of the allusions in 2 Timothy, get rid of the evidence they are generally understood to give in favor of a second imprisonment. The voyages required by the two former Epistles, and the writing of them, are placed within the three years spent chiefly at Ephesus (Act 20:31). But the hypothesis of voyages during that period not recorded by Luke is just as arbitrary as that of a release from Rome, which is objected to expressly because it is arbitrary; and such a distribution of the Pastoral Epistles is shown by overwhelming evidence to be untenable. The whole question is discussed in a masterly and decisive manner by Alford in his Prolegomena to the Pastoral Epistles. If, however, these Epistles are not accepted as genuine, the main ground for the belief in a second imprisonment is cut away. For a special consideration of the Epistles, let the reader refer to the aticles on SEE TIMOTHY and SEE TITUS.

The difficulties which have induced such critics as De Wette and Ewald to reject these Epistles are not inconsiderable, and will force themselves upon the attention of the careful student of Paul. But they are overpowered by the much greater difficulties attending any hypothesis which assumes these Epistles to be spurious. We are obliged therefore to recognize the modifications of Paul's style, the developments in the history of the Church, and the movements of various persons, which have appeared suspicious in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, as nevertheless historically true. And then, without encroaching on the domain of conjecture, we draw the following conclusions:

(1) Paul must have left Rome, and visited Asia Minor and Greece; for he says to Timothy (1Ti 1:3), “I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I was setting out for Macedonia.” After being once at Ephesus, he was purposing to go there again (1Ti 4:13), and he spent a considerable time at Ephesus (2Ti 1:18).

(2) He paid a visit to Crete, and left Titus to organize churches there (Tit 1:5). He was intending to spend a winter at one of the places named Nicopolis (Tit 3:12).

(3) He traveled by Miletus (2Ti 4:20), Troas (2Ti 4:13), where he left a cloak or case, and some books, and Corinth (2Ti 4:20).

(4) He is a prisoner at Rome, “suffering unto bonds as an evil-doer” (2Ti 2:9), and expecting to be soon condemned to death (2Ti 4:6). At this time he felt deserted and solitary, having only Luke of his old associates to keep him company; and he was very anxious that Timothy should come to him without delay from Ephesus, and bring Mark with him (2Ti 1:15; 2Ti 4:9-12; 2Ti 4:16).

These facts may be amplified by probable additions from conjecture and tradition. There are strong reasons for placing the three Epistles at as advanced a date as possible, and not far from one another. The peculiarities of style and diction by which these are distinguished from all his former epistles, the affectionate anxieties of an old man, and the glances frequently thrown back on earlier times and scenes, the disposition to be hortatory rather than speculative, the references to a more complete and settled organization of the Church, the signs of a condition tending to moral corruption, and resembling that described in the apocalyptic letters to the Seven Churches — would incline us to adopt the latest date which has been suggested for the death of Paul, so as to interpose as much time as possible between the Pastoral Epistles and the former group. Now the earliest authorities for the date of Paul's death are Eusebius and Jerome, who place it, the one (Chronic. Ann. 2083) in the thirteenth, the other (Cat. Script. Eccl. Paulus”) in the fourteenth year of Nero. These dates would allow some seven or eight years between the first imprisonment and the second. During these years, according to the general belief of the early Church, Paul accomplished his old design (Rom 15:28) and visited Spain. Ewald, who denies the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles, and with it the journeyings in Greece and Asia Minor, believes that Paul was liberated and paid this visit to Spain (Geschichte, 6:621, 631,632); yielding upon this point to the testimony of tradition.

The first writer quoted in support of the journey to Spain is one whose evidence would indeed be irresistible if the language in which it is expressed were less obscure. Clement of Rome, in a hortatory and rather rhetorical passage (Ephesians 1 ad Cor. c. 5), refers to Paul as an example of patience, and mentions that he preached ἔν το τῇ ἀνατολῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ δύσει, and that before his martyrdom he went ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως. It is probable, but can hardly be said to be certain, that by this expression, “the goal of the west,”  Clement was describing Spain, or some country yet more to the west. The next testimony labors under a somewhat similar difficulty from the imperfection of the text, but it at least names unambiguously a “profectionem Pauli ab urbe ad Spaniam proficiscentis.” This is from Muratori's Fragment on the Canon (Routh, Rel. Sac. 4:1-12). (See the passage quoted and discussed in Wieseler, Chron. d. apost. Zeitalt. p. 536, etc., or Alford, 3:93.) Afterwards Chrysostom says simply, Μετὰ τὸ γένεσθαι ἐν ῾Ρωμῇ, πάλιν εἰς τὴν Σπανίαν ἀπῆλθεν (on 2Ti 4:20); and Jerome speaks of Paul as set free by Nero, that he might preach the Gospel of Christ “in Occidentis quoque partibus” (Cat. Script. Eccl. “Paulus”). Against these assertions nothing is produced, except the absence of allusions to a journey to Spain in passages from some of the fathers where such allusions might more or less be expected. Dr. Davidson (Introd. to the New Test. 3:15, 84) gives a long list of critics who believe in Paul's release from the first imprisonment. Wieseler (p. 521) mentions some of these, with references, and adds some of the more eminent German critics who believe with him in but one imprisonment. These include Schrader, Hemsen, Winer, and Baur. The only English name of any weight to be added to this list is that of Dr. Davidson. (See further below.)

We conclude, then, that after a wearing imprisonment of two years or more at Rome, Paul was set free, and spent some years in various journeyings eastwards and westwards. Towards the close of this time he pours out the warnings of his less vigorous but still brave and faithful spirit in the letters to Timothy and Titus. The first to Timothy and that to Titus were evidently written at very nearly the same time. After these were written, he was apprehended again and sent to Rome. As an eminent Christian teacher Paul was now in a far more dangerous position than when he was first brought to Rome. The Christians had been exposed to popular odium by the false charge of being concerned in the great Neronian conflagration of the city, and had been subjected to a most cruel persecution. The apostle appears now to have been treated, not as an honorable state-prisoner, but as a felon (2Ti 2:9). But he was at least allowed to write this second letter to his “dearly beloved son” Timothy; and though he expresses a confident expectation of his speedy death, he yet thought it sufficiently probable that it might be delayed for some time, to warrant him in urging Timothy to come to him from Ephesus. Meanwhile, though he felt his isolation, he was not in the least daunted by his danger. He was more than ready to die (4:6),  and had a sustaining experience of not being deserted by his Lord. Once already, in this second imprisonment, he had appeared before the authorities; and “the Lord then stood by him and strengthened him,” and gave him a favorable opportunity for the one thing always nearest to his heart, the public declaration of his Gospel.

This epistle, surely no unworthy utterance at such an age and in such an hour even of a Paul, brings us, it may well be presumed, close to the end of his life. For what remains, we have the concurrent testimony of ecclesiastical antiquity that he was beheaded at Rome, about the same time that Peter was crucified there. The earliest allusion to the death of Paul is in that sentence from Clemens Romanus, already quoted: “Having gone to the boundary of the West, and testified before rulers, so he departed out of the world” (ἐπὶ τὸ τέρμα τῆς δύσεως ἐλθὼν καὶ μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ τῶν ἡγουμενων, οὕτως ἀπηλλάγη τοῦ κόσμου), which just fails of giving us any particulars upon which we can conclusively rely. The next authorities are those quoted by Eusebius in his Hist. Ecc 2:25. Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (A.D. 170), says that Peter and Paul went to Italy and taught there together, and suffered martyrdom about the same time. This, like most of the statements relating to the death of Paul, is mixed up with the tradition, with which we are not here immediately concerned, of the work of Peter at Rome. Caius of Rome, supposed to be writing within the 2d century, names the grave of Peter on the Vatican, and that of Paul on the Ostian Way. Eusebius himself entirely adopts the tradition that Paul was beheaded under Nero at Rome. Among other early testimonies, we have that of Tertullian, who says (De Praescr. Haeret. 36) that at Rome “Petrus passioni Dominicas adequatur, Paulus Johannis [the Baptist] exitu coronatur;” and that of Jerome (Cat. Scr. “Paulus”), “Hic ergo 14to Neronis anno (eodem die quo Petrus) Romae pro Christo capite truncatus sepultusque est, in via Ostiensi.” It would be useless to enumerate further testimonies of what is undisputed.

It would also be beyond the scope of this article to attempt to exhibit the traces of Paul's apostolic work in the history of the Church. But there is one indication, so exceptional as to deserve special mention, which shows that the difficulty of understanding the Gospel of Paul and of reconciling it with a true Judaism was very early felt. This is in the apocryphal work called the Clementines (τὰ Κλημέντια), supposed to be written before the end of the 2d century. These curious compositions contain direct assaults (for though the name is not given, the references are plain and undisguised)  upon the authority and the character of Paul. Peter is represented as the true apostle, of the Gentiles as well as of the Jews, and Paul as ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἄνθοωπος, who opposes Peter and James. The portions of the Clementines which illustrate the writer's view of Paul will be found in Stanley's Corinthians (Introd. to 2 Cor.); and an account of the whole work, with references to the treatises of Schliemann and Baur, in Gieseler, Eccl. Hist. i, § 58.

III. Special Investigations. — We propose here briefly to take up the various disputed points above referred to, the discussion of which, in their respective connections, would have interrupted the narrative.

1. On the chronology of Paul's life, see the following works: Pearson, Annales Paulini, in his Posthum. Op. (Lond. 1688, and separately at Halle, 1719); Hottinger, Pentas dissertat. Bibl. Chromn p. 305 sq.; Vogel, in Gabler's Journal f: auserl. theol. Lit. 1:229 sq.; Haselaar, De nonnullis Act. Apost. et Epp. Paul. ad hist. P. pertinent. locis (L. B. 1806); Hug, Einleit. 2:263; SUskind, in Bengel's A rchiv, 1:156 sq., 297 sq.; Schmidt, in Keil's Analekt. III, 1:128 sq.; Schrader, Paculus, vol. i; Schott, Erorterung wichtiger chronol. Puncte in d. Lebensgesch. d. P. (Jena, 1832);- Anger, De tempor. in Actis. (Leips. 1833); Wurm, in the Tiibing. Zeitschr. fur Theol. 1833; Wieseler, Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters (Getting. 1848); Conybeare and Howson, Life and Letters of St. Paul (Lond. 1850); Davidson, Introd. to the New Test. (ibid.) vol. ii; Lewin, Elements of Early Christ. Chron.; Browne, Ordo Sceclorum. The fundamental points on which this chronology depends are his joining the Christian Church (Kuchler, De Anno quo P. ad Sac. Christ. Conver. est, Leips. 1828), and his journey to Jerusalem. It is of course utterly impossible to determine the year of Paul's birth. According to an old tradition (Orat. de Petro et Paulo in Chrysost. Opp. ed. Bened. 8:10), it falls in the second year after Christ. Schrader places it in the fourteenth year after Christ. It is easier to determine the time of his joining the Church than of his visit to Jerusalem (comp. Act 9:22 sq. with 2Co 11:32). But two difficulties arise: first, we are not certain whether this open act of allegiance to Christianity took place during the first or second stay of Paul, after his conversion, at Damascus (Gal 1:17; the latter seems probable, according to Act 9:26); and, second, the year in which an ethnarch of the Arabian king Aretas ruled in Damascus affords no satisfactory ground for chronology. (Yet see Neander, Pfanz. 1:127 sq.). It is even urged that the Arabian ethnarch was  present only as a private man (Anger, p. 181); but this is improbable in view of the expressions used by Paul (2Co 11:32). We must, however, be content to give up the hope of using this as a safe starting- point for Paul's chronology. SEE ARETAS.

We have, however, the death of king Agrippa (Acts 12), and the arrival of the procurator Porcius Festus in his province of Judaea (Act 24:27), as the two extreme points between which the active missionary life of Paul lies. Now we know certainly that king Agrippa died in the year 44, and the arrival of Festus may be fixed with high probability in the summer of the year 55. SEE FESTUS. But with regard to the details of the events which occurred between these periods the widest diversity of opinion exists, even among the ablest investigators, on grounds which we cannot here set forth. SEE CHRONOLOGY. The chronological arrangement which seems, on the whole, the most probable, is given under the head ACTS SEE ACTS (q.v.).

2. On the family of Paul, Jerome remarks that Paul was of the tribe of Benjamin, and the town of Gischala, in Judaea (comp. Γίσχαλα, a small city in Galilee: Joseph. War, 2:20, 6; 4:1, 1; Life, 10:38; and Reland, Palaest. p. 813), and, when this town was taken by the Romans, he emigrated with his parents to Tarsus, in Cilicia. But this is plainly contradicted by Act 22:3, where Paul speaks of himself as a native of Tarsus; nor is it easy to see how Gischala could have been taken by the Romans during Paul's childhood, so that residents judged it prudent to emigrate. A story of the Ebionites (Epiphan. Haer. 30, 16:25) tells us that Paul was by birth a heathen, but became a Jew in Jerusalem, in order to obtain the high-priest's daughter in marriage! It is not certainly known how Paul's father obtained the right of Roman citizenship (see Becker, Romans Alterthumsk. II, 1:89 sq.; Cellar. Dissertat. 2:710 sq.; Deyling, Observat. 3:388 sq.; Arntzen, Diss. de civitate Pauli, Traj. ad Rhen. 1725). Either some ancestor, perhaps the father of Paul himself, had obtained it by great service to the state (Grotius, ad loc.; Cellarius, ut sup. p. 726 sq.), or he had purchased it (Gronov. Ad Joseph. Decr.pro Jud. p. 42; Deyling, ut sup. p. 393 sq.). The supposition that the whole city of Tarsus received the right from Augustus is without ground (comp. Bengel, on Act 16:27). SEE TARSUS.

If the reading υἱὸς Φαρισαίου, “son of a Pharisee,”' in Act 23:6, were correct, we might infer that only Paul's father had belonged to this sect; but if, with the best manuscripts, we read, υἱὸς Φαρισαίου, “son of Pharisees,” it would imply that his ancestors had been Pharisees for several or many generations; and perhaps that they had  been reckoned among the most aristocratic of the Jews. We know nothing further of Paul's family, save that he had a sister and a nephew, the latter living in Jerusalem (Act 23:16), and that he was not himself married (1Co 7:7; comp. 9:5; and see Schmid, De Apostolis Uxoratis, p. 80 sq., where also the account of Clemens Alexand. in Euseb. 3:30, is examined; esp. see Usher, Prolegom. in Ignat. c. 17; Append. to 2d vol. Patres Apost. ed. Coteler. Cleric. p. 226 sq.). The tradition affirms that Paul led with him for some time as a companion the young woman Thecla, of Iconium, whom he had converted (Menolog. Graec. 1:66).

3. As to Paul's trade, on the word “tent-maker” (σκηνοποιός) we may refer to the Lexicons, to Bertholdt (v. 2698 sq.), and Schurtzfleisch (De Paullo σκηνοποιῷ, Leips. 1699). Luther makes it “carpet-maker;” Morus (in Act 18:3) and others, “maker of mats or mattresses;” Michaelis (Einl. ins N.T. § 216) and Hanlemn (inl. ins NV. T. 3:301), “tool-maker;” Chrysostom and others, “worker in leather” (=σκυτοτόμος ); Hug (Introd. p. 505, Fosdick's transl.) and Eichhorn (Einl. ins N.T. 3:8), “maker of tent- cloth;” but most critics agree with our translators in rendering it “tent- maker” (comp. Kuinol, Dindorf, Rosenmüller, Olshausen, Schleusner). Shepherds. travelers, and others used small tents of cloth or leather as a protection against the weather, especially at night. The manufacture of them was a flourishing and profitable employment. SEE TENT. Paul accordingly preferred, when opportunity offered, to support himself by laboring at this trade, rather than to live upon the gifts of the Church (Act 18:3; 1Co 4:12; 1Th 2:9; 2Th 3:8). There was a goat's-hair cloth called Cilicium, manufactured in Cilicia, and largely used for tents. Paul's trade was probably that of making tents of this haircloth.

4. As to Paul's education, there was a flourishing Greek academy in Tarsus, and the residents were respected in other countries fortheir cultivation. Whether and how far this circumstance influenced Paul while young cannot be determined; probably he was yet very young when he went to Jerusalem, and obtained his facility in the use of the Greek language and his Hellenistic education rather by his travels among the Greeks than in his native city. It is not in itself probable that he attended a Greek school in Tarsus, nor can it be proved from his writings. He shows in them rather the learning of a Jewish rabbi, for which position he had been educated (Gal 1:14), and the logical training of a Pharisee (Ammon, Opuscula, p. 63 sq.), supported by a remarkable natural  endowment; and the few quotations from Greek poets which are found in his epistles and speeches (see Jerome, on Isaiah 1), as in 1Co 15:33; Act 17:28 (see Progr. by Benner [Giess. 1753], on Tit 1:12; Schickendanz, De trib. a Paullo profanor. scriptis allegatis [Servest. 1764]; Von Seclen, Meditt. Exeg. 2:312 sq.; Hoffmann, De Paullo Apost. Scriptor. prof. allegante [Tub. 1770]), might have been picked up in the course of his travels, as they are merely general, and perhaps proverbial, sentences. So as regards the few words quoted from Aratus, we need not suppose, with Tholuck, that the apostle had read him, although this is not very improbable (Neander, 1:111); nor must we forget that Paul seems to indicate (Gal 6:11) that it was not easy for him to write in Greek letters (see Thalemann, De EFIuditione Panlli Judaica non Griceca [Leips. 1769]; Michaelis, Einl. 1:162 sq.; Henke, on Paley, lorae Paulinoe, p. 469 sq. On the contrary side, Strom bach, De Eruditione Paulli [Leips. 1708]; Schramm, De stupenda Eruditione Paulli [Herborn, 1710]; Miller, in the Biblioth. Lubec. v. 104 sq.). The active mind of the apostle did not remain ignorant even of the philosophical speculations of the day. But by the philosophy of Paul (see Zobel, De Paullo philosopho [Altdorf, 1701]; Feller, De Patho philosopho plane divino [Viteb. 1740]; Bieck, De Pauli philosophia, in Heumann's Act. Philos. 13:124 sq.) is not meant a formal system or scientific view, but simply that his mind had a philosophical turn. In the same manner the acquaintance he betrays occasionally with the Roman law does not at all pass beyond the miost common legal relations, and cannot be called jurisprudence (Kirchmaier, Dejurisprudentia Paullina [Viteb. 1730]; Westenburg, Opusc. Academ. ed. Piittmann [Leips. 1794]; Stryck, De jurisprud. Paul. [Halle, 1705]; Freiesleben, De jurisprud. Paul. [Leips. 1840]). The style of Paul's Epistles shows that he had acquired a real facility in expressing himself in Greek; and the Greek coloring which appears through all the Hebraisms of his style excludes the supposition that he conceived his letters in Hebrew (Arameean). Translations from the Hebrew by a foreign hand, and that, as it is urged in excess of learned trifling, an unskilled one would read quite otherwise. The Greek style of Paul rises even at times to eloquence (Hug, Einleit. 2:285), although he may have seemed to the Greeks “rude in speech” (2Co 11:6), and a better Pauline system of rhetoric could easily be derived from his works than Baur suggests (Halle, 1782, 2:8; see Kirchmaier, De P. Eloquentia [Viteb. 1695]; Baden, De Eloquent. Pauli [Havn. 1786]; Tzschirner, Observat. Pauli epistol. scriptoris ingenium concernentes [Viteb. 1800], 3:4; Hoffmann, De stilo Pauli [Tubing. 1757]). Paul not  only talked Greek in the ordinary intercourse of life, but was able to make extemporaneous speeches in Greek (Act 21:37; Act 17:22 sq.).

Nor can there be any doubt of the acquaintance of the apostle with Latin, and his ability to speak it (see Ehrhardt, De Latinitate Pauli [Silus. 1755]. 2:4). But perhaps his idiomatic facility in the Greek had failed him, and led to his employment of an amanuensis. Extravagant claims have often been made on the apostle's behalf as to his classical education, based upon slender evidence. This evidence consists (1) of a few supposed references, in the discourse alluded to by Dr. Bentley, to certain dogmas of the Greek philosophers; but even supposing the apostle to have had these in his eye, it will not follow that he must have studied the writings in which these dogmas were unfolded and defended, because he might have learned enough of them to guide him to such referenced, as by the supposition he makes in that discourse, from those controversial encounters with “the philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics” which we are told he had in the market-place of Athens, previous to the delivery of his oration on the Areopagus; (2) of three quotations made by him from Greek poets: one from the Phoenomena (Act 17:5), of his countryman Aratus (Act 17:28), one from a lost play of Menander (1Co 15:33), and one from Epimenides (Tit 1:12), all of which, however, bear the general character of gnomes or proverbs, and might consequently find their way to the apostle merely as a part of the current coin of popular conversation, without his having once visited the treasury whence they were originally drawn; and (3) of certain similarities of idea and expression between some passages of the apostle and some that are found in classic authors (Horne, Introd. 4:343); but none of which are of such a nature as to necessitate the conclusion that the coincidence is more than purely accidental. SEE EDUCATION.

5. On the conversion of Paul there are various views (see Lyttleton, Observ. on the Convers. of Paul [Lond. 1747], and Kuinol, Comment. 4:329 sq.). The older view, and the prevailing one still in England and America, which interprets the accounts literally, and supposes a visible manifestation of Jesus, is brought forward by Miller (De Je u a Paullo Viso [Gott. 1778]). But the prevailing current of German opinion, under rationalistic influence, has for a long time been to explain away the supernatural elements in this narrative, either by referring them to the imagination of Paul and his followers, working on natural events (see Ammon, De repentina Sauli ad doctr. Christi conversione [Erl. 1792],  also in his Opusc. Theol. 1 sq.; Eichhorn, Biblioth. der bibl. Lit. vi sq.; Greiling, in Henke's Mus. 3:226 sq.; Schulz, in Heinrich's Beitr. z. Beford. d. theol. Wiss. 1:47 sq.; Bengel, Observ. de Pauli ad rem Christ. conver. [Tubing. 1819], 2:4 [this work takes, however, a middle course, and shows more than usual regard for the narrative]; Planck, Gesch. der ersten Periode d. Christen, 2:90 sq. But Neander [i. 116] and Olshausen [on Act 9:1] return partially to the old view), or reject the narrative entirely as a relation of actual facts (so Bretschneider, Land. der Dogmatik, 1:325 sq., who considers all as a vision; Baur, p. 63 sq., who makes the account a fable, framed out of Paul's internal experience, by his defenders, as an offset to Peter's vision, Act 10:11).

The apologetic bearing of Saul's conversion, according to the obvious meaning of the Scripture narrative, upon the question of the supernatural origin of Christianity is too obvious not to have rendered the subject a field of fierce debate among the contending parties. The Christian Church, as a whole, has ever appealed to this remarkable event as furnishing irresistible evidence of the truth of the crowning miracle of the Gospel, the resurrection of our Lord. Upon this one fact, the “conversion and apostleship of Paul,” a well-known author (Lyttleton) has consented to lay the whole stress of the argument. Was Paul an impostor, or an enthusiast, or deceived by others? Let us weigh the probabilities. This is not the case of a rude Galilasan peasant, whose untutored perceptions might be supposed incapable of distinguishing between natural and miraculous phenomena; but of a man of acute and discriminating intellect, well versed in Jewish learning, and not unacquainted with classic lore; and so far from being predisposed towards the Christian cause, or even, like his master Gamaliel, content to remain neutral, or to leave the event to a higher power, animated by sentiments of the bitterest hostility to Christ and to Christ's followers. His most cherished associations, his temporal prospects, alike pointed to his continuance in the Jewish faith. His subsequent course furnishes no evidence of any change of mind. His convictions and his zeal know no abatement, and at length he seals his ministry with a martyr's death. If we examine his extant letters, we find in them not a trace of the credulous or the enthusiastic or the fanatical temperament, which might explain the phenomenon. According to the ordinary motives of human action, Paul's conversion is, if the facts were not as stated, unaccountable.

Feeling the force of this, the modern opponents of the supernatural have retreated from the position of the elder deists, and, admitting that Paul  believed that he saw and heard the risen Savior, have attempted to explain the matter either on a combination of natural and psychological grounds, or on the latter purely. The very excess of Paul's antichristian zeal paved the way to his conversion. It brought him into contact with the Christians, and thus made him acquainted with the arguments for and against the claims of Jesus to be the Messiah. Was the scandal of the cross decisive against this claim? An impartial examination of the prophets would prove that the idea of a suffering Messiah was familiar to them. To himself as a Pharisee the idea of a resurrection from the dead would present no difficulties. The patience and joy with which the Christians encountered suffering must have produced a deep impression upon him. Thus a state of doubt and hesitation would naturally succeed to that of unreasoning prejudice. Might not the death of Christ, shameful as it appeared, be really, as the Christians considered it, God's ordinance for the salvation of the world? If his resurrection were but a fact, it would turn the scale. The more this thought fixed itself in Paul's mind, the more, in the agony of suspense to which it would give rise, would he long for some convincing proof of what he had come to hope might be true. On that memorable journey the crisis took place. As he was vainly endeavoring, by redoubled efforts against the Christian faith, to stifle the remonstrances of conscience and the growth of conviction, either a sudden thunder-storm which overtook him (Ammon), or his own excited imagination without any external cause aiding (Baur, Holsten), so affected the nerves of vision and hearing that an appearance or phantasm of the risen Savior, uttering words of reproach and admonition, figured itself on his retina, and produced the effects recorded.

Such is the latest form of the rationalistic theory on this subject. To us it appears wholly inadequate to support the conclusion intended, viz. that no external manifestation of Christ took place. We can but briefly touch upon its inherent improbabilities. That Paul fully believed that the transaction had an existence external to himself is plain, not merely from his own references to it (Act 22:6-10), but from his unhesitating claim to be an apostle of Christ, in no wise inferior to those who had seen the Savior in his humiliation (1Co 9:1). Now it was the special qualification for the apostolic office that the holder of it should have beheld the Lord in his glorified body, so as to be able to testify to the fact of his resurrection. (See especially Act 1:22, and the addresses of Peter in ch. ii and iii of that book.) As certainly, therefore, as Paul claimed to be an apostle, so certainly was it his conviction that, like his colleagues, he had had ocular  demonstration of our Lord's resurrection: on no other ground could he have asserted a coordinate rank and authority. Still, it is no doubt possible that he might have mistaken vision for reality; or at least that Luke, the historian, might have confounded the two. But, in fact, both writers exhibit a perfect consciousness of the difference between them. Peter's “vision” (Acts 10) is expressly described as such (Act 10:3); and that the distinction was familiar to the historian is proved by his observation in the account of the same apostle's miraculous deliverance, that he “wist not that it was true which was done by the angel, but thought he saw a vision.” We are told that it was in a “vision” that Christ appeared to Ananias (Act 9:10), and to Paul himself on subsequent occasions (Act 18:9; Act 22:17). The apostle speaks in various passages of his Epistles of a state of ecstatic trance, as not unfrequent with him; and in such cases whether he was “in the body or out of the body” he could not tell; a description which presents a strong contrast to the positive matter-of-fact style which the apostle uses in describing what took place on the journey to Damascus.

It is clear then that both Luke and Paul, far from placing all supernatural communications in the same category, drew a distinction, well-known and acknowledged, between a mere vision, or rapture, and an external manifestation; and, therefore, if they had regarded that appearance of Christ which issued in the conversion of the latter as an instance of vision merely, they would have described it as such. The hypothesis, therefore, that they were unable to distinguish the one from the other falls to the ground. Not less ungrounded, as far as the evidence is concerned, is the “psychological” explanation. There is no trace in the history of any intercourse between Paul and Christians of a friendly nature previous to his conversion. Neither is there any evidence of a growing struggle in his own mind between prejudice and conviction as to the truth of Christianity. His mental and moral conflicts were wholly of a legal character (Romans 7). Is it credible that if, as the theory supposes, such a struggle had been going on he would have continued, as he did, in his career of persecution to the last moment? Moreover, is it agreeable to experience that a change, not merely of view but of heart, so vast as to be called by Paul himself a “new creation,” should have been wrought by the unaided exercise of the natural powers? The theory sinks under an accumulation of inherent improbabilities. There remains only the other alternative, that Paul really beheld the risen Savior piercing the clouds of heaven as he will do at the last day, and visible in his glorified body. Nor can we fail to perceive the  divine wisdom in this extraordinary conversion. Natures like Paul's can only be transformed, if at all, suddenly and with a mighty shock: a lightning stroke of conviction must fuse the hard metal; or, to vary the image, the veil that was upon his heart must be split from without, if the light of heaven was to visit the darkened chamber.

6. Evangelistic Labor. — Paul's personal efforts for the spread of the Gospel consisted chiefly in oral preaching, enforced with eloquence of the heart. He did not usually occupy himself with baptism (1Co 1:14 sq.), but left this ceremony to his companions and attendants (οἱ διακονοῦντες αὐτῷ, Act 19:22; οἱ συνεργοὶ αὐτοῦ, Rom 16:21; Php 2:25; Phm 1:24), of whom he gradually collected a considerable number (Act 20:4; Phm 1:24), and used them as emissaries (Act 19:22; Act 17:14; 1Co 4:17; Php 2:25; 1Th 3:2). After he parted with Barnabas and Mark (Act 15:37 sq.) he numbered among them especially Silas (comp. Act 15:40), Timothy (Act 16:1 sq.), Luke the physician, Titus, Demas, Erastus, and Epaphroditus. He first came in contact with the original apostles of Jesus and the Mother-Church in Jerusalem through Barnabas (Act 9:27), but he renewed his acquaintance with them by frequent tarrying in that city (Act 15:4; Galatians 2; Act 21:18). In his fundamental view of the invalidity of the Mosaic law for Christians, Paul disagreed with some of the apostles, and on this ground had at one time a dispute with Peter at Antioch (Gal 2:11 sq.; see Bockel, De controversia inter Paul. et Petr. Leips. 1817, and Winer, Comment. ad loc.), and continued always to be an object of suspicion to the Jerusalem Christians (Act 21:21). But this did not prevent him from making collections wherever he could in behalf of the poor Christians in Jerusalem and Judaea (Rom 15:25 sq.; 1 Corinthians 16; 2 Corinthians 8 sq.; Gal 2:10; Act 24:17). He extended his apostolic labors from Syria to the north and north-west (Rom 15:19), where he could not fear to disturb the sphere of work of others (2Co 10:16; Rom 15:20); but even there he was not, it seems, altogether unaffected by the authorities of the Church in Palestine (1Co 1:12; 1Co 3:22). His whole life was a struggle against adversaries as wily as they were unwearying (Scharling, De Paullo ejusq. adversariis, Havn. 1836). Not only did the Jews in Palestine and elsewhere persecute their former companion with the whole weight of their national and religious hatred (Act 9:23; Act 13:50; Act 14:5 sq.; Act 17:5; Act 18:12; Act 21:27 sq.; Act 23:12), but even within the Christian Church itself, openly and secretly, Judaizing Christians and philosophizing Christians opposed him; and while Paul was defending Christian freedom against the stiff legality of the former, he was compelled to rescue the historical basis of Christianity from the errors of the latter. Like other great teachers, too, he was forced sometimes to meet misunderstanding of his own instructions (1Co 15:10; 1Co 8:9). Although Paul saw the necessary end of the Jewish ritual, yet, in dealing with the weak, he was no bigoted opponent of it (1Co 9:19-20); he not only had Timothy circumcised (Act 16:3), but himself fulfilled a Jewish vow (Act 21:24 sq.; SEE NAZARITE, and Lakemacher, Observ. 6:364 sq.). Only where Jewish prejudices pressed in with bold demands, and threatened serious trouble, did he manifest severity (Gal 2:4 sq.). On the other hand, his opponents left nothing untried to diminish his apostolical authority, descending even to slander (2 Corinthians 1; comp. 10). They had even forged letters under Paul's name (2Th 2:2; see Neander, 1:281). Thus his life was really a series of continuous strife and danger (2Co 11:23 sq.).

7. Visits to Corinth. — From several passages of 2 Corinthians (2Co 2:1; 2Co 12:14; 2Co 12:21; 2Co 13:1-2) it has appeared to many that before the writing of that epistle Paul had twice visited Corinth, and that one of these visits had been after the Church there had fallen into an evil state. The words (2Co 12:14) τρίτον τοῦτο ἑτοίμως ἔχω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς are usually explained as meaning only, “I am a third time prepared to come,” and in accordance with this it is thought that τρἰτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι (2Co 13:1) may be rendered “This third time I am purposing to come to you;” so that it is not of a third visit, but simply of a third purpose to visit that Paul speaks. Against this the following arguments are urged:

(1) That though ἔρχομαι may signify “I am coming” in the sense of “purposing to come,” the whole phrase τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι cannot be rendered “this is the third time I have purposed to come to you;” as De Wette remarks (Erklhirung, ad loc.), it is only when the purpose is close on its accomplishment, not of an earlier purpose, that ἔρχομαι can be so used. But in this case the ἔρχομαι does not refer to any previous purpose; that is implied only in the τρίτον: so that the instance fairly comes under the usage of the pres. for the determined fut. (Kruiger, Griech. Sprachl. v. 148, 149; Winer, Gr. Gr. p. 281). Moreover, we have the apostle's own epexegesis of his usus loquendi in the parallel passage, showing that τοῦτο denoted the intention or readiness (ἑτοίμως) only.

(2) The contrast of τρίτον in 2Co 13:1 with δεύτερον in 2Co 13:2 leads to the conclusion that it is of a third visit, and not of a third purpose to visit, that Paul is writing; he had told them formerly when he was present with them the second time, and now when absent, in announcing a third visit, he tells them again, etc. Some render, as in the A.V., ὠς παρών by as if present, so as to make the apostle intimate that he had not been oftener than once before at Corinth; but it is very doubtful if ὡς is ever used to express the supposition of a case which does not exist (1Co 5:3 is not a case in point, for there the case supposed actually did exist), and, moreover, as it is connected here as well with ἀπών as with παρών, if we translate it “as if,” the whole clause will read thus, “I tell you beforehand, as if I were present the second time, and were now absent,” etc., which is of course as inadmissible on the ground of sense as the rendering in the A.V. is on critical grounds. If, however, as is far more natural, we construe τὸ δεύτερον with παρών immediately preceding, rather than with either of the verbs in the beginning of the verse, and render as one present the second time,” we have a direct argument (in harmony with all the other passages which speak of his determination as if already a fact) that there had been but one previous visit to Corinth, namely, that during which the Church was planted.

(3) In 12:14 the apostle intimates his being ready to go to Corinth in connection with his resolution not to be burdensome to the Christians there. Now, inasmuch as it was not Paul's purpose to visit them that could impose any burden on them, but his actual presence with them, it is said that there seems no fitness in such a connection in his telling them of his mere repeated purpose to visit them; in order to make congruity out of this, we must regard him as saying, “I was not burdensome to you when with you before, and now I have a third time formed a purpose to visit you; but when I make out this visit, I will not be burdensome to you any more than at first, though it be a thrice purposed visit.” Accordingly it is claimed that to find all this in the few words he utters is to attribute to the apostle a somewhat improbable breviloquence. Nevertheless, nothing could be more natural than the phraseology here, on the supposition that the second intended visit had not taken place. The purpose still remained, and the visit was looked upon as certain; when it did occur, Paul hoped not to be a burden to his hosts. And if we construe (as we may properly do, despite Alford's subjective emendation) the τρίτον here also with its nearer verb ἔχω, we have again a positive statement of a third preparation only to  make the visits. The reason why the apostle is so emphatic on this point is that his enemies had charged him with fickleness respecting it (1:17), and had even questioned it altogether (1Co 4:18). See in favor of this intermediate visit, Bleek (Stud. u. Krit. 1830; Einleit. p. 393) and others; against it, Davidson (Introd. 2:213 sq.) and Lange (Apost. Zeitalter, 1:199 sq.).

On the other hand we have the following arguments:

(1) In 2Co 1:15-16, the apostle speaks of a second benefit as to be anticipated by the Corinthians from his visiting them; from which it is argued that he could only have been there once before, else would he have used consistent language, and spoken of a third benefit, and not a second only. To escape from this difficulty various expedients have been devised, such as taking δευτέραν χάριν here for a double benefit (διπλῆν χαράν, Bleek and Neander, after Chrysostom and Theodoret), and supposing the term of the apostle's residence at Corinth (Act 18:1-11) divided into two parts, in the interval between which he had made a short excursion fron Corinth and back again, so that in one sense he had twice before visited that city, and, in another sense, had only once before visited it. But these are violent expedients, manifestly devised for maintaining a previous hypothesis. The only tenable solution that will save the supposed visit seems to be that proposed by Meyer, who takes the expression (δευτέρα χάρις) in connection with the return from Macedonia (πάλιν ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς); the apostle determines to visit them first before going to Macedonia, and thereby secure to them a double benefit by going thence to Macedonia, and returning to them from Macedonia in place of going to the latter place first (so also Alford, ad loc.). But it is very harsh thus to refer the πρότερον, “before” (whether construed with the actual coming, ἐλθεῖν, or with the simple purpose, ἐβουλόμην), to the journey into Macedonia, which had not yet been spoken of; it clearly designates something prior to the time of writing, namely, the design of an earlier and second visit that should bring an additional conferment of spiritual gifts. It may therefore be fairly set off against whatever force there may be thought to remain in the first of the above arguments on the other side. There was a third intention of a second visit.

(2) Those who suppose this second visit already made are greatly perplexed where to locate it: they generally fix upon some presumed  interval in the apostle's three years' stay at Ephesus. Now it should be noted that this is not only a pure hypothesis, without a word to sustain it in the direct history covering this very period, but Paul's time is stated to have been exclusively employed in the labors at Ephesus, both by his own explicit statement respecting the whole three years (Act 20:31, “by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one night and day”), and also by Luke's nearly as strong language concerning the first two years (“disputing daily in the school of Tyrannus; and this continued by the space of two years,” Act 19:9-10), during which, if at all, the supposed trip to Corinth occurred. There is certainly no room for it in the narrative there.

(3) If such a visit were made, how comes it that neither in the Acts nor in Paul's letters are there any positive and definite notices of it or of its results? It is altogether unsafe to found so palpable a historical conclusion upon these few, slight, and ambiguous expressions. A treatise has been written by Muller, De Tribus Pauli Itin. (Basle, 1831). SEE CORINTHIANS.

8. Paul's imprisonment at Rome is represented as a lax one (Act 28:16; Act 28:23; Act 28:30), but still imprisonment; for by the words “in his own hired house” (Act 28:30), Luke cannot mean a life at freedom, or he must have mentioned Paul's liberation before. Bottger (Beitrage, etc., pt. 2) would prove, by reference to the judicial customs of the Romans, and on the supposition that the letters to the Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon were written in Caesarea, that Paul was confined but a few days in Rome. But the artificial argument which he uses will not satisfy any one who desires a firm historical ground for his belief. (See remarks in reply by Olshausen and Neander, Gesch. d. Pflanz. 1:428.) But it is puzzling that Luke, giving so particularly the period of two years, says nothing of what Paul did after the two years. Did he end this work at their close? This seems probable, although the Acts was certainly written after the Gospel, according to Act 1:1 (see Hug, Einleit. 2:262 sq.). The apostolic history is completed by the tradition in Abdias (Hist. Apost. 2:6 sq.), which makes Paul's imprisonment end with his execution. But since the 4th century the prevailing tradition has been that Paul was at that time released, and made several apostolic journeys afterwards (Niceph. 2:34), especially one to Spain (Cyril. of Jerus. Catech. c. 17; Jerome, in Jes. 11:14; see Weller, De verosim. P. in Hisp. martyrio [Argent. 1787]; comp. against this view Spier, Diss. qua testimonia patrum de Pauli itinere Hisp. labefactantur [Viteb. 1740]; Hist. Crit. de Hisp. P. itinere [1742];  Harenburg, Otia Gandershem. p. 161 sq.), or even farther (Theodoret, in Psalm cxvi), as into Britain (Minter, Stud. u. Krit. 1833, 1:55); and at last was again implisoned in Rome, and put to death at the same time with Peter (Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 2:22; Ecc 2:25; comp. Acta Petri et Pauli, Gr. ed. Thilo [Hal. 1838]). The oldest tradition of Paul's release, and the only one worthy of any attention, is that in Eusebius (Hist. Ecc 2:22; comp. Danz, Pr. de loco Euseb. H. E. 2:21 [Jena, 1816]). But he simply mentions it as a report (λόγος ἔχει), and the confirmation which he draws from the Second Epistle to Timothy would lead us to suppose that those who originated this report had derived, as the moderns have, the idea of a second imprisonment of Paul from that epistle. But no such stress should be laid upon the First Epistle of Clemens Romanus to the Corinthians, as has been given it, for example, by Neander (1:653 sq.) and Bohl (p. 95 sq.; comp. Baur, ut sup. p. 150; Schenkel, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, p. 56 sq.; yet see Neander, 1:454). It is mainly the peculiar difficulty of referring this Second Epistle to Timothy to any point in the known life of the apostle which has led to the supposition of a second imprisonment. This argument has been urged with great acuteness by Neander (1:453 sq.). The following authors have opposed the idea of a second imprisonment of Paul: Oldendorp, in D. Brem. u. Verdenzsch. Biblioth. 3:1027 sq.; Schmidt, Einleit. ins N.T. p. 198 sq.; Eichhorn, Einzleit. 3:364 sq.; Wolf, De altera P. ap. captivitacte (Leips. 1819), 2:8; Schrader, Paulus, 1:227 sq.; Goschen, in Hemsen, p. 736 sq.; Schenkel, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1841, 1:53 sq.; Baur, Paul. p. 229 sq.; Niedner, Kirchengesch. p. 104 sq.; De Wette. Einleit. 2:220 sq. On the other hand, in favor of the journey, see Heyrdenreich, Bearbeit. d. Pastoralbr. 2:6 sq.; Mynster, Kleine theol. Schrift. p. 291 sq.; Neander, ut sup.; Bohl, Abfass. der Briefe an Tim. u. Titus p. 81 sq.; Schott, Erorterung, p. 116 sq.; Wurm, in the Tubing, Zeitschr. 1853, 1:82 sq.; Guericke, Einleit. ins N.T. p. 338 sq.; Walch, Biblioth. Theol. 3:455. Others are cited above.

9. Personal Appearance and Character. — All testimony; his own included (2Co 10:10), leads to the conclusion that in outward appearance the apostle had nothing to command admiration or respect. His figure was diminutive, his eyesight defective (comp. Act 23:5; Gal 4:15), and his speech such as produced little effect. An ancient writer adds that he was bald, and had a hooked nose like an eagle's beak. The combination of these features presents such a figure as one may  often see among the Jews of our own day, especially in the humbler class of them. Such pictorial representations of the apostle as have come down to us in paintings and mosaics agree in the main with this, though they give more of power and dignity to the apostle's countenance than this would lead us to expect. They are the early pictures and mosaics described by Mrs. Jameson, and passages from Malalas, Nicephorus, and the apocryphal Acta Pauli et Theclae (concerning which see also Conybeare and Howson, 1:197). They all agree in ascribing to the apostle a short stature, a long face with high forehead, an aquiline nose, close and prominent eyebrows. Other characteristics mentioned are baldness, gray eyes, a clear complexion, and a winning expression. According to Hug, the apostle's temperament was sanguine; but as Tholuck, with better reason, says (Stud. u. Krit. loc. cit.), sanguine-bilious. On his person, we have only an untrustworthy tradition (in the Dialog. Philophatris, c. 12, and Malalas, Chron. x, p. 257, Bonn). Too much stress must not be laid upon the allusions in the Epistles (1Co 15:9; 2Co 10:10; see Bengel, on Act 13:9; Tholuck, op. cit. p. 381). It is probable, however, that the general appearance of Paul did not correspond well with his greatness of mind and heart. But a strong, healthy body he must have had, to endure such journeys and hardships (2Co 11:23 sq.), and he seems to have had great mental energy and endurance (comp. Act 20:7; 2Co 11:28), but could not undergo much bodily toil (1Th 2:9; 2Th 3:8).

Of his mental temperament and character Paul is himself the best painter. His speeches and letters convey to us, as we read them, the truest impressions of those qualities which helped to make him the great apostle. We perceive the warmth and ardor of his nature, his deeply affectionate disposition, the tenderness of his sense of honor, the courtesy and personal dignity of his bearing, his perfect fearlessness, his heroic endurance; we perceive the rare combination of subtlety, tenacity, and versatility in his intellect; we perceive also a practical wisdom which we should have associated with a cooler temperament, and a tolerance which is seldom united with such impetuous convictions. When he first comes before our view in the history, we see a man of intense energy, firm decision, iron resolution, and uncompromising zeal; and these qualities, tempered by purer religious feeling, guided by higher knowledge, and modified by experience, continue to characterize him so long as he appears upon the stage of life. His natural mental endowments were of the highest order. He  had great breadth of view, great clearness of apprehension, a capacity of firmly grasping principles, the power of arranging his thoughts in their proper logical order, and the ability to utter them in forcible and fitting words. The dialectician predominates in his writings; but he could also play the orator after no mean fashion; and there are passages in his epistles which could have come only from the pen of one who had in him the faculties of the poet. In his moral development everything is great and noble. To honesty of purpose and sincerity of speech, he added humility and self-distrust, generous regard for the welfare of others, a tender sympathy with those he loved, and a philanthropy that embraced the race; while the absence of everything mean, mercenary, or selfish, and a noble devotedness, at whatever cost, to the interests of a great cause, combine to shed around a character, in other respects so beautiful, traits of sublimity and grandeur. We feel that here is a man at once to be admired and loved-a teacher at whose feet one might sit with unhesitating docility-a friend on whose bosom one might lean with confidence and affection. The vigorous intellect and the large heart which belonged to him by nature would have brought him distinction under any circumstances; but his highest claim to honor is derived from his having, under the constraining power of the love of Christ, consecrated himself, body, soul, and spirit, to the service of God in promoting the best interests of men. In this respect he stands foremost among the Church's heroes and the benefactors of the race. The principle which harmonized all these endowments and directed them to a practical end was, beyond dispute, a knowledge of Jesus Christ in the Divine Spirit. Personal allegiance to Christ as to a living Master, with a growing insight into the relation of Christ to each man and to the world, carried the apostle forward on a straight course through every vicissitude of personal fortunes and amid the various habits of thought which he had to encounter. The conviction that he had been entrusted with a Gospel concerning a Lord and Deliverer of men was what sustained and purified his love for his own people, while it created in him such a love for mankind that he only knew himself as the servant of others for Christ's sake.

A remarkable attempt has recently been made by Prof. Jowett, in his Commentary on some of the Epistles, to qualify what he considers to be the blind and undiscriminating admiration of Paul, by representing him as having been, with all his excellences, a man “whose appearance and discourse made an impression of feebleness,” “out of harmony with life and nature,” a confused thinker, uttering himself “in broken words and  hesitating forms of speech, with no beauty or comeliness of style,” and so undecided in his Christian belief that he was preaching, in the fourteenth year after his conversion, a Gospel concerning Christ which he himself, in four years more, confessed to have been carnal. In these paradoxical views, however, Prof. Jowett stands almost alone; the result of the freest, as of the most reverent, of the numerous recent studies of St. Paul and his works (among which Prof. Jowett's own Commentary is one of the most interesting) having been only to add an independent tribute to the ancient admiration of Christendom. Those who judge Paul as they would judge any other remarkable man confess him unanimously to have been “one of the greatest spirits of all time;” while those who believe him to have been appointed by the Lord of mankind, and inspired by the Holy Ghost, to do a work in the world of almost unequalled importance, are lost in wonder as they study the gifts with which he was endowed for that work, and the sustained devotion with which he gave himself to it. On the intellectual and moral character of Paul, see Niemeyer, Charakter, 1:206 sq. , Hug, Einleit. 2:283 sq.; Hartmann. in Scherer's Schriftforsch. 1:1 sq.; Journ.f. Pred. 28:298 sq.; Palmer, Paulus u. Gamaliel, ein Beitrag zur altesten Christengesch. (Giess. 1806); Olshausen, Bibl. Comment. III, 1:11 sq.

10. Apocryphal Writings. — In addition to the letters usually given as Paul's, a farged correspondence between him and the philosopher Seneca (six letters of the apostle and eight of Seneca, comp. Jerome, Viri Illustr. 11; August. Ep. 153) is printed in Fabricius (Apocryph. 2:880 sq.). That it is not genuine, see his Biblioth. Lat. 2:9; Apocryph. N.T. 3:710 sq. The whole tradition of intimacy between Paul and Seneca has perhaps grown by conjecture out of Act 18:12 (see Schmidt, Einleit. ins N.T. p. 268 sq.). Yet it has found a defender in Gelpe (Defamiliaritate quae Paulo c. Seneca intercessione traditur verisimillima [Leips. 1812]), who is answered by Eckhard (in Miscell. Leips. 9:90 sq.), in an attempt to show that Seneca was a firm heathen and opponent of Christianity. On other writings attributed to Paul, see Fabricius, Apocryph. 2:918, 943 sq.; 3:667 sq.; and B. Elsing, De Pseudepigraphis P. Apost. (Leips. 1707). Zeltner (Fragment.

Pauli quond. perversi ἀθεόπνευστον [Altdorf, 1713]) thinks he has discovered in the Talmud a Hebrew form of prayer composed by Paul before his conversion. Tischendorf has published the “editio princeps” of the apocryphal “Apocalypsis Pauli” in his Apocalypses Apocryphm (Lips. 1866). Several other ancient apocryphal productions are ascribed to Paul,  most of which are now lost. Among them were “the Acts of Paul,” or “the Preaching of Paul;” this appears to have formed the conclusion of the so- called “Preaching of Peter,” and dates probably from about the middle of the 2d century. The Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Epistles of Paul to Seneca, with those of Seneca to Paul, and the Epistle to the Laodiceans, were translated by Mr. Jer. Jones, in his work On the Canon. A good translation of the apocryphal epistles to the Corinthians will be found in Whiston's Authentic Records. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. 3:147. SEE APOCRYPHA.

III. Literature. — This is very copious, as the subject is more or less handled in nearly all the Introductions and Commentaries on the New Test., as well as in many treatises on Scripture history and theology in general, and in numerous articles in religious periodicals. The most important special treatises have been mentioned in the preceding discussion; we name below only such recent works of considerable extent as relate exclusively to the apostle. For others see Danz, Worterbuch, s.v.; Darling, Cyclopcedia, col. 1870 sq.; Malcom, Theological Index, s.v.; Reuss, Gesch. d. hil. Sclhrift, § 58 sq.; Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 77 sq.

1. On Paul's Life in general: Menken, Blicke in d. Leb n, etc. (Brem. 1828, 8vo); Schafer, Paulus der Apostel (Leips. 1874, 8vo); Hemsen, Der Ap. Paulus (G6tt. 1830, 8vo); Schrader, Der Ap. Paulus (Leips. 1830-36, 5 vols. 8vo); Scharling, De Paulo Apost. (Hafn. 1836, 8vo); Hessel, Leben Paul. (Leips. 1837, 8vo); Tate, Continuous Hist. (in new ed. of Paley's lorce l'aulince, Lond. 1840, 8vo); Blunt, Hist. of St. Paul (new ed. ibid. 1858, 2 vols. 12mo); Tholuck, Life and Writings of Paul (transl. in the Biblical Cabinet, Edinb. 1859, 12mo); Hausrath, Der Ap. Paulus (Heidelb. 1865, 8vo); Vidal, St. Paul, sa Vie et ses (Euvres (Paris, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Baur, Paulus der Apostel (2d ed. Leips. 1866, 8vo); Binney, Paul's Life and Ministry (Lond. 1866, 12mo); Howson, Scenes in the Life of St. Paul (ibid. 1866, 8vo); Bungener, Vie, OEuvres, et Epitres de St. Paul (Paris, 1867, 8vo); Krenkel, Paulus der Apostel (Leips. 1869, 8vo); Renan, Vie de Saint Paul (Paris, 1869, 8vo); Conybeare and Howson, Life and Epistles of Mst. Paul (3d ed. Lond. 1870, 8vo); Neveux, Vie de St. Pal (Palis, 1870, 8vo); Rivington, Paul the Apostle (Lond. 1874, 8vo); Lewin, Life and Letters of St. Paul (new ed. ibid. 1874, 2 vols. 4to).

2. On Paul's doctrines as a whole: Meyer, Entwickelung d. Paul. Lehrbegs isf (Altona, 1801, 8vo); Dahne, idem (Halle, 1835, 8vo); Usteri, idem (6th ed. Zur. 1851, 8vo); Rabiger (against Baur), De Christologia Paulina (Vratisl. 1852, 8vo); Lipsius, Die Pauliaische Rechtfertigungslehre (Leips. 1853, 8vo); Whately, Essays on St. Paul's Writings (8th ed. Lond. and Andover, 1865, 8vo); Irons, Christianity as tanght by St. Paul (“Bampton Lecture for 1870,” 2d ed. Lond. 1876, 8vo); Pfleiderer, Der Panlinismus (Leips. 1873, 8vo).

3. On special points relating to Paul: Saville, Introduction of Christianity (by Paul) into Britain (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Howson, Character of St. Paul (“Hulsean Lectures for 1862,” ibid. 1864, 8vo; N.Y. 1873, 12mo, new ed.); Lasonder, De linguce Paulinoe idiomate (Tr. ad Rb. 1866. 8vo); Marcken, Paulus und Petrus in Antiochien (Leips. 1866, 8vo); Smith, Voyage of St. Paul (3d ed. Lond. 1866, 12mo); Howson, Metaphors of St. Paul (ibid. 1868, 8vo); the same, Companions of St. Paul (ibid. 1871, 8vo).

## Paul (St.) The Hermit[[@Headword:Paul (St.) The Hermit]]

             SEE ANTHONY, ST

.

## Paul De La Croix[[@Headword:Paul De La Croix]]

             generally known as Paul Francois de Danei, founder of the Order of the Passionists (q.v.), was born Jan. 3, 1694, at Ovieda, Geneva. He was early consecrated to a life of piety, and while still a layman was entrusted by his bishop with teaching the catechism to children; and this incited Paul to the design of establishing an order for the conversion of souls. To this end he assumed a mendicant dress of black, to which he attached the emblems of Christ's passion, and with bare feet and head he retired in 1720 to a hermitage, where he prepared himself by, rigid mortifications to write the rules of the new society, with the aid of his younger brother, Jean Baptiste. He then repaired to Rome, where he was ordained priest by Benedict XIII, and returned to establish his order, of which he was elected general. He died Oct. 18,1775, and was canonized in 1852. See Abregi de la Vie de P. de la Croix Tournay, 1857, 12mo).

## Paul I[[@Headword:Paul I]]

             Patriarch OF CONSTANTINOPLE, was born in Thessalonica, and flourished in the early part of the 4th century. On the death of patriarch Alexander (A.D. 336), Paul, one of the presbyters of that Church, and comparatively a young man, was chosen to succeed him by the Homoousian, or orthodox party, while the Arians were anxious for the election of the deacon Macedonius, who sought to prevent the election of Paul by some charge of misconduct, which, however, he did not persist in. Both men appear to have been previously marked out for the succession by their respective partisans; and Alexander had, before his death, passed a judgment on their respective characters. The Homoousians had carried their point; but the election was annulled by a council summoned by the emperor, either Constantine the Great or his son Constantius II, and Paul, being ejected, was banished into Pontus (Athanas. Histor. Arianor. ad Monachos, c. 7), and Eusebius, bishop of Nicomedia, was appointed by the council in his place.

On the death of Eusebius, who died A.D. 342, the orthodox populace of Constantinople restored Paul, who appears to have been previously released from banishment, or to have escaped to Rome, while the bishops of the Arian party elected Macedonius. The emperor, Constantius II, being absent, the contest led to many disturbances, in which a number of people were killed; and an attempt by Hermogenes, magister  militum, to quell the riot and expel Paul, led to the murder of that officer by the mob. The emperor immediately returned to Constantinople and expelled Paul, without, however, as yet confirming the election of Macedonius. Paul hastened back to Rome and sought the support of Julius I, bishop of that city, who, glad to exercise the superiority implied in this appeal to him, sent him back with a letter to the bishops of the Eastern churches, directing that he and some other expelled prelates should be restored to their respective sees, and bitterly accusing those who had deposed him. Paul regained possession of the Church of Constantinople, but the Eastern bishops, in a council at Antioch (A.D. 343), returned a spirited answer to the arrogant pretensions of Julius; and the emperor, who was also at Antioch, wrote to Philippus, prafectus prcetorio, to expel Paul again. Philippus, to avoid a commotion, sent the prelate away privately; but when he attempted to establish Macedonius in possession of the Church, a riot occurred, in which above three thousand lives were lost. Paul'was banished, according to Socrates, to Thessalonica, and then into the Western empire, being forbidden to return into the East.

But the account of Socrates is disputed, and Tillemont's opinion is probably correct, that it was at this time that Paul was loaded with chains and exiled to Singara, in Mesopotamia, and afterwards to Emesa, in Syria, as mentioned by Athanasius (l.c.). If Tillemont is correct, the banishment into the Western empire may probably be referred to the former expulsion of Paul, when he appealed to pope Julius I, or possibly Paul may have been released from banishment and allowed to retire to Rome, which, according to Photius, he did three several times. The cause of Paul and of Athanasius, who was also in banishment, was still supported by the Western Church, and was taken up by the Western emperor Constans, brother of Constantius; and the Council of Sardica (A.D. 347) decreed their restoration. Constantius, however, refused to restore them until compelled by the threats of his brother; upon whose death, shortly after, Paul was again expelled by Constantius, and exiled to Cucusus, in Cappadocia, amid the defiles of the Taurus, where, it is said, he was privately strangled by his keepers (A.D. 351), and buried at Ancyra. It was reported that his keepers, before strangling him, attempted to starve him to death. Great obscurity hangs over his death; and it is not clear whether he died by violence or disease. But he was regarded by his party as a martyr; and when orthodoxy triumphed under the emperor Theodosius the Great, that prince brought his remains in great state to Constantinople, and deposited them in a church which was subsequently called by his name. See, besides Athanasius,  Socrates, Hist. Ecc 2:6-7; Ecc 2:12-13; Ecc 2:15-16; Ecc 2:20; Ecc 2:22-23; Ecc 2:26; Ecc 2:9; Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 3:3-4; Ecc 3:7-10; Ecc 3:20; Ecc 4:2; Theodoret, Hist. Eccles. 1:19; 2:5, 6; Photius, Bibl. Cod. p. 257; Tillemont, Memoires, 7:251, etc.; Neale, Hist. of the East. Ch. 2:35 sq.

## Paul I (2)[[@Headword:Paul I (2)]]

             pope of Rome, was a native of the city of Rome, a brother of pope Stephen III (q.v.), whom he succeeded, and by whom he was employed in important political missions. Paul I began his pontificate May 29, 757, amid much opposition and disorder. There were at the time two parties at Rome, the Frankish and the Italian. He owed his elevation to the Frankish party. The Italians were led by Theophylactus, who disputed for a while the right to the pontificate with Paul; the latter, however, proved strongest in the contest, and finally secured submission. Paul's pontificate is distinguished partly by efforts for the complete and secure papal possession of the  territories which were claimed as granted by the Frankish king, and partly by the remarkable growth of papal power in Rome itself. Baxmann (Gesch. der Politik der Papste, 2:251) says: “Very seldom have the politics of Rome seen so much deceit and fraud, or so borne the character of unconscientiousness and double-tonguedness, as under pope Paul I.” In order to retain the newly acquired exarchate of Ravenna, and to strengthen himself against the attacks of the Lombards and the Byzantines, Paul sought the good graces of king Pepin, and prevented this ruler from alliance with the iconoclastic Greeks (see the Codex Carolinus, in Muratori, vol. 3, pt. ii, p. 116 sq.). One of the most troublesome neighbors of the papal territory was the Lombard king Desiderius, who devastated it several times. He was, however, conciliated in A.D. 766, and we find Desiderius at Rome that year engaged in his devotions, and putting the Church in possession of some portions of his property. Pope Paul I is venerated by the Romish Church as a saint (June 28). He was a friend of the monks, and erected a monastery in his parental home. He was kind towards the poor, and exhibited a compassionate spirit for all troubled hearts. He died June 28, 767, and was succeeded by his brother, who is known as Constantine II. Pope Paul's letters are preserved in the collections of the councils, and in Gretser's collection; but as one of them bears a date after the decease of this pontiff, their genuineness is called in question. See Raynaldus, Annales; Chacon, Vitac Pontificum Romanorum; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, vol. 3; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:322-324; Reichel, Hist. of the Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 113 sq.; Neander, Church Hist. vol. 3; Milman, Hist. of Lat. Christianity, 2:428-432; Aschbach (R. C.), Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Paul II[[@Headword:Paul II]]

             pope of Rome, was a Venetian by birth. His original name was Pietro Barbo, and he was the nephew of pope Eugenius III, through the sister of the latter. Barbo had been successively archdeacon at Bologna and bishop of Cervia. He entered upon the pontificate in 1464. Paul II began by correcting abuses, and checking the exactions of the officers and secretaries of the papal court, who levied contributions at pleasure from those who had occasion to apply to Rome for licenses, rescripts, and other official papers. He endeavored also to form a league of the Christian princes against the Turks. But while he resumed the design of his predecessor for a general crusade against the Mohammedans, Paul adopted a course of policy which perpetuated disunion in Christendom. He aided  Ferdinand in expelling the partisans of Anjou from Naples (q.v.), and consequently quarreled with that monarch respecting certain fiefs and arrears of tribute claimed by the Holy See; he attacked Podiebrad, king of Bohemia, on the ground that he favored the Hussite movement, and sent a legate to Louis XI to claim the definite revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction. And so, while Paul opposed the king of France, excited a civil war in Bohemia (q.v.; SEE HUSSITES; SEE POLAND ), and fomented the discords of Italy, the common interests of Christendom were forgotten, and the Turks continued to acquire new territory. When, by their taking of Negropont, the establishment of the naval power of the Turks in Europe seemed a certainty, and they threatened Italy, he proclaimed (in 1468) a general peace among the Italian governments, threatening with excommunication those who did not observe it. But the decision had been reached too late, and ere the final preparations for a united attack of the Turks had been perfected, pope Paul II died suddenly, July 25, 1471. He was the first pontiff who openly declared himself a foe to the progress of knowledge. An academy had been formed at Rome for the cultivation of Greek and Roman antiquities and philology, of which Pomponius, Laetus, Platina, and other learned men were members. Paul, who, unlike his predecessor Pius II, had no taste for profane learning, became suspicious of the academicians and their meetings. Some one probably excited his suspicions by accusing them of infidelity and of treasonable designs. The academy was proscribed, some of its members ran away, others were seized and tortured, and among them Platina, who after a year's imprisonment was released through the intercession of several cardinals. It may easily be supposed that Platina, in his Lives of the Popes, which he wrote afterwards under Sixtus IV, did not spare the memory of Paul II. But besides Platina, other contemporary writes, such as Corio Ammirato, an anonymous chronicler of Bologna, and the monk Jacopo Filippo of Bergamo, all speak unfavorably of this pope. Cardinal Querini has undertaken the defense of Paul II in his Vindiciae adrersus Platinam aliosque Obtrectatores, and Romanists claim that Paul II is maligned by Protestants because he proved the persecutor of the Hussites. There is however no justice in this accusation, for many Romanists themselves confess that Paul II was envious, malicious, and hypocritical. His vacillating policy speaks for itself. He was ambitious for the extension of papal power, and resolved to maintain the privileges of ecclesiastics, and their exemption from the jurisdiction of temporal courts, as is most clearly proven in his conduct towards Louis XI, and the treacherous cardinal  Balluc, who deserved to be executed for the betrayal of his sovereign to Charles of Burgundy at Perronne. See Muratori, Script. Rer. Ital. vol. iii, pt. ii, p. 993; Bower, Gesch. der Romischen Papste, 9:312; Artaud, Hist. des Souverains Pontifs Romans (Paris, 1847), 3:341 sq.; Hist. of Popery (Lond. 1838, 8vo), ch. xvi; Reichel, Hist. of the Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 235 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte (R. C.), Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, s.v.

## Paul II Of Constantinople[[@Headword:Paul II Of Constantinople]]

             patriarch of Constantinople, flourished in the 7th century. When, on the accession of Constans II as sole emperor, and the banishment of his colleague Heracleonas, the patriarch Pyrrhus was deposed, Paul succeeded to the patriarchate of Constantinople, of the Church of which he had been a presbyter, and also ceconomus. He was consecrated patriarch in October, 642. He is charged with being a monothelite, and with having induced the emperor (A.D. 648) to issue an edict prohibiting a1 discussion of the question whether there were in Christ one will or operation, or two. On account of his heretical opinions, he was declared by the pope Theodore I, in a council held at Rome (A.D. 648), to be deposed; but as the pope had no power to enforce the sentence, though confirmed by the Lateran Council (A.D. 649), held under Theodore's successor in the papacy, Martin I, Paul retained his patriarchate till his own death (A.D. 652). He even retaliated the attempts of the popes by urging the emperor to depose Martin, and exile him to Chersona, where he died. Paul died not long after the banishment of Martin, and is said to have repented of the evil which he had brought upon his antagonist. There are extant of the writings of Paul: Epistola Theodoro (i.e. pope Theodore, the predecessor of Martin): — part of an Epistola ad Theodorum (i.e. Theodore of Pharan): — part of an Epistola ad Jacobum — all printed in the Concilia (Concil. Lateran. secret. iv, Concil. Constantin. iii, act. x, vol. vi, ed. Labbe, col. 221, 837, 839, and vol. iii, ed. Hardouin, col. 815, 1246, 1247). See Anastatius Bibliothecarius, Collectanea (Commenzoratio eorum quce acta sunt in Martinum Papaam, etc.), apud Galland, Biblioth. Patrum, 13:47; id. De Vitis Roman. Pontif. (Theodori et Martini), apud Muratori, Rerum Italic. Scriptores, vol. iii; Baronius, Annales, ad ann. 642, 1:648, i, etc.; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann 642, 1:585; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, vol. i, col. 229.

There were two other Pauls patriarchs of Constantinople, viz. PAUL III (A.D. 686-692) and PAUL IV (A.D. 780-784.).

## Paul III[[@Headword:Paul III]]

             a noted pope of Rome, flourished in a most critical period of the history of the Christian Church. His original name was Allessandro Farnese. He was born at Carino, in Tuscany, in 1468. He was educated at the university of the Medici at Florence, and there acquired great familiarity with the Latin and the Greek. After this he lived at Rome, largely given up to pleasure and frivolity. He kept low company, supported mistresses, became a father, and in many ways gained an unenviable notoriety. He finally, however, became more serious, and determined to enter the service of the Church. He was first employed in the apostolical chancellory, and soon gained friends by his learning and promptness in the discharge of all duties. In 1493 he was made bishop of Montefiascone, and in 1499 was created a cardinal. As such he served in important trusts, and eventually became bishop of Ostia and dean of the Sacred College.

On the death of Clement VII, in 1534, Farnese was elected pope, just at the crisis when the most urgent applications were made by the various states of Europe to Rome for the assembling of a general council, which was required by the state of the Western Church, distracted by the disavowal of the papal supremacy by Luther and Zwingli, as well as by the measures of Henry VIII of England. For a while it seemed as if the new pontiff was well adapted for the settlement of the great controversies. He showed himself favorable to the Reforming party within the Church. He made choice of discreet and honorable men for his college of cardinals. Of those to whom Paul III gave the red hat shortly after his accession were Contarini, Caraffa, Pole, Sadolet, and others, most of whom bad belonged to the Oratory of Divine Love, and some of whom were friendly to the Protestant doctrine of salvation. He also appointed commissioners of reform, whose duty it was to point out and remove the much-complained- of abuses in the Roman curia. He even entered into negotiations with the Protestants of Germany, through his nuncio, Peter Paul Vergerins, and it  seemed not impossible that the concessions which he was ready to make would once more unite these and all Protestants with the Romish body. In 1537 Paul gave further expression to his desire for peace and union by his call of the council to meet in Mantua in the month of May. The German Protestants, believing the pontiff sincere in his endeavors, were encouraged to appoint Luther to draw up a clear statement of their grievances and differences of opinion, and at the meeting of the League of Smalcald (q.v.), in February, adopted the articles which Luther had written out and presented. But as they feared that their radical position about the papal and episcopal authority would not be likely to find favor with Romanists, the assembly rejected the invitation to the council, and simply placed in the hands of the papal nuncio and the imperial vice-chancellor the articles adopted. The Romanists, discouraged and maddened by the boldness of the Protestant party, now hoped to bring about by threats what they had failed to carry in kindness. They encouraged the leading Roman Catholic estates to join themselves together in Christian union, or, as they called the body, the Holy League (q.v.). The Protestants, seeing the hostile array of the Romanists, now strengthened the Smalcald leaguers, and entered into friendly relations with Switzerland. Every preparation was made on both sides for conflict, and not for peace, and yet both claimed to be preparing simply for defense. In 1540 the emperor Charles of Germany called another conference, for the purpose of effecting a religious union that might have the approval of the pope. SEE INTERIM OF RATISBON.

The good feeling which prevailed at the opening of this conference at Ratisbon, in 1541, made the sanguine Contarini and his friends very hopeful; but while Bucer and Melancthon were moderate and yielding, Luther was dissatisfied with the platform adopted on account of its want of definiteness, and had no confidence in the practicableness of a union. On the Romish side, the same opposition and distrust manifested itself. Caraffa would not approve of the terms of the agreement which Contarini had sanctioned, though he conceded that there was need of practical and immediate reforms. “Caraffa stood forth as the representative and leader of those who were resolved to defend to the last the polity and dogmas of the Church against all innovation, while at the same time they aimed to infuse a spirit of strict and even ascetic purity and zeal into all its officers, from the highest to the lowest.” Paul III took sides with Caraffa and his party. Some, and it seems reasonably, claim that there was jealousy of Charles V at Rome, and that the project of this conference was frustrated because it was feared that Charles V, strengthened by the destruction of the Protestant league of  Smalcald, ,would prove treacherous to the papacy, like Henry VIII of England. The papal party, therefore, not only broke up the Ratisbon conference, but shortly after the papal troops which had been sent Charles were recalled, and Francis I was even induced to side with the Protestants, who were now in conflict with the imperial forces. The result was that the Protestant cause, at the moment when it was possibly on the verge of extinction, was strengthened by its worst enemies (see Fisher, p. 49, 165).

A general council of the Church was indispensable, if the Protestants were ever to be gained over again to the old fold. Henry VIII had been excommunicated, and England was greatly distanced from papal interests; and the Jesuitic order, which had been sanctioned, had failed to effect a healing of the discord. In 1542, finally, the call was issued by papal will, but the war between Charles and Francis which was now waging delayed the assembling of the conference (at Trent) until 1545. These delays are also charged upon Paul, but it can hardly be doubted that much of it was due to the difficulties of the times. We need hardly add that the council, SEE TRENT, failed to bring about the much-desired result. Paul himself did not live to see the close of the council, which occurred in 1563. He died Nov. 10, 1549, and was succeeded by Julius III (q.v.). Pope Paul was devotedly attached to his own friends, and though he favored reform, he lacked boldness, and feared too much from defections, which were probably never intended, or even conceived, except in his own imagination. The charges of vacillation in his dealings with the Protestants may be true or not, but the charges of simony and selfishness which have been presented against him are not so easily answered. He was anxious to aggrandize his own family. His natural son, Pier Luigi Farnese, he made first duke of Castro, and afterwards duke of Parma and Piacenza. For his grandson Ottavio he obtained the hand of Margaret, a natural daughter of Charles V, and made him duke of Camerino. The pope subdued the people of Perugia who had revolted against him, put to death several of the leaders, and built a citadel to keep the citizens in awe. He also attacked the Colonna, the most powerful baronial family in the neighborhood of Rome, took all their strongholds, and obliged the members of that family to take refuge in the fiefs which they held in the kingdom of Naples. He received in the same year the news of the tragical death of his son Pier Luigi, who was murdered at Piacenza, where he had made him self odious by his tyranny and his lust. Overcome with grief at the news, he told his two grandsons, who were with him at the time, to take warning from their father's death, and to live in the fear of God. Pope Paul III maintained a correspondence  with Erasmus and cardinal Sadolet, and also wrote some Notes to several of Cicero's letters. See Panvinius, Vita Pauli III; Querini, Imago pontifiis Pauli III; Raynaldus, Annales; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:112 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, vol. i; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. iv, ] 65; Burnet, Hist. of the Reformation, vol. iii; Fisher, Hist. of the Reformation, p. 3, 49, 165, 395, 401; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy; Ffoulkes, Hist. of the Divisions of Christendom, i, § 63; Robertson, Hist. of Charles V; Zeitschrift fir historische Theologie, April, 1875, art. i; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon (R. C.), 8:231.

## Paul IV[[@Headword:Paul IV]]

             pope of Rome, was the descendant of a noble Neapolitan family named Caraffa, and was born in Naples in 1476. His early career was distinguished for ascetic rigor. In 1507 he was appointed bishop of Chieti, in which see he labored most earnestly for the reformation of abuses, and for the revival of religion and morality. With this view he established, in conjunction with several congenial reformers, the congregation of secular clergy called Theatines (q.v.), and was himself the first superior. He was made cardinal in 1536, and organized the tribunal of the Inquisition in Rome. On the death of Marcellus II in 1555, although in his seventy-ninth year, he was elected to succeed. He entered upon the wider career which his new position opened for him with all the ardor of a young man, and with all the stern enthusiasm which had characterized him during life. He was remarkably large and lean, walked with a hurried step, and seemed to be all sinew. As he had never confined himself hitherto in his daily habits to any precise rules — he would often sleep during the day and study at night — so he ever followed in other matters the impulses of the moment. But these were swayed by opinions formed in the course of a long life, and which had now become a second nature.

He seemed to know no other duty and no other business than the restoration of the old faith to its former domination. He enforced vigorously upon the clergy the observance of all the clerical duties, established a censorship, and completed the organization of the Roman Inquisition. But while he was thus intent upon strengthening the papal hierarchy, he also manifested good qualities of head and heart. Thus, e.g., he took measures for the alleviation of the burdens of the poorer classes, and for the better administration of justice, not sparing even his own nephews, whom he banished from Rome on account of their corrupt conduct and profligate life. His foreign relations involved him in much perplexity. He was embroiled with the emperor Ferdinand, with  Philip II of Spain, and with Cosmo, grand-duke of Tuscany. Having condemned the principles of the Peace of Augsburg, he protested against its provisions. Under the weight of so many cares his old age gave way. He died Aug. 18, 1559. As soon as the news of his death became known to the people of Rome, they rose in insurrection, ran to the prison of the Inquisition, wounded a Dominican monk who acted as commissary, delivered all the prisoners, and burned the papers. They then threw down the statue of the pope, crying out, “Death to the Caraffas!” The tumult lasted several days, after which the conclave elected as new pope Pius IV (q.v.). Paul IV wrote, Tractat. de symbolo, de emendanda ecclesia ad Paulum III, regulas Theatinorum: — Tractat. de ecclesia Vaticana et ejus sacerdotum principatu de quadragesimal. observantia: — Parcenes ad Bernardum Ochium: —Note in Aristotelis Eihicam: — Public fidei profess: — Orationes et Epistole. See Caraccioli, Collectanea hist. de Vita Pauli IV (Colossians 1612, 4to); Magi, Disquisit. hist. de Pauli IV inculpata vita (Neap. 1672); Bromato, Vita di Paolo IV (Ravenna, 1748, 2 vols. 8vo); Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:207, 234; Ffoulkes, Divisions of Christendom, vol. i, § 67; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, vol. vii; Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, vol. ii; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, 3:148 sq., 249 sq., 258 sq.; Hausser, Reformationsgesch. (1868) p. 296 sq.; Robertson, Hist. of Charles V. bk. xi and xii; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon (Romans Cath.), 8:231, 232.

## Paul Of Burgos[[@Headword:Paul Of Burgos]]

             SEE PAULUS BURGENSIS.

## Paul Of Constantinople[[@Headword:Paul Of Constantinople]]

             a historian of note, was a native of Persia, and is said to have been a disciple of the heresiarch Nestorius. Nothing is known of his personal history except that he was a deacon of the Church of Constantinople, and one of the most ardent supporters of Nestorianism at the time of the outbreak of the controversy respecting it. He wrote a work, De Judicio, and apparently another work, De vero Bono. A fragment of the former is quoted in the proceedings of the Lateran Council, held under pope Martin I, A.D. 649 (Actio s. Secretarius V, apud Concilia, vol. 6, col. 320, ed. Labbe ), and by the confessor St. Maximus, in his Tomus Dogmaticus adversus Heraclii Ecthesin (Opera, 2:91, ed. Combefis). An extract on the subject indicated by the title of the second work, and from which the existence of the work itself is inferred, is among the Excerpta Miscellanea extant in MS. in the Imperial Library at Vienna. It may be that the title is appropriate only to the extract, and this may have been taken from the work De Judicio. See Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 436, 1:426.

## Paul Of Cordova[[@Headword:Paul Of Cordova]]

             SEE PAULUS, ALVAREZ.

## Paul Of Emesa[[@Headword:Paul Of Emesa]]

             an Eastern prelate of note, who flourished in the first half of the 5th century, was among the bishops who, at the General Council of Ephesus  (A.D. 431), united with patriarch John of Antioch in supporting the cause of Nestorius. When negotiations were in progress for a reconciliation between John and the Oriental bishops with Cyril of Alexandria, Paul was sent by John to Cyril, but the latter would by no means comply with the solicitations of John until his messenger Paul had delivered some homilies before him, and presented to him a confession of faith, in which the term θεοτόκος was applied to the Virgin Mary, and had joined in anathematizing Nestorius. Having satisfied Cyril in these points, Paul concluded the negotiations successfully. The few facts known of the life of Paul are given by Tillemont, Memoires, vol. 14, and by Christianus Lupus, in his Scholia et Note ad varior. PP. Epistolas, forming the second volume of the work cited below. Paul wrote, Libellus quem (s. Libelli quos) Paulus Episcopus Emesenus Cyrillo Archiepiscopo Alexandrice obtulit, a Joanne Antiocheno Episcopo missus: — Homilia Pauli Episcopi Emesseni . . . de Nativitate Domini et Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi, et quod beata Virgo Maria sit Dei Genitrix, et quod non duos, sed unum Filiun et Dominum Christum dicamus, etc.: — Ejusdem Pauli Homilia . . . in Christi Domini et Salvatoris nostri Nativitatem. These pieces are given in the Concilia, vol. iii, col. 1090, 1095, 1098, ed. Labbe: — Epistola Pauli Emeseni Episcopi ad Anatholium Magistrum Militie, given in a Latin version in the Ad Ephesinum Concilium variorum Patrum Epistoloe of Christianus Lupus (Louvain, 1682, 4to), Ep. 107.

This Paul of Emesa is to be distinguished from a predecessor of the same name, who was present at the Council of Seleuceia (A.D. 359), and adhered to the party of Acacius (Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, vol. ii, col. 839, but he does not give his authority); but who seems afterwards, under the emperor Jovian, to have united himself with the orthodox (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 3:25; 4:12; Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 6:4; Ecc 6:12), and to have acted with them possibly at the Synod of Antioch (A.D. 363), certainly at that of Syana (A.D. 367 or 368). Gennadius (De Viris Illustribus, c. 31) mentions “Paulus Episcopus,” he does not say of what see, as having written a little book on repentance (De Punitentia Libellus), in which he cautions the penitent against such an excess of sorrow as might lead to despair. We have no means of identifying this Paul. The period occupied by the writers enumerated by Geuuadius includes that in which Paul of Emesa flourished; and as he was the most eminent prelate of the time of his name, he may possibly be the writer named by Gennadius.

## Paul Of Pannonia[[@Headword:Paul Of Pannonia]]

             lived probably in the 5th century; according to Trithemius and Cave, in A.D. 430. Gennadius calls him Paulus Presbyter, and states that he knew from his own testimony (ex dictis ejus) that he was a Pannonian, but does not say to what Church he belonged. Paul wrote De Virginitate servinda et contemtu Mundi ac Vitae Institutione Libri duo, addressed to a holy virgin, Constantia. He took the opportunity of abusing “the heretic Jovinian,” the great opponent of monasticism, as a luxurious glutton. The work is lost. In some MSS. of Gennadius, and by Honorius of Autun (De Scriptor. Eccles. 2:74), he is called, not Paulus, but Petrus. See Cave, Hist. Litt. 1:414; Trithemius, De Scriptor. Eccles. c. 146; Fabricius, Biblioth. Med. et Infim. Latinitat. v. 217, ed. Mansi.

## Paul Of Samosata[[@Headword:Paul Of Samosata]]

             a noted Eastern ecclesiastic of the 3d century, was a native of Samosata, and must have been born shortly after the opening of the century. Very little is accessible as to his early personal history. He was elevated to the bishopric of Antioch in A.D. 260. His original calling seems to have been that of a sophist; how he obtained admittance into the clerical order is unknown; his elevation, or at least his continuance in the see, he owed to the celebrated Zenobia, to whom his literary attainments and his political talents may be supposed to have recommended him. The charge that his personal character was not all that could be desired for the episcopal office seems groundless, when we consider the silence of the ecclesiastical writers of that period, who, if they had had the opportunity, would have gladly laid hold of anything to his disadvantage; and we should rather think that his character must have been remarkably pure and worthy to have led to his being raised from an originally obscure condition to the highest dignity in the Church. After his elevation he was apparently less scrupulous and humble, and it may be reasonably inferred from what his enemies say of him — and they are the only ones who have written about Paul of  Samosata — that he manifested in the episcopal office great rapacity, arrogance, and vanity. The encyclical letter issued by the council which deposed him (see below) was published at the time of his condemnation (A.D. 269), and if the charges had been capable of refutation or denial, Paul would not have suffered them to go unanswered. He obtained, while holding his bishopric, the secular office of procurator decenarius (so called from the holder of it receiving a yearly salary of two hundred sestertia), and is said to have loved the pomp and state of his secular calling better than the humbler and more staid deportment which became his ecclesiastical office; and it was probably by the exercise, perhaps the abuse of his procuratorship, that he amassed the immense wealth which, contrasted with his original poverty, so scandalized his opponents.

He was led also by his habits of secular grandeur, and the pride they inspired, to introduce into the Church a greater degree of pomp than had as yet been allowed, erecting for himself an episcopal tribunal (βῆμα) and a lofty seat (θρόνον ὑψηλόν), and having this seat placed in a recess screened from public observation, in imitation of the higher judges and magistrates (see Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 7:30). When abroad he assumed all the airs of greatness, being attended by a numerous retinue, and affecting to read letters and to dictate as he went, in order to inspire the spectators with an idea of the extent and pressing character of his engagements. The decencies of public worship he also violated. He encouraged his admirers of both sexes to manifest their approval by waving their handkerchiefs and rising up and shouting, as in the theatres, and rebuked and insulted those whom a sense of propriety restrained from joining in these applauses. His style of preaching tended to aggravate the disaffection which his general deportment inspired. He was equally unsparing in his strictures on those former teachers of the Church whose memory was held in reverence, and in his praises of himself, “after the manner rather of a rhetorician or a mountebank than of a bishop” (Eusebius). He allowed and excited women to sing his praises publicly in the church, amid the solemnities of Easter, and encouraged his flatterers among the neighboring bishops to praise him in their discourses to the people, and extol him “as an angel from heaven.” To these charges of open and ascertainable character, his accusers add others of more secret and therefore of more dubious nature, resting in fact on mere suspicion. But it is very probable that these offensive traits would have excited less animadversion had they not been connected with heretical theological opinions. Indeed, his accusers admit that, “though all groaned and lamented his wickedness in secret,” they feared his power too much to  provoke him by attempting to accuse him; but the horror excited by his heresy inspired a courage which indignation at his immorality had failed to excite; and they declare that, when he set himself in opposition to God, they were compelled to depose him and elect another bishop in his place (Eusebius). Mosheim, who is inclined to take the most favorable view of Paul's failings, says:

“That Paul was publicly lauded by women, and by neighboring bishops and presbyters, I can believe without much difficulty; but that he was so infatuated and so greedy of praise as boldly to urge forward these proclaimers of his virtues, I cannot believe so easily. I suspect that Paul, after the controversy arising from his novel opinions had become warm, and the people had become divided into factions and parties, persuaded some bishops and presbyters to defend and support his cause in public discourses; and, through his satellites, he encouraged some women, on Easter-day, when the people were all assembled, suddenly to shout forth his praise, in order to conciliate popular favor to him, and to check the rising storm of opposition. He allowed his presbyters and deacons, among other wrong things, to keep the so-called sub-introduced (συνεισάκτας, subintroductas) women: and he himself kept two young women, and carried them with him when he traveled. This was not contrary to the custom of the priests of that age, of which I have spoken elsewhere. But the bishops do not accuse Paul of any illicit intercourse with these women; whence it appears that, though a luxurious liver, he was not altogether regardless of the laws of chastity and decorum.

“Respecting the impiety of Paul of Samosata, scarcely any writer since the 3d century, who has treated of the trinity of persons in God, and of Christ, either formally or incidentally, is silent; and the writers on heresies, one and all, place him among the worst corrupters of revealed truth, and vehemently inveigh against him: so Epiphanius, Theodoret, Augustine, Damascenus, and the rest. Moreover, some of the public documents of the proceedings against him have reached us, a circumstance which has not occurred in regard to most of the other heretics. For there is extant (1) a great part of the epistle of the bishops by whose decision he was condemned in the council at Antioch, addressed to all the bishops of Christendom, to make it manifest that they had good  reasons for what they had done (in Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 1. vii, c. 30, p. 279, etc.). But it is to be regretted that Eusebius has preserved only that part of the epistle which recounts the vices and delinquencies of the man, omitting the part which stated his doctrines or errors. If the latter had been preserved, we could more confidently and more definitely determine what were his principles. There is extant (2) a copy of one of the epistles of the bishops of the council, addressed to Paul, relating to the controversy with him (in the Bibliotheca Patrum Parisiensis [ed. Paris], 1644, fol., 11:302). In this epistle, six of the bishops state their own opinions respecting God and Christ, and inquire of him whether he disagrees with them. There is extant (3) an epistle of Dionysius of Alexandria to Paul of Samosata, in which the writer chides and confutes him (in the same Bibliotheca Patrum, 11:273). Though it is true that some, and for reasons worthy of consideration, deny that this epistle was written by Dionysins (q.v.), it is as unquestionably true that the epistle is very ancient. It was probably addressed to Paul by some bishop or presbyter, whose name being omitted in the early copy, some person, recollecting that Dionysius was an opposer of Paul, ascribed the epistle to him. There are extant (4) ten questions of Paul of Samosata, addressed to Dionysius of Alexandria, and the answers of the latter to these questions (in the same Bibliotheca Patrum, 11:278). But this unequalled abundance of documents relative to Paul's heresy has not prevented a great diversity in opinion, both among the ancients and the moderns, respecting his real sentiments. For the ancients speak, sometimes obscurely, sometimes inconsistently, and sometimes they mistake, either from passion or prejudice; and hence the moderns differ widely, some criminating and some vindicating the man. We collect together all that can be learned respecting Paul's sentiments from these ancient documents, and compare with these statements whatever has reached us from other ancient sources.

“I. The bishops by whom Paul was condemned, in their epistle, preserved by Eusebius say: First, That he denied his God and Lord: τὸν θεὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ Κύριο ἀρνουμένου (p. 280). Secondly, That before the bishops, assembled in council, he would not acknowledge that the Son of God descended from heaven: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταλελυθέναι. Thirdly, That he distinctly said Jesus  Christ originated on earth: Λέγει Ι᾿ησοῦν Χριστὸν κάτωθεν. Fourthly, That he went over to the abominable heresy of Artemas. What the heresy of Artemas was, with which they tax Paul, is a question of doubt and uncertainty. I shall therefore pass by this charge, and consider only the others; in which, doubtless, the chief error of Paul was included, and that error which was the cause of so much odium against him. From these charges it is evident that he would not acknowledge Jesus Christ to be both God and man; or he denied that Jesus Christ was a person — if I may so say — compounded of God and man. For when he said the Son of God did not descend from heaven, but originated on the earth, what could he mean but that Christ was a mere man, though divinely begotten of the Virgin Mary? And what could the bishops mean, when they taxed him with denying his God and Lord, but that he divested Christ of his divinity, or denied that a divine person received the man Christ into union with himself? From the same charges it also appears that he called the man Christ the Son of God; and this, undoubtedly, because he was supernaturally produced from the Virgin Mary. For he denied that the Son of God descended from heaven; and as this, most certainly, must be understood as referring to Christ, it is manifest that he applied the title Son of God to the man Christ. This alone is a sufficient refutation of the error of those who believe what Marius Mercator asserts (De Anathematismis Nestorii, in his Opp. 2:128), that Paul of Samosata represented Christ as being a man, born like other men of two parents.

Yet we have a better witness for confuting this error in Paul himself, who distinctly says (Questio V in the Biblioth. Patr. 11:286), Ι᾿ησοῦς ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ πνέυματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου. — That the bishops, whose charges we are considering, did him no injustice, he himself makes manifest. For all his ten questions now extant, whether addressed to Diounsius or to another person, have one sole aim, namely, to evince, by means of various texts of Scripture brought together, that Christ was a mere man, and destitute of any divinity; or, what amounts to the same thing, to confute the belief that the divine and human natures united in Christ produced one person. It is therefore not necessary to produce the testimony of others among the ancients to the same point. Yet I will add that of Simeon Betharsamensis, a celebrated Persian, near the beginning of the 6th century, whose testimony I regard as of more value than that of all the Greek and Latin fathers. In his epistle on the heresy of the Nestorians  (in Jos. Sim. Assemlani's Bibliotheca Oriental. 1:347) he says: Paulus Samosatenus de beata Maria haec dicebat: “udum hominem genuit Maria, nec post partum virgo permansit. Christunm autem appellavit creatunm, factum, mortalem et filium (Dei) ex gratia.” De se ipso vero dicebat: “Ego quoque si voluero, Christus ero, quum ego et Christus unius, ejusdemque simnus nature.”' These statements accord perfectly with the allegations of the bishops, and with the character of Paul, who was rash and extravagant. Epiphanius also (Hoeres. 65:617) says of him that he gave himself the appellation of Christ; a declaration which is elucidated by the quotation from the Persian Simeon.

“II. The six bishops of the Council of Antioch, in their letter to Paul before sentence was pronounced upon him, while they state their own doctrine respecting God and Christ, condemn some errors of their adversary. In the first place, they say it could not be endured that he should inculcate υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ θεὸν μὴ ειναι πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμον, and δύο θεοὺς καταγγέλλεσθαι, ἐὰν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ θεὸς κηρύσσηται (Biblioth. Patr. 11:303). The bishops speak less definitely than could be wished; in consequence, perhaps, of the studied obscurity of Paul, who did not wish his real sentiments to be distinctly known. Yet it is not difficult to see whither tend the sentiments they attribute to him. First, he acknowledged that there is something in God, which the Scriptures call the Son of God. He therefore supposed that there are two Sons of God — the one by grace, the man Christ; the other by nature, who existed long before the other Son. Secondly, He denied that the latter Son of God was God anterior to the creation of the world. Thirdly, Consequently he held that this Son of God became God at the time the world was created. These statements appear confused, and very different from the common apprehensions; but they will admit of elucidation. Paul meant to say that the energy — or, if any prefer it, the Divine energy which he denominated the Son of God, was hidden in God, before the creation of the world; but that, in a sense, it issued out from God, and began to have some existence exterior to God, at the time God formed the created universe. Fourthly, Hence he inferred that (p. 710) those profess two Gods (or speak of two as in the place of the one God) who proclaim the Son of God to be God; but undoubtedly, considering what precedes, the limitation should be added, before the creation of the world. His belief was that they divide the one God into two Gods, who make the Son of God to have existed  as a person, distinct from the Father, before the foundation of the world. He did not deny, as we have seen, that the Son of God was, in some sense, made God at the time the world was created. From all this we learn that Paul denied the eternal generation of the Son of God, and also his personal distinctness from the Father; and he supposed that when God was about to create the world he sent out from himself a certain energy, which is called the Son of God, and also God, although it is nothing distinct from God. These ideas may be further illustrated by the subsequent charge of the bishops; in which they not obscurely tax Paul with representing God the Father as creating the world by the Word (ὡς δἰ ὀργάνου καὶ ἐπιστήμης ἀνυποστάτου) as by an instrument, and by intelligence, having no separate existence or personality.

For it hence appears that by the Son or Word of God, he understood the divine wisdom (ἐπιστήμην); which, before the world was created, had been at rest in God, and hidden during numberless ages: but now, when the supreme God formed the purpose of creating the world, it exhibited its powers, and, as it were, came out from the bosom of the Father; or, in other words, it manifested its presence by discriminating, acting, and operating. From that time onward it is called, though figuratively, the Son of God, because it proceeded forth from God, just as a son does from his parents; and also God, because it is essentially God, and can be conceived of as separate from him only by an abstraction of the mind. In perfect accordance with these views are the statements of other ancient writers. Thus Epiphanius (inceres. 65:608) states the sentiments of Paul: God the Father, Son, and Spirit are one God. The Word and Spirit are ever in God, as reason is in man; the Son of God has no separate existence, but he exists in God.... νἱὸς ἐν τῷ πατρί, ὡς λόγος ἐν ἀνθρώρῳ. The Son is in the Father, as reason (not speech, sermo, as Petavitls rendered it; but ἐπιστήμη, as the bishops term it) is in man. Elpiphanius, who as an author as not distinguished for his accuracy and research, has not stated all that Paul held, but what he has stated is very well. I omit similar citations from Athanasius and others, that the discussion may not be too prolix.

“III. Dionysius, or whoever wrote the epistle bearing his name (in the Biblioth. Patr. 11:273, 274), says that Paul taught: δὐο (esse) ὑποστάσεις καὶ δύο πρόσωπα τοῦ ἑνὸς ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ, και δύο Χριστους, καὶ δύο υἱούς, ἕνα φύσει τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ προϋπάρχοντα, καὶ ἕνα κατ᾿ ὁμοννυμίαν Χριστὸν καὶ υἱὸν τὃῦ  Δαβίδ. Whether Paul so expressed himself, or whether Dionysius so inferred from the language of Paul, there is nothing here disagreeing with the opinions of Paul. For since he declared Christ to be a mere man, born of Mary; and denied that the Wisdom of God, combined with the man Christ, constituted one person; and yet asserted that the eternal Son of God, by whom the world was created, dwelt in the man Christ; and as he also called the man Christ the Son of God, and applied the same appellation, Son of God, to that power of the divine Wisdom which projected the world — it must necessarily be that, in some sense, he recognized two distinct and separate things in Christ, two forms, two Sons, two Christs. Here it should be noticed that the word ὑπόστασις, in the language of Dionysius, is not to be understood in our sense of the term, but in a broader acceptation. From the questions of Paul (Quast. vii, p. 280) it appears that he used the word ὑπόστασις in a broad sense, as applicable to anything that is or exists, whether it subsists by itself or only in something else. The eternal Son of God, which Paul acknowledged to exist in Christ, he could not have regarded as truly an ὑπόστασις or person. For, if he had so regarded it, he would have admitted the very thing which he denied, namely, that the Son of God is a person distinct from the person of the Father. In this same epistle (p. 274) Dionysius blames Paul for saying, ἄνευ τῆς ἀσκητικῆς καὶ ἐπιπόνου δικαιοσύνης

He therefore admitted that God, in the sense before explained, i.e. as being the Wisdom of God, dwelt in Christ. But he added that God dwelt in Christ, sine laborios ajustitioe exercitatione. This well explains the views of Paul, and in part confirms my former remarks. For Paul's meaning is that Christ, while obeying the commands of the law, and suffering its penalties, acted and suffered alone; nor did God, as present with him, either act or suffer along with the man Christ. Hence it appears that Paul rejected altogether the union of the divine and human natures in Christ. In this manner Dionysius correctly understood him, as appears from the conftation he subjoined, in which he endeavors to show, by many proofs, that God was born in Christ, and suffered the penalties, and died. More passages of a similar character might be drawn from this epistle; but they are not needed.

“IV. In the ten questions proposed by Paul to Dionysius, the sole aim of Paul is to prove that the man born of Mary had no community of nature or of action with God dwelling in him. Hence he brings forward  the texts in which the soul of Christ is said to be troubled and sorrowful (Joh 12:27; Mat 26:28). He then asks: Can the nature of God be sorrowful and troubled? (p. 712). He also lays before his antagonist the words of Christ to the Jews, Destroy this temple, etc. (Joh 1:19), and then demands, Can God be dissolved? This objection, so easy of solution, Dionysius answers miserably, by resorting to a mystical interpretation. For he would have Paul believe that by the temple which Christ represents as to be dissolved must be understood the disciples of Christ; because these the Jews actually dissolved, that is, dispersed and scattered. Some of the other answers are no better. In Question V (p. 286) Paul says: Luke tells us (ch. 2:40) that Christ grew. But can God grow? If, therefore, Christ grew, he was nothing but a man. With this argument the good Dionysius is greatly puzzled. But at length he finds his way out, and says: ‘The boy who, as Luke tells us, grew and waxed strong, is the Church, so that Αὔξησις τοῦ θεοῦ εὶς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐστί, the growth of God, relates to the Church: for it is recorded in the Acts that the Church increased daily and was enlarged, and that the Word of God increased every day.' How ingenious and beautiful! If all the bishops who opposed Paul were like this Dionysius for acuteness and genius, I do not wonder they could not refute him. And lest this fine response should lose its force and beauty, Dionysius closes it with exquisite taunts.

“But I will desist. Paul, undoubtedly, had wrong views, and views very different from those which the Scriptures inculcate. But his adversaries also appear to have embraced more than one error, and they had not sufficiently precise and clear ideas on the subject they discussed. These statements, derived from the best and most credible documents on the subject, if carefully examined and compared together, will give us easy access to the real sentiments of Paul of Samosata. The system he embraced, so far as it can be ascertained at the present day, is contained in the following propositions:

1. God is a perfectly simple unit, in whom there is no division into parts whatever!

2. Therefore, all that common Christians teach respecting different persons in God, an eternal Son of God, and his generation from eternity, is false, and should be corrected by the Holy Scriptures.

3. The Scriptures speak indeed of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. But those texts must be so understood as not to militate with the clearest and most certain doctrine of both reason and Scripture respecting the unity of the divine nature.

4. The Son of God mentioned in the Scriptures is merely the Reason (λόγος) and Wisdom (ἐπιστήμη ) of God. Those who have translated the Greek writers concerning Paul into Latin (De Valois, Petavius, and others) commonly render the Greek word λόγος by the Latin word Verbum. This is wrong. From the epistle of the bishops at Antioch to Paul, it is clear that he understood by λόγος the divine Wisdom. Hence this Greek word is equivalent to the Latin word ratio. Marius Mercator, whom many follow (De Anathematisno L'estoriano, in his Opp. 2:128, ed. Garnerii), erroneously says: ‘Verbum Dei Patris, non substantivum, sed prolativum, vel imperativum, sensit Samosatenus.' But Paul did not recognize the word προφορικόν (prolativum); and by the word λόγος he intended the Wisdom or the Reason of God, as is manifest from Epiphanius (p. 713), who, it must be confessed, is not always sufficiently accurate (uceres. 65:609): Λόγον νομίζουσι σοφίαν, οιον ἐν ψυχῇ ἀνθρώπου ἕκαστος ἔχει λόγον.

5. This Reason of God was at rest in him from eternity, and did not project or attempt anything exterior to God. But when God determined to create the visible universe, this Reason in a sense proceeded out from God, and acted exteriorly to God. On this account, in the Scriptures, it is metaphorically called the Son of God.

6. The Spirit is that power which God possesses of producing and animating all things at his pleasure. It first received the name of Spirit when it manifested itself in the creation of the world; and it is so called because it may be compared to the wind or the breath, which produces motions in the air. When it excites pious emotions in the souls of men, it is called the Holy Spirit.

7. Therefore, until God entered on the creation of the world, and operated externally, there was neither any Son of God nor any Holy Spirit. Yet both may, in a certain sense, be pronounced eternal, because they eternally existed in God.

8. When God would make known to men a way of salvation superior to that of Moses, he, by means of that eternal power of his, which gives life, and motion to all things, and which is called the Holy Spirit, begat, of the Jewish Virgin Mary, that very holy and most perfect man Jesus: and this man, because he was begotten by the power of God, without any intervening agency, is also called the Son of God; just as a house receives the name of its builder (see Dionysius, Epistle to Paul, ut sup. up. 274).

9. This extraordinary man, though he was more holy and more noble than any other mortal, yet lived and acted in the way and manner of other men, and was subject to all the wants and frailties which are incident to our nature. All the things which he either did or suffered prove clearly that he was a mere man.

10. But to enable him to perform the functions of a divine ambassador. without failure (for, as a man, he was liable to erl ors ani defects), that same divine Reason, which proceeded forth, as it were, from God at the time the world was created, joined itself to his soul, and banished from it all ignorance on religious subjects and all liability to failure. At what time, in the opinion of Paul, the divine Reason or Wisdom became associated with the soul of Christ, I do not find stated. I can suppose that the advent of the Reason or Word of God to be made Christ was delayed till the commencement of his public functions; because, previously, the man-Christ did not need the aid of this eternal Wisdom.

11. This presence of the divine Wisdom (which is nothing different from God himself) in the man Christ, makes it proper that this man should be, and he is, called God. Athanasius (De Synodis, in Opp. 2:739): Οἱ ἀπὸ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμωσατέως λέγονται, Χριστὸν ὕστερον (p. 714) μετὰ τὴν ἐνανθρώπησιν ἐκ προκοπῆς τοθεοποιῆσθαι, τῷ τὴν φύσιν ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον γεγονέναι. 1

12. It will be no mistake, then, if we say there are two Sons of God, and that there were in Christ two. ὑποστάσεις, or two distinct separately existing things, two forms or πρόσωπα.

13. But we must be careful not to commingle and confound the acts of these two Sons of God. Each acts alone, and without the other. The divine Reason, with no co-operation of the man, speaks by  Christ, instructs, discourses, sways the minds of the auditors, and performs the miracles. On the other hand, the man, with no cooperation of the divine Reason dwelling in him, is begotten, is hungry, sleeps, walks, suffers pain, and dies.

14. At length, when the man Christ had fulfilled his mission, the divine Reason left the man, and returned to God. Epiphanius (Haeres. lxv, § 1, p. 608): Φησὶ Παύλος Ε᾿λθών ὁ λόγος ἐνήργησε μόνος, καὶ ἀνῆλθε πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. This passage is miserably translated by Dion. Petaviu as are many other passages in Epiphanius) thus: ‘Sed solum, inquit Paulus, adveniens verbum, totum illud administravit, et ad patrem revertit.' The true meaning of the passage is: The divine Reason came (to the man Christ, long after his birth, and when in mature life), and solely (without any community of action with the human nature) operated in him, and afterwards returned to God” (Mosheim, History of Christianity in the First Three Centuries, 2:228 sq.).

The writers on the history of doctrines vary in their opinions respecting the relation in which Paul of Samosata stands, whether to Sabellianism or to the Unitarianism of the Artemonites (see Euseb. v. 28, ab init.); comp. Schleiermacher, p. 389 sq.; Baumgarten-Crusius, 1:204; Augusti, p. 59; Meier, Dogmengesch. p. 74, 70; Dorner, p. 510). The difference between Sabellius and Paul may be said to have consisted in this, that the former thought that the whole substance of the divine Being, the latter that only one single divine power had manifested itself in Christ. Trechsel (Geschichte des Antitrinitarismus, 1:81) agrees with this, calling Samosatianism “the correlate of Sabellianism, according to the measures of the mere understanding.” The divine here comes only into an external contact with man, touches human nature only on the surface; while, on the other hand, the human element comes to its rights more than in the system of Sabelliuis. Dionysius of Alexandria, as we have seen, was the first to write against Paul, and afterwards assembled some councils against him at Antioch, about 264. In the last of these councils, which appears to have met in the year 269, one Malchion, a rhetorician, an acute and eloquent man, so skillfully drew Paul out of the subterfuges in which he had before lurked that his error became manifest to all. As he would not renounce his error, he was divested of the episcopal office, and excluded from the communion by common suffrage. This decision Paul resisted; and relying perhaps on the patronage of queen Zenobia, and on the favor of the people,  he refused to give up the house in which the bishop resided, and in which the Church was accustomed to assemble. But when Zenobia was conquered by the emperor Aurelian, in the year 272, and the contest was taken before the emperor, the case was referred for arbitrament to the Romish and Italian bishops, who decided against Paul. It is probable that Paul, notwithstanding his deposition, continued to preach and to propagate his opinions. Nothing subsequent, however, is known of him. His followers, and he had many, formed themselves into a sect, and flourished under the name of Paulians (q.v.), or Paulianists, for some time after.

Paul does not seem to have written much. The ten questions and propositions extant under his name, and addressed, according to the existing title, to Dionysius of Alexandria, have been noticed. A Greek MS. work, ascribed by some to John of Damascus, contains a fragment of a work by Paul, entitled Οἱ πρὸς Σαβεανὸν λόγοι (Ad Sabianum Libri), and some fragments of this are cited in the Concilia (3:388, ed. Labbe). Vincentius Lirinensis, in his Conmonitorium, states that the writings of Paul abounded in quotations from the Scriptures both of the O.T. and the N.T. To introduce his Christology into the mind of the people, he undertook to alter the Church hymns, but was shrewd enough to accommodate himself to the orthodox formulas, calling Christ, for example, “God of the Virgin” (θεὸς ἐκ παρθένου), and ascribing to him even homoousia with the Father, but of course in his own sense. See, besides the authorities already referred to, Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 7:27-29; Mansi, Coll. Conc. 1:1033 sq., especially Epistol. Episcopar. ad Paul. v. 393; Epiphanius, Hist. Eccles. 65, 1; Maji, Nov. Collect. 7:1, p. 68, 299 sq.; Fragments in Leont. Byz. Contr. Nestor. et Eutych. iii; Ehrlich, Diss rtatio de Errorib. Pauli Samos. (Leips. 1745, 4to), p. 23; Fuerlin, De Hceres. Pauli Samos. (Gotting. 1741, 4to); Schwab, De Pauli Samos. vita atq. Doctr. (Herbip. 1839); Cave, Hist. Litter. ad ann. 260, 1:135; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, 1:705; Tillemont, Memoires, 4:289 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2:269 sq.; id. Diogenus, 1:169, 206; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:289 sq.; Pressense, The Early Years of Christianity (Heresy and Christian Doctrine), p. 131 sq.; Baur, Dreieinigkeitslehre, 1:293-335; Ha. genbach, History of Doctrines, vol. i; and his Erste drei Jahrh. etc., vol. 16; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 1:109 sq., 225, 411, 507; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 3:149 sq.

## Paul Of Thebes[[@Headword:Paul Of Thebes]]

             a saint of the early Christian Church, whose personal history is enshrouded in mystery by legends and traditions, was born, according to Jerome, in the second half of the 3d century. He early lost his rich Christian parents, and during the Dacian persecutions fled into the Theban wilderness, where he lived for ninety-seven years in communion with his God, to be seen only by man in his dying hours, when the anchorite Antonius found him.

## Paul The Deacon[[@Headword:Paul The Deacon]]

             (Paulus Diaconus), called also by his patronymic WARNEFRIDUS, one of the most learned ecclesiastics of the Middle Ages, is noted especially as a historical writer and iconographist. He was born about 740, at the town of Friuli (Forum Julii). He became attached to the court of Rachis, king of the Lombards, and received a superior education at Pavia. About 763 he left the court, and was ordained deacon of the Church at Aquileia. He returned to the court on the invitation of Desiderius, successor of Rachis, by whom he was made chancellor. About the part of his life which followed the overthrow of the kingdom of Desiderius by Charlemagne in 774 we know nothing for certain; but the most probable account is that he retired to a monastery, and afterwards entered the celebrated monastery of Monte Casino, whence he addressed to Charlemagne in the year 781 an elegy, in which he implores the release of a brother who had been taken prisoner in the Lombard war. About this time Charlemagne appears to have attached him to his court. Paul was employed to instruct in Greek the clergymen who were to accompany the emperor's daughter Rotrude in her journey to Constantinople to wed the son of the empress Irene. Paul visited France, and stayed some time at Metz, of the early bishops of which city he wrote a history. He afterwards returned to Monte Casino, where he died about the  year 799. As a poet, Paul is spoken of in the most extravagant terms of praise by his contemporary Peter of Pisa. His poems, which are really good, consist chiefly of hymens and other short pieces in Latin. Of his hymns, the song in praise of John the Baptist is still in use in our day in the Roman Catholic Church. Paul's fame rests however chiefly on his merits as a historian. His works were: Historial Miiscellanea, a Roman history consisting of twenty-four books, of which the first eleven contain the history of Eutropius; the next five, by Paul himself, contain the period from the reign of Valentinian to that of Justinian; the remaining books are attributed to Landulphus Sagax. The best edition of this work is in Muratori's “Rerum Italicarutm Scriptores.” This Roman history is a work of no great value at present, for it is a mere compilation of works that have been preserved to us; but in the Middle Ages it was greatly used, as the many MSS., recensions, and continuations of it attest: — De Gestis Longobardarum Libri Sex, a history of the Lombards; his most valuable work. It is unfortunately incomplete; he lived to bring it down only to the death of Luitprand, in A.D. 744. There are several editions of this work. It is characterized by remarkable candor, and a style unusually pure for that age. The high repute in which this work was long held is attested by the great number of MSS. and continuations. This is also contained in Muratori's collection: — Gesta Episcoporum Metensium; this history of the bishops of Metz was undertaken at the request of Angilram, bishop of Metz. it was the first work of the kind south of the Alps, and became an example which was soon very generally followed: — Vita S. Gregorii Magni (later much interpolated): — Excerpta from Festus, “De Verborum Significatione.” There are also extant a collection of homilies and two sermons which are attributed to him. The Homiliarium was collected from the best sources at emperor Charlemagne's request, and was introduced into the whole Frankish Church. It was printed several times between the years 1482 and 1569, and translated into German and Spanish. See Wattenbach and Bethmann, Paulus Diaconus Leben u. Schriften, in the “Archiv der Gesellschaft fur iltere deutsche Geschichtskunde,” vol. x (1851); Potthast, Bibl. Med. AEv. p. 484 sq., where the bibliography regarding Paulus is almost complete; Piper, Monumental-Theologie, p. 828 sq.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. ii.

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

             SEE PAUL OF PANNONIA.

## Paul The Silentiary[[@Headword:Paul The Silentiary]]

             a Christian poet of the 5th century, was of a noble family, the son of Cyrus and grandson of Florus, and possessed of great wealth. He held in the palace of Justinian the office of chief of the Silentiarii, a class of persons who had the care of the emperor's palace. When the church of St. Sophia at Constantinople was rebuilt by Justinian in 562, Paul wrote a description (or ἔκφρασις) of the edifice, in 1026 Greek hexameters, with a proemium consisting of 134 iambic verses. It is evident from this poem that he was a Christian. The work was edited, with notes and a Latin translation, by Ducange (Paris, 1670); the text, edited by Becker, is contained in the Bonn edition of the “Byzantine Historians” (1837), with a second part, consisting of 275 hexameters and a procemnium of 29 iambics, not included in the edition of Ducange. Paul was also the author of a poem entitled Εἰς τὰ ἐν Πυθίοις θέρμα, and of several epigrams, which are included in the Greek Anthology. See Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca (ed. Harles), 4:487; 7:581; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol. 3:151 (18); Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. ii, s.v.

## Paul The Simple[[@Headword:Paul The Simple]]

             (Paulus Simplex), so called on account of the childlike simplicity of his character, was a disciple of St. Anthony, who flourished in the 4th century. His native country appears to have been Egypt, but the place of his residence is not described. He was a poor countryman, who, till the age of sixty, had served God in the married state. His retirement into the desert was occasioned by his surprising his wife, who was exceedingly beautiful, and must have been much younger than himself, in the act of adultery with a paramour, with whom she appears to have long carried on a criminal intercourse. Abandoning to the care of the adulterer, not only his guilty wife, but also his innocent children, according to Palladius and Socrates, he took his departure, after having, “with a placid smile,” said to the adulterer, “Well, well; truly it matters not to me. By Jesus! I will not take her again. Go; you have her, and her children; for I am going away, and shall become a monk.”

The incident affords a curious illustration of the apathy which was cherished as a prime monastic virtue, and offers an instance of what was probably in that day still rarer, monastic swearing. A journey of eight days brought him to the cell of St. Anthony, then in the zenith of his reputation. “What do you want?” said the saint. “To be made a monk,” was Paul's answer. “Monks are not made of old men of sixty,” was the  caustic rejoinder. The fervor of the candidate induced him to remain three days without food at the door of the hermit; and Anthony, won by his importunity and earnestness, at length admitted him as a disciple. After a long and rigorous practice of obedience, he was placed in a cell at three miles' distance from Anthony's, who came to regard Paul as the holiest among his followers. Paul is reputed to have possessed the gift of miracles in a far more eminent degree than his great master; and to him, it is said, St. Anthony was in the habit of sending such sick or possessed persons as he himself was unable to cure. The date of Paul's retirement and the time of his death are not known; but an anecdote recorded in the Eccles. Graec. Monumenta of Cotelerius (1:351) shows that he was living at the accession of the emperor Constantius II, A.D. 337. See Palladius, Hist. Lausiac. c. 28, in the Biblioth. Patrum (Paris, 1654, fol.), 13:941; Sozomen, Hist. Ecc 1:13; Tillemont, Memoires, 6:144; Neale, Hist. of the Holy East. Church (Patriarchate of Alexandria), 1:152; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 3:151.

## Paul V[[@Headword:Paul V]]

             a noted pope of Rome, was originally named Camillo Borghese. He was born at Rome in 1552. In his early life he was a distinguished canonist and theologian; and, after the ordinary prelatical career at Rome, he rose first to the post of nuncio at the Spanish court, and afterwards to the cardinate in 1596 under Clement VIII. On the death of Leo XI in 1605, cardinal Borghese was elected to succeed him. His pontificate is rendered memorable by the concern to maintain its pretensions in Italy in all their integrity. Thus he was involved in the celebrated conflict with the republic of Venice, into which he was plunged at the very outset of his career. The original ground of dispute was the question of immunity from the jurisdiction of civil tribunals conceded to the clergy, who claimed to be tried by ecclesiastical tribunals alone. This claim the senate resisted; and further causes of dispute were added by a mortmain law, and a law prohibiting the establishment of new religious orders or associations unless with the sanction of the senate. Each party remaining inflexible in its  determination, Paul V issued a brief directing a sentence of excommunication against the doge and the senate, and placing the republic under an interdict unless submission should be made within twenty-four days. The senate forbade the publication of the bull; and as the members of several monastic orders professed that they could not continue to perform religious worship in a country placed under interdict, they were allowed to quit Venice, and the senate appointed secular priests to perform service in their stead. The people remained perfectly quiet, and the bishops and vicars continued their functions as usual; but there was, nevertheless, an animated conflict maintained by the pen, in which the celebrated Fra Paolo Sarpi, SEE PAUL, Father. on the side of the republic, and on the papal side Bellarmine and Baronius, were the leaders. There were three points at issue between the pope and the senate:

(1) The senate had made a decree that no new convent or religious congregation should be founded without their permission;

(2) that no property or perpetual revenue of any kind should be bequeathed to the Church without their approbation;

(3) that clerical men accused of crime should be judged by the secular power like other citizens.

The king of France and the emperor took the part of Venice, the court of Spain that of the pope, and Italy was threatened with a war, like that of the Investitures (q.v.). Henry IV of France, however, proposed his mediation, and sent to Venice cardinal De Joyeuse, who, after consulting with the senate, proceeded to Rome, where he succeeded in effecting a compromise in 1607, and peace was restored, although dissatisfaction afterwards arose on the subject of the nomination of a patriarch. The decrees of the senate were maintained, but the two clerical culprits, in compliance with the wish of the French king, were given up to the pope, “saving the right of the republic to punish all offenders, clerical or lay, within its dominions.” Upon this arrangement being made the interdict was removed. A misunderstanding of a similar nature arose between the pope and the crown of France (Louis XIII) as to the right of censorship of books, and as to the approval of the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Trent; but it was removed by mutual explanations. SEE SUAREZ.

Pope Paul's administration was vigorous and enlightened. He reformed many abuses in the tribunals of the Roman court, and did much for the promotion of public works, for the restoration and preservation of antiquities, the improvement  of the museums and libraries, and the embellishment of the city of Rome. He enlarged the Vatican and Quirinal palaces, restored the church of Santa Maria Maggiore, constructed or repaired aqueducts, made additions to the Vatican Library, collected statues and other antiquities, and built the handsome villa Mondragone at Frascati. Paul V was also much given to the improvement and providing of charitable and pious institutions. He likewise established the fortune of the Borghese family, which is one of the wealthiest of the Roman families. Paul V died Jan. 28, 1621, and was succeeded by Gregory XV. Paul V avoided decisions in all dogmatical controversy. Thus he reserved his judgment in the controversies on the doctrine of mercy, SEE MOLINA; SEE QUIETISM, and commanded silence to both parties in the controversy regarding the immaculate conception. He sainted Loyola and Charles Borromeo. See Bzovius, Vita Pauli V; De Montor, Hist. des souv. Pont. Romains; Muratori, Annales d'Italie, ann. 1616 and sq.; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:604; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, vol. vii; Schrickh, Kirchengesch. seit der Ref. 3:346 sq.; 4:305 sq.; Le Bret, Gesch. v. Italien, 3:203 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Popes, vol. ii; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon (Romans Cath.), 8:232, 233.

## Paul Veronese[[@Headword:Paul Veronese]]

             SEE PAOLO VERONESE.

## Paul Von Bernried[[@Headword:Paul Von Bernried]]

             SEE PAULUS VON BERNRIED.

## Paul(us), Von Bernried[[@Headword:Paul(us), Von Bernried]]

             an ecclesiastic of the first half of the 12th century, was canon of the cathedral at Regensburg. He was a devoted adherent of the cause of the emperor Henry IV, and a hater of pope Gregory VII. Persecuted by the clergy, he took refuge in the Augustinian convent at Bernried, in Bavaria. In 1128 he went to Rome, and wrote there an apology and a life of Gregory VII (in which are inserted some documents), and a life of St. Hercula, a prophetess and contemporary of his.

## Paul, David[[@Headword:Paul, David]]

             a celebrated Polish Unitarian divine, flourished near the middle of the 16th century. In 1563 he took part in a discussion against the Lutherans at Weissenburg, and was so persuasive in his arguments that the princes and the chief nobles of the country embraced his doctrines. There is scarcely anything else known of his history. See Krasinski, Hist. of the Ref. in Poland, 1:356.

## Paul, Father[[@Headword:Paul, Father]]

             whose original name, before he embraced the monastic profession, was PIETRO SARPI, is celebrated as the historian of the Council of Trent. He was born at Venice Aug. 14,1552, of a respectable commercial family. His father, however, was unsuccessful in trade; and his mother, a woman of sense and virtue, was early left a widow in indigent circumstances. Fortunately her brother was the master of an excellent school, and under his care she placed her son, who from infancy displayed a quick apprehension, a prodigious memory, and great strength of judgment, in short, an extraordinary aptitude for study. Before the completion of his fourteenth year he had made great progress in mathematics and logic, as well as in general literature, and in the languages, particularly the Greek and Hebrew; and at that boyish age, having become a pupil of the logician Capella of Cremona, who was of the Servite Order, this connection led him, contrary to the urgent advice of his uncle and mother, to adopt the monastic habit and rule of his preceptor. In his twentieth year he solemnly took the vows of the order. At the same period the ability which he displayed in a public disputation, held at Mantua during a chapter of his  order, attracted the favorable notice of the reigning prince of the house of Gonzaga, and he was appointed to the professorship of divinity in the cathedral of that city.

But, though he was honored with many marks of regard by the Mantuan duke, a public life was little to his taste; and he shortly resigned his office, and returned to the learned seclusion which he loved. In that retirement he continued to cultivate learning and science; and in his twenty second year he was not only acknowledged master of the Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Chaldee languages, but was also noted as a proficient in the civil and canon law, in various departments of philosophy, in mathematics and astronomy, in chemistry, medicine, and anatomy. In these last sciences he became deeply versed for his times, and it is alleged that he was acquainted with the theory of the circulation of the blood, for the discovery of which Harvey is celebrated. The claim of Sarpi as the discovered rests on the authority of Veslingius; who states, in his Epist. Anat. et Medicae, ep. xxvi, that he had read a MS. by Sarpi, belonging to his pupil and successor Fulgentius, in which the circulation was described. George Ent (Harvey's commentator and friend) admitted the testimony, but said that whatever Sarpi knew of the circulation he learned from Harvey. Ridanus, Harvey's chief adversary, gives no credit for the discovery to Sarpi; and Fulgentius himself does not claim it for him. Several writers attribute to Sarpi the discovery of the valves of the veins, which gave Harvey the first idea of a circulation; but Fabricius was acquainted with them in 1574, when Sarpi was but twenty-two years old, and it is certain that he (Fabricius) taught Harvey their existence. The above is on the authority of Haller (Bibliotheca Anatomica), who does not attribute any part of the discovery to Sarpi. The pursuit of such diversified studies, and the renown which they procured for father Paul, no less than the freedom of his expressed opinions in correspondence with the kindred minds of his age, drew upon him the envy and suspicion of the mean and bigoted; and he was twice arraigned before the Inquisition on a false and absurd accusation of heresy, and on a better-founded charge of having declared in a letter his detestation of the papal court and its corruptions. His high reputation protected him in both cases; but the court of Rome never forgave him, and at a subsequent period revenged and justified his bad opinion of its administration by refusing him a bishopric.

It has been said that secretly father Paul was at the time of these trials before the Inquisition a Protestant; but, even if this were true, his Protestantism was confined to an acceptance of the first simple positions of  the Augsburg Confession, if he really held even these. At least father Paul, all his life long, daily read mass. Indeed it would be impossible to give a name to the creed to which, in his own mind, he was attached; it was a body of opinions, symptoms of which are often to be found in the men who at that period devoted themselves to the natural sciences; deviating from the common standards of orthodoxy, inquisitive and searching, yet in itself neither decided nor completely matured. But this much is certain, that father Paul indulged towards the secular influence of the popedom a determined and implacable detestation. It was perhaps the only passion he cherished, and of it very little was manifested until the famous dispute which arose between the Roman see and the republic of Venice, during the pontificate of Paul V, in the year 1696, drew the speculative recluse from the quietude which had only been thus partially interrupted, and brought him into open and dangerous collision with the papal power. When Paul V endeavored to revive the doctrine of the supremacy of the popedom over all temporal princes and governments, and reduced these pretensions to practice by laying the Venetian state under an interdict and excommunication for having subjected priests to the secular jurisdiction, the senate of Venice, not contented with setting these papal weapons at defiance, determined to support by argument the justice of their cause.

The most eloquent and successful advocate whom they employed for this purpose was father Paul; and, animated both by zeal in the service of his native state and by indignant opposition to the Romish usurpations, he fulfilled his task with equal courage and ability, and signally exposed the papal pretensions. Paul was finally compelled to consent to an accommodation very honorable to the Venetian state. The papal party, however, though reduced to yield to the power of that republic and the strength of her cause, was resolved not to forego its vengeance against her defenders, an among them father Paul was signally marked for a victim. Several attempts were made to assassinate him; and even in the apparent security of his retreat at Venice he was attacked one night as he was returning home to his monastery by a band of ruffians, who inflicted on him no fewer than twenty-three wounds. The assassins escaped in a ten-oared boat; and the papal nuncio and the Jesuits were naturally suspected of being the authors of a plot prepared with such a command of means and expensive precautions. The wounds of father Paul, however, were mortal; and preserving one of the stilettoes which the assassins had left in his body, he surmounted it with the inscription, “Stilo della chiesa Romana” (The pen [or dagger] of the Romish Church).  These attempts upon his life compelled father Paul to confine himself to his monastery, where he employed his constrained leisure in the great literary composition by which he is chiefly remembered — The History of the Council of Trent (Historia del Concilio Tridentino di Pietro Soave Polano) — a work which has been not more deservedly commended for its style as a model of historical composition than for the extent of its learning, the generous candor of its spirit, the unbiassed integrity of its principles, and the unostentatious piety of its sentiments. While occupied in this and other labors of minor import, a neglected cold produced a fever, and after lying for nearly twelve months on a bed of sickness, which was supported with the most edifying cheerfulness and piety, he expired in the beginning of the year 1623. His memory was honored by the gratitude of the Venetian republic with a public funeral, which was distinguished by its magnificence, and the vast concourse of nobility and persons of all ranks attending it; and the senate, out of gratitude to his memory, erected a monument to him, the inscription upon which was written by John Anthony Venerio, a noble Venetian.

Father Paul was of middle stature: his head very large in proportion to his body, which was extremely lean. He had a wide forehead, in the middle of which was a very large vein. His eyebrows were well arched, his eyes large, black, and sprightly; his nose long and big, but very even; his beard but thin. His aspect, though grave, was extremely soft and inviting; and he had a fine hand. Cardinal Perron thought proper to deliver himself concerning our author in these terms: “I see nothing eminent in that man; he is a man of judgment and good-sense, but has no great learning. I observe his qualifications to be mere common ones, and little superior to an ordinary monk's.” But the learned Morhoff (Polyhistor. p. 293 sq.) has justly remarked that “this judgment of Perron is absurd and malignant, and directly contrary to the clearest evidence; since those who are acquainted with the great things done by father Paul, and with the vast extent of his learning, will allow him to be superior, not only to monks, but cardinals, and even to Perron himself.” Courayer, his French translator, says, in his Vie abregee de Fra Paolo, prefixed to the Hist. du Concile de Trent, that, “in imitation of Erasmus, Cassander, Thuanus, and other great men, Paul was a Catholic in general, and sometimes a Protestant in particulars. He observed everything in the Roman religion which could be practiced without superstition, and in points which he scrupled took great care not to scandalize the weak. In short, he was equally averse to all extremes: if he  disapproved the abuses of the Romanists, he condemned also the too great heat of the Reformed; and used to say to those who urged him to declare himself in favor of the latter that God had not given him the spirit of Luther.” Courayer likewise observes that “Paul wished for a reformation of the papacy, and not the destruction of it; and was an enemy to the abuses and pretences of the popes, not their place.” Walton tells us that the contests between the court of Rome and the senate of Venice “were the occasion of father Paul's knowledge and interest with king James, for whose sake principally he compiled that.eminent history of the remarkable Council of Trent; which history was, as fast as it was written, sent in several sheets in letters by Sir Henry Wotton, Mr. Bedell, and others, unto king James and the then bishop of Canterbury, into England.” Wotton relates that James himself had a hand in it, for the benefit,” he adds, “of the Christian world” (Reliquine Wottonianae, p. 486). This history of the Council of Trent was first published at London (1619, fol.), and dedicated to James I by Antony de Dpminis, archbishop of Spalatro. It had been written by Paul in Italian, and sent in manuscript to England by Sir Henry Wotton, so that the English was the first edition.

The Italian edition was first brought out in 1629 at Genoa, and was afterwards translated into Latin, English, French, and other languages; and a new translation of it into French by Dr. Le Courayer, with notes critical, historical, and theological, was published at London in 1736 (2 vols. fol.). Burnet's account of this work may serve to show the opinion which Protestants entertain of it. “The style and way of writing,” says he, “is so natural and masculine, the intrigues were so fully opened, with so many judicious reflections in all the parts of it, that it was read with great pleasure, and it was generally looked on as the rarest piece of history which the world ever saw. The author was soon guessed, and this raised the esteem of the work; for as he was accounted one of the wisest men in the world, so he had great opportunities to gather exact information. He had free access to all the archives of the republic of Venice, which has been looked upon for several ages as very exact, both in getting good intelligence, and in a most careful way of preserving it; so that among their records he must have found the despatches of the ambassadors and prelates of that republic who were at Trent; which being so near them, and the council being of such high consequence, it is not to be doubted but there were frequent and particular informations both of more public and secret transactions transmitted thither.

He had also contracted a close friendship with Camillus Oliva, that was secretary to one of the legates, from whom he had many discoveries of  the practices of the legates, and of their correspondence with Rome; besides many other materials and notes of some prelates who were at Trent, which he had gathered together. His work came out within fifty years of the conclusion of the council, when several who had been present there were still alive, and the thing was so recent in men's memories that few thought a man of so great prudence as he was would have exposed his reputation by writing in such a nice manner things which he could not justify. Never was there a man more hated by the court of Rome than he was, and now he was at their mercy if he had abused the world by such falsehoods in matter of fact as have since been charged on his work; but none appeared against him for fifty years” (preface to a book entitled The Policy of Rome, or the Sentiments of the Court and Cardinals there concerning Religion and the Gospel, as they are delivered by Cardinal Pallavicini in his History of the Council of Trent (Lond. 1681, 8vo). Ranke says: “The memory of Paul Sarpi is justly held in high honor throughout all Roman Catholic states. He it was that fought for and won the fundamental principles to which we may refer the spiritual privileges which they all enjoy in common. The pope found it beyond his power to set him aside.” Father Paul is also the author of A Treatise of beneficiary Matters, or a History of Ecclesiastical Benefices and Revenues, in which are set forth their Rise and Progress, and the various Means by which they have accrued to the Church, translated, with the notes of Amelot de Houssaie (Westminst. 1727, 8vo). A complete edition of father Paul's works in the original language was published at Verona and Naples in 1761, 1768, and 1790. See, besides the memoir appended to the different editions of father Paul's History of the Council of Trent and his collected works, Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:616 sq.; Brischar, eurtheilung Sarpi's u. Pallavicini's (Tub. 1843, 2 vols. 8vo); Werner, Gesch. der apo'ogetischen u. polem. Literatur, 4:386-579; and the references under PALLAVICINI SEE PALLAVICINI and SEE TRENT (Council of).

## Paul, Festival Of The Conversion Of[[@Headword:Paul, Festival Of The Conversion Of]]

             a feast held by the Church of Rome on January 25. SEE PETER.

## Paul, John De St[[@Headword:Paul, John De St]]

             an Irish prelate, was prebendary of Donnington, in the cathedral of York, and canon of Dublin, when he was advanced to the archbishopric of Dublin, September 12, 1350. In 1360 he was one of the three whom the king appointed to explore for such mines of gold and silver as were thought to be abundant in various parts of Ireland. In 1361 he had an especial writ of summons to a great council to be held in Dublin, on which occasion he is said to have labored with his usual good sense and judgment to effect a general amnesty and pardon of such of the Irish and English as were then opposed to the government. He died September 9, 1362. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 134.

## Paul, Vincent de[[@Headword:Paul, Vincent de]]

             one of the most eminent saints of the modern Romish Church, and founder of the congregation of “Priests of the Missions,” was born of very humble parentage at Ranquines, in the diocese of Dax, France, in 1576. The indications of ability which he exhibited as a youth interested in him several people of influence and means, and he was sent to Toulouse to be educated. He became an ecclesiastical student, and was admitted to priest's orders in 1600. For a time he was tutor in a noble family, and was then made principal of the college “Des Bons Enfans.” On a voyage which he was making from Marseilles to Narbonne the ship in which he had taken passage was captured by corsairs, and he was sold into slavery at Tunis.  After having spent several years in the most forlorn condition, he succeeded in claiming his master, a renegade Christian, to the true faith, and together with him Paul made his escape from Barbtry. They landed in France in 1607. Shortly after this he went to Rome, and was entrusted by the pontiff with an important mission to the French court in 1608. He now took up his residence in Paris, and became the almoner of Marguerite de Valois. He also taught, and as tutor of the children of M. de Gondy, the commandant of the galleys at Marseilles, gained the friendship of this distinguished man, and secured the appointment as almoner-general of the galleys in 1619. It was at this time that the well-known incident occurred of his offering himself and being accepted in the place of one of the convicts, whom he found overwhelmed with grief and despair at having been obliged to leave his wife and family in extreme destitution.

But Vincent de Paul is especially noted for having laid the foundation of what eventually grew into the great and influential congregation of “Priests of the Missions,” an association of priests who devote themselves to the work of assisting the parochial clergy by preaching and hearing confessions periodically in those districts to which they may be invited by the local pastors. The rules of this congregation were approved by Urban VIII in 1632, and in the following year the fathers established themselves in the so- called priory of St. Lazare, in Paris, whence their name of Lazarists (q.v.) is derived. From this date his life was devoted to the organization of works of charity and benevolence. To him Paris owes the establishment of the Foundling Hospital, and the first systematic efforts for the preservation of the lives and the due education of a class theretofore neglected, or left to the operation of chance charity. The pious Sisterhood of Charity is an emanation of the same spirit, and Vincent was intrusted by St. Francis de Sales with the direction of the newly founded order of Sisters of the Visitation. The queen, Anne of Austria, warmly rewarded his exertions, and Louis XIII chose him as his spiritual assistant in his last illness. Vincent de Paul was placed by the queen-regent at the head of the Conseil de Conscience, the council chiefly charged with the direction of the crown in ecclesiastical affairs; and the period of his presidency was long looked back to as the golden sera of impartial and honest distribution of ecclesiastical patronage in France. Vincent was not, in any sense of the word, a scholar; but his preaching, which (like that of the fathers of his congregation of Lazarists) was of the most simple kind, was singularly affecting and impressive. He left nothing behind him but the Rules or Constitutions of the Congregation of the Mission (1685); Conferences on these  Constitutions (4to), and a considerable number of letters, chiefly addressed to the priests of the mission, or to other friends, on spiritual subjects. He died at an advanced age at St. Lazare, Sept. 27, 1660, and was canonized by Clement XII in 1737. His festival is held on July 19, the day of his canonization. See Mrs. Jameson, Legends; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 1:319 sq.; 2:11; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 7:592.

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

             D.D., an English prelate, flourished near the middle of the 17th century. Of his early history we know scarcely anything. He was not educated for the sacred office of the ministry, but had entered the mercantile profession, and, possessed of a large property, had made himself quite prominent in that walk of life, when, through the influence of bishop Sheldon, Paul was called into the ministry, and finally given the important see of Oxford. It was hoped that his vast wealth would be expended for the good of the bishopric, and, to judge from the preparations he made for the rebuilding of the dilapidated episcopal palace at Cuddesden, the hope was not unfounded. He died suddenly in 1665, having held the see only two years. He also held the valuable rectory of Chinnor in commendam. See Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England (Church of the Restoration), 1:490.

## Paula[[@Headword:Paula]]

             ST. ( Α῾γία Παῦλα), was a noble Roman matron, a pupil and disciple of Jerome. Though descended from the Scipios and the Gracchi, and accustomed to luxurious self-indulgence, she preferred to follow her saintly teacher to Bethlehem and devote herself to a religious life. The church dedicated to St. Jerome at Rome is said to be upon the spot where the house of Paula stood, in which she entertained that holy man during his stay in Rome, A.D. 382. She studied Hebrew, in order to understand the Scriptures better. She built a monastery, hospital, and three nunneries at Bethlehem. Her daughter St. Eustochia was with her. The rule for these convents was very strict, and her own austerities were so severe that she was reprimanded for them by St. Jerome. Her granddaughter Paula was sent to her at Bethlehem to be educated, and succeeded her as superior of the monastery. Paula died (A.D. 404) making the sign of the cross on her lips, and was buried in the church of the Holy Manger, where her empty tomb is now seen near that of St. Jerome. Her relics are said to be at Sens. She is commemorated Jan. 26.

## Paula Francis Of[[@Headword:Paula Francis Of]]

             SEE FRANCIS.

## Paula, Vincentius[[@Headword:Paula, Vincentius]]

             SEE VINCENTIUS.

## Pauli Joannites[[@Headword:Pauli Joannites]]

             a name given to the Attingians, and sometimes to all the Paulicians.

## Pauli, Carl Wilhelm[[@Headword:Pauli, Carl Wilhelm]]

             a German jurist, was born at Lubeck, December 18, 1792. He studied jurisprudence at Gottingeli and Tuibingen, and occupied the highest positions in his profession at his native place, where he died, March 18, 1879. For a number of years he belonged to the officers of his Church, which he served everywhere, and for which he undertook the publication of a new hymn-book in 1832. Having thus become interested in hymnology, he continued his studies, and published as their result, Geschichte der  lubeckischen Gesangbucher und Beurtheilung des Gegenwartigen (Lubeck, 1875). He was a warm friend of the mission among the heathens, and for a number of years stood at the head of the missionary society at Liibeck. To this period belong his Der lubeckische Verein zur Beforderung der, evangelischen Mission unter den Heiden im Jahre 1856 (ibid. i857) and Nothgedrungene Erklarung in Sachen des lubeckischen Vereins (ibid. 1857); His essay, Peter Heyling, der erste deutsche Missiondr, in Warneck's Allgem. Missions-Zeitschrift (May, 1876), is a valuable contribution to the history of missions and the Church. (B.P.)

## Pauli, Christian William Henry[[@Headword:Pauli, Christian William Henry]]

             a minister of the Church of England, was born of Hebrew parentage; at Breslau, Silesia, August 11, 1800. He received a strict Jewish education and at the age of twenty-four, while yet in the synagogue, published a volume of sermons under the title Predigtes fur fromme Israeliten (Halle, 1824; by Hirsch Prinz, as his Jewish name originally was). When twenty- five years of age he embraced Christianity at Minden; on coming to England was for some time a student at Cambridge, and while there was invited to come to Oxford, where he was appointed lecturer in Hebrew. This post he held for thirteen years, and published, in 1839, his Analecta Hebraica. In 1840 he was ordained, and sent to Berlin by the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews. In 1843 he was stationed at Amsterdam, but resigned his position in 1874. He then retired to Luton, Bedfordshire, England, and died May 4, 1877. He also published, The Great Mystery; or, How can Three be One? and A Translation of the Chaldee Paraphrase of Isaiah (Lond. 1871). (B.P.)

## Pauli, Ernest L[[@Headword:Pauli, Ernest L]]

             SEE PAULI, PHILIP REINHOLD.

## Pauli, Georg Jacob[[@Headword:Pauli, Georg Jacob]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born at Brunswick, July 24, 1722. He studied at Halle, was in 1746 director of the Reformed gymnasium, in 1750 cathedral preacher, in 1751 preacher at Berlin, in 1774 again at Halle, and died Feb. 23, 1795. He published, De Occasione Psalmi 34 Conscribendi (Halle, 1747): — De Conciliando Loca Marc. 15:25 et Joh 19:14 (1748): — De Auctoribus Classicis in Christianorum Scholis Caute Tractandis (1749): — Entwurf einer katechetischen und popularen Theologie (2d ed. 1785): — Heidelbergischer Katechismus (1781 ). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pauli, Gregorius[[@Headword:Pauli, Gregorius]]

             a Unitarian divine of Italian descent, flourished at Brzeziny in Poland near the middle of the 16th century. In 1556 he attended the Synod of Secemin, and favored Gonesius (q.v.), who there proclaimed his anti-Trinitarian opinions. Being accused at the Synod of Pinczow on that account, he threw off every restraint, and proclaimed from the pulpit his opinions respecting the mystery of the Trinity. He rejected the Nicene Creed and the doctrine of the first five oecumenical councils. He went even much farther than Gonesius and Arius, maintaining that Christ did not exist before his birth, and consequently reduced him to the condition of man. He condemned the baptism of infants, and maintained that Christ had abolished the temporal powers, that death did not separate the soul from the body, and that the body did not in reality die; that the Holy Scriptures do not establish any difference between the resurrection of the soul and of the body, but that they will both have a common resurrection; that the spirit formed not a separate and independent substance; that God raised from the dead the body of Christ, which entered heaven; that the doctrine about the death of the body was introduced by the antichrist, who established by it purgatory and the invocation of the saints. Pauli was also inclined to a community of goods. These daring propositions were strenuously opposed by Sarnicki and the orthodox party, which was strong at that synod.

They boldly denounced the doctrine of Pauli as dangerous, and subversive of Christianity itself. The synod separated, however, without giving any final decision, but a war from the pulpit was begun on the subject. The Synod of Rogow, in July, 1562, convened for the purpose of conciliating the parties, evinced a leaning to the doctrines of Pauli, and that of Pinczow (August, 1562) was composed of a majority of his adherents; but Sarnicki refused to acknowledge its authority. Another synod, which met at the same place  (Nov. 4, 1562), tried to preserve a union by a proposition that the confession of the Helvetian Church should be signed, but that all should be permitted to examine and to explain it without limitation. This proposition was rejected by the orthodox party. But the conference of Piotikow, which was held the same year, established a final separation, as the anti- Trinitarian party, guided by the ministers Pauli, Stanislav, Ludomirski, Martinus KIrowicki, George Shoman, and the nobles John Niemojowski, Hieronymus Filipowski, and John Kazanowski, solemnly declared their rejection of the mystery of the Trinity. Sarnicki, supported by the influence of Boucer, castellan of Biecz, and by Myrzkowski, palatine of Cracow, assembled on May 14, 156:, at the last-named capital, a synod of the stanch adherents of the Helvetian Church. It condemned in an unqualified manner the anti-Trinitarian doctrines, and summoned Pauli, who was minister of the congregation of Cracow, to resign his office. He was obliged to comply with this injunction, but remained for some time at the head of a separate congregation which had embraced his opinions. He retired to Pinczow, whence he passed to Racow, and presided over the congregation of that place until his death in 1591. He advocated all his life the doctrine that a Christian should neither accept civil offices nor bear arms. See Krasinski, Hist. of the Ref. in Poland, 1:357 sq.

## Pauli, Philip Reinhold[[@Headword:Pauli, Philip Reinhold]]

             one of the pioneer ministers of the German Reformed Church in this country, was born in the city of Magdeburg, Prussia, June 22, 1742. His father, Ernest L. Pauli, was a clergyman of high standing, and at one time courtpreacher. Philip completed his literary course in the universities of Halle and Leipsic, traveled for some time in Europe, and came to this country in 1783. For several years he taught school, last at Philadelphia Academy; in 1789 he was ordained to the ministry, and placed over several congregations in Montgomery County, Pa. In 1793 he removed to Reading, Pa., where “he labored with great zeal and activity as pastor of the German Reformed Church for a period of twenty-one years and nine months,” at the same time conducting a “Latin and French School.” He died Jan. 27, 1815. Mr. Pauli was a man of good parts and finished education. “He was regarded in his day as an eloquent preacher.” Two of his sons entered the ministry of the Church. See Harbaugh, Fathers of the Ref. Church, 3:21-24.

## Paulianists[[@Headword:Paulianists]]

             the followers of Paul of Samosata. SEE PAULIANS.

## Paulians, Or Paulianists, Or Samosatians[[@Headword:Paulians, Or Paulianists, Or Samosatians]]

             the followers of Paul of Samosata, who was made bishop of Antioch in 260, and deposed by the uanimous sentence of a great council held in Antioch in 269 or 270. SEE PAUL OF SAMOSATA. He refused to submit to the decision of the council, and the exercise of Aurelian's authority to enforce their decree is memorable as the earliest instance on record of the interference of the secular power in the internal affairs of the Church. One of the canons of Nice required the Paulians to be rebaptized, because in baptizing they did not use the only lawful form according to Christ's command. See Forbes, Nicene Creed (see Index). SEE ARTEMONITES.

## Paulicians[[@Headword:Paulicians]]

             is the name of a powerful Eastern sect, which originated probably in or before the 6th century. According to Peter of Sicily and Photius, the sect was originated in Armenia by two brothers, one named Paul (from whom they are alleged to have received their name) and the other named John, who flourished as far back as the 4th century. Others trace them to an Armenian named Paul who lived under Justinian II (A.D. 670-711). Still others trace them back to even an earlier period than the 4th century, and hold that their name was probably derived from the high esteem which they cherished as a body for the apostle Paul. According to Gieseler and Neander they had their origin from one Constantine of Mananalis (near Samosata), an Armenian, who had received a present of two volumes — one containing the four Gospels, and the other the Epistles of Paul — and who afterwards assumed the name of Paul, in testimony of his great veneration for that apostle. They were undoubtedly believers in the two original principles of good and evil; but they combined with this dualism a high value for the universal use of the Scripture, a rejection of all external forms in religion, and a special abhorrence of the use of images. Their opinions are known, like so many other sects, only through the representations of their adversaries, by whom they have been designated as  Manichaeans.

It seems, indeed, most probable that they were descended from some one of the ancient Gnostic sects; but they differed widely from the Manichaeans, at least in Church government; for they rejected the government by bishops, priests, and deacons, to which the Manichaeans adhered; and admitted no order or individuals set apart by exclusive consecration for spiritual offices. They were charged by their enemies with gross immorality, and at one time there seems to have been good ground for the accusation. Baanes, their leader at the end of the 8th century, was notorious for his immorality; but about the year 800 a reformer arose among them named Sergius, whose opposition to this immorality, together with his exertions to extend the sect, gained him the reputation of a second founder. Both before and after this reform they were subject to much suspicion and bitter persecution, and were repressed with great severity by the Eastern emperors: Constans, Justinian II, and especially Leo the Isaurian opposed them. Indeed, with the exception of Nicephorus Logotheta (802-811), it may be said that all the emperors persecuted them with more or less rigor. Their greatest enemy, however; was Theodora (841-855), who, having ordered that they should be compelled to return to the Greek Church, had all the recusants cruelly put to the sword or driven into exile. A bloody resistance, and finally an emigration into the Saracen territory, was the consequence. About A.D. 844 some of the Paulicians, especially the adherents of Baanes, entered into a league with the Sergists, under the leadership of Carbeus, an officer of the greatest valor and resolution, and, supported by the Saracens, declared war against the Greeks, and for fifty years the conflict was waged with the greatest vehemence and fury.

The Paulicians were more or less successful in the combat, made inroads upon the Byzantine territory, and in 867 reached as far as Ephesus, but they were ultimately overpowered and forced to submission. In 970 the greater part of them were removed into the neighborhood of Philippopolis, in Thrace, where they were granted religious freedom. Thence the Paulicians became settlers also of Bulgaria, and there made many converts to their sect. The renewal of persecutions against them in the the century forced them into Western Europe. Their first migration was into Italy (comp. Baird, Sketches of Protestantism in Italy, p. 14), whence, in process of time, they sent colonies into almost all the other provinces of Europe, and gradually formed a considerable number of religious assemblies who adhered to their doctrine, and who were afterwards persecuted with the utmost vehemence by the Roman pontiffs. In Italy they were called Patarini (q.v.), from a certain place  called Pataria, being a part of the city of Milan, where they held their assemblies; and Gathari, or Gazari, from Gazaria, or the Lesser Tartary. In France they were called Albigenses (q.v.). The first religious assembly which the Paulicians formed in Europe is said to have been discovered at Orleans in 1017, under the reign of Robert, when many of them were condemned to be burned alive. A few Paulicians, of course, remained in the East for some time after the migration of the general body. As late as the 17th century there was a remnant of them existing in Bulgaria (Mosheim, 2:238). Whether any Paulicians exist at present it is difficult to tell. There are so-called Paulicians in the Danubian provinces, but these heretics practice bloody sacrifices, and by their barbarism would seem to have more kinship with the Bogomiles (q.v.). At present an accurate account of the religion and opinions of the Paulicians is really a desideratum.

The Paulicians, as we have said above, have been accused of Manichaeism; but there is reason to believe this was only a slanderous report raised against them by their enemies, and that they were, for the most part, men who were disgusted with the doctrines and ceremonies of human invention, and desirous of returning to the apostolic doctrine and practice. They refused to worship the Virgin Mary, the saints, and the cross, which was sufficient in those ages to procure for them the name of atheists; and they also refused to partake of the sacraments of the Greek and Roman churches, which will account for the allegation that they rejected them altogether, though it is asserted by Neander and Gieseler that they simply denied the material presence of Christ in the Eucharist. It is, however, barely possible that some may, like the Quakers and some other sects, actually have discarded them as outward ordinances. See Mosheim, Church Hist. 2:363; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (student's edition, p. 506 sq.; large edition, ch. liv); Jones, Hist. of the Christian Church; Neander, Church Hist. vol. iii; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. vol. i; and Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1829, vol. ii, No. 1; Journal der theol. Lit. by Winer u. Engelhart, vol. vii, No. 1 and 2; Hardwick, Church Hist. of the Middle Ages, p. 84, 91, 201, 302, 305 sq.; Marsden, Dict. of Church Hist. (see Index).

## Paulinians[[@Headword:Paulinians]]

             is a name sometimes applied by the Arians to the ancient Christians, from Paulinus, bishop of Antioch.

## Paulinier, Pierre Antoine Justin[[@Headword:Paulinier, Pierre Antoine Justin]]

             a French prelate, was born at Pezanas (Herault), January 19, 1815. He was at first cure of St. Roch, Montpellier, made bishop of Grenoble in 1870, archbishop of Besancon in 1875, and died November 14, 1881, leaving some pastoral letters and essays.

## Paulinus[[@Headword:Paulinus]]

             OF YORK, St., an ecclesiastic of the 7th century, noted as the companion of St. Augustine in hie mission in England, was sent from Rome by pope Gregory I in A.D. 601. He soon made himself the favorite of the English princes, and obtained positions of influence and trust at court. In A.D. 625 he was consecrated bishop by archbishop Justus to attend Athelburga, daughter of AEthelbert, king of Kent, to the North on her marriage with Edwin, king of the Northumbrians. In A.D. 626 and 627 his missionary labors resulted in marvellous successes; thousands were baptized by him, and his fame was in all the land. He was made bishop of York, where he founded the cathedral, about 628, and in 631 consecrated Honorius archbishop of Canterbury at Lincoln. In 633, on the death of king Edwin, he was obliged to flee before the invading Northumbrians, and settled in Kent. He there became bishop of Rochester, and died about 643. Wordsworth gives a word-picture of Paulinus of York thus:

 — “of shoulders curved, and stature tall, Black hair and vivid eye, and meagre cheek, His prominent feature like an eagle's beak.”

See Mrs. Clement, Handbook of Legends and Mythology, p. 248; Inett, Hist. of the Church of England (see Index); Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 2:186 sq.

## Paulinus (Pontius Meropius) Of Nola, St.[[@Headword:Paulinus (Pontius Meropius) Of Nola, St.]]

             a noted prelate of the early Christian Church, was born about A.D. 353, at Bordeaux, of a noble family. He was a pupil of Ausonius, and was recommended by him to the emperor Gratian, who appointed him consul in 378, and afterwards advanced him to several offices of great importance. Through the influence and exhortations of St. Ambrose, he was induced to relinquish the world and give his property to the Church. He retired from official life, caused himself and his wife to be baptized, and lived quietly for a while in the vicinity of the Pyrenees. But he was finally induced to enter the service of the Church, and was ordained presbyter, in 393, at Barcelona, in Spain. He did not, however, long remain to exercise his ecclesiastical functions in this region of country, but crossed over the Alps to Italy. Passing through Florence, where he was greeted with much cordiality by St. Ambrose, he proceeded to Rome, and, after meeting with a cold reception from pope Siricius, who probably looked with suspicion on the hasty irregularity of his ordination, reached Nola, in Campania, where he possessed some property, soon after Easter, A.D. 394. In the immediate vicinity of this city were the tomb and miracle-working relics of Felix, a confessor and martyr, over which a church had been erected, with a few cells for the accommodation of pilgrims. In these Paulinus, with a small number of followers, took up his abode, conforming in all points to the observances of monastic establishments, except that his wife appears to have been his companion. After nearly fifteen years, passed in holy meditations and acts of charity, he was chosen bishop of Nola in A.D. 409 (or, according to Pagi, in A.D. 403), and during the stormy inroad of the Goths attended in the episcopal capacity the Council of Ravenna (q.v.) in 419. He died in 431.

Paulinus wrote several works, of which only a few have come down to us; the principal of them are a discourse on almsgiving, some letters, and some thirty poems on religious subjects. Paul was intimate with the most distinguished theologians of his time, and is frequently mentioned in the Epistles of St. Augustine and St. Jerome. Paul of Nola was, in a sense, a believer in image and saint worship. He caused Biblical pictures to be exhibited annually at the festival season, on the ground “that by them the Bible scenes were made clear to the uneducated rustic as they could not otherwise be, and impressed themselves on his memory, awakened in him holy feelings and thoughts, and restrained him  from all kinds of vice.” His poems, too, are full of direct prayers for the intercession of the saints, especially of St. Felix, in whose honor he erected a basilica, and annually composed an ode, and whom he calls his patron, his father, his lord. He relates that the people came in great crowds around the wonder-working relics of this saint on his memorial day, and could not look on them enough. His works were published for the first time by Badius (Paris, 1516); but the best editions are by Muratori (Verona, 1736, fol.), and by Le Brun (Paris, 1685, 2 vols. 4to). See Jortin, Remarks on Eccles. Hist. 2:339 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2:442; 3:568, 598; Cave, Hist. Litt. i; 228; Alzog, Patrologie, § 69; Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Sacre, vol. viii; Tillemont, Memoir Ecclesiastiques, vol. xiv; Schonemann, Biblioth. Patr. Lat. vol. i, cap. 4, § 30; Bahr, Gesch. der Romischen Literatur (supplement vol.), pt. i, § 23-25; pt. ii, § 100; Buse, Paulinus von Nola und seine Zeit (Regensb. 1856, 2 vols. 8vo); Gilly, Vigilantius and his Times (Lond. 1844). The article in Smith's Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythol, we think, underestimates the pious character of Paul of Nola, and belittles his ability and scholarship. It is, however, a nearly exhaustive sketch of the life and writings of this personage.

## Paulinus A St. Bartholomaeus[[@Headword:Paulinus A St. Bartholomaeus]]

             a noted Orientalist, of the Order of the Carmelites, whose original name was JOHN PHILIP WERDIN, was born near Mannersdorf, in Austria, April 25, 1748. He studied philosophy and theology at Prague, and afterwards learned some of the Oriental languages in the college of his order at Rome, which he had joined in 1769. He was sent as missionary to the coast of Malabar in 1774, where he remained for fourteen years. and was successively appointed vicar-general and apostolic visitor. In 1790 he returned to Rome, in order to superintend the religious works which were printed by the Propaganda for the use of the missionaries in Hindostan. He  died at Rome Jan. 7, 1806.

Paulinus was one of the earliest Europeans who acquired a knowledge of the Sanscrit language. In consequence of his being settled in the south of Hindostan, he could not obtain so accurate a knowledge of the Sanscrit as if he had been brought in contact with the Brahmins, but he nevertheless gained quite a mastery of the tongue, and even published a Sanscrit grammar (in the Tamul characters instead of the Devanagari) at Rome in 1790, under the title of Sidharubam, senu Grammatica Samscridamica, cum Dissertatione historicocritica in Linguam Samscridamicam; and also in a fuller and different form in 1804, under the title of Vyacarana, seu locupletissima Samscridamicae Linguae Institutio; but both these works are entirely superseded by later, more accurate, and complete grammars. Paulinus also wrote and edited many other works, of which the most important are, Systema Brahmanicum litsrgicum, mythologicum, civile, ex monumentis Indicis, etc., dissertatiotibus histuricis illustratum (Rome, 1791): — India Orientalis Christiana, continens Fundationes Ecclesiaruls, Seriem Episcoporum, Missiones, Schismata, Persecutiones, Viros illustres (ibid. 1794): — Viaggio alle Indie Orientali (ibid. 1796): — Amarashinha, seu Dictionarii Samscridamici sectio prima, de Ccelo; ex tribus ineditis Codicibus Inlicis Manuscriptis, cum Versione Latina (ibid. 1798) (the whole of this dictionary, of which Paulinus has edited the first part, was printed at Seram pore, in 1808, under the care of Colebrooke): De Antiquitate et Affnitate Linguce Zendicce et Samscridamicoe Germanicoe Dissertatio (ibid. 1798; Padua, 1799):and De Latini Sermonii Origine et cum Orientalibus Linguis Connexione (Rome, 1802). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. 2:2313.

## Paulinus Of Antioch[[@Headword:Paulinus Of Antioch]]

             flourished as bishop of that see in the 4th century. He was ordained presbyter by Eustathius, bishop of Antioch, and was a leader among the Eustathian party in that city. When Athanasius, after his return from exile,  on the death of the emperor Constantius II, and the murder of George of Cappadocia, the Arian patriarch, assembled a council at Alexandria, Paulinus sent two deacons, Maximus and Calimerus, to take part in its deliberation. He was shortly after ordained by the hasty and impetuous Lucifer of Cagliari bishop of the Eustathians at Antioch-a step unwarrantable and mischievous, as it prolonged the schism in the orthodox party, which would otherwise probably have been soon healed. His ordination took place in A.D. 362. He was held, according to Socrates (Hist. Ecc 4:2) and Sozomen (Hist. Ecc 6:7), in such respect by the Arian emperor Valens as to be allowed to remain when his competitor Meletius was banished. Possibly, however, the smallness of his party, which seems to have occupied only one small church (Socrates, Hist. Eccles. 3:99; Sozomen, 6:13), rendered him less obnoxious to the Arians, and they may have wished to perpetuate the division of the orthodox by exciting jealousy. Paulinus's refusal of the proposal of Meletius to put an end to the schism is mentioned elsewhere, SEE MELETIUS OF ANTIOCH, but he at length consented that whichever of them died first, the survivor should be recognised by both parties. On the death of Meletius, however (A.D. 381), this agreement was not observed by his party, and the election of Flavianus disappointed the hopes of Paulinus, and embittered the schism still more. In A.D. 382 Paulinus was present at a council of the Western Church, which had all along recognised his title, and now ardently supported his cause; but the Oriental churches generally recognised Flavianus, who was de facto bishop of Antioch. Paulinus died A.D. 388 or 389. His partisans chose Evagrius to succeed him. A confession of faith by Paulinus is preserved by Athanasius and Epiphanius in the works cited below. See Epiphanius, Hoeres. 77. 21, ed. Petavii; Socrates, Hist. Ecc 3:6; Ecc 3:9; Ecc 4:2; v. 5, 9, 15; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles.v. 12, 13; 6:7; 7:3, 10, 11, 15; rheodoret, Hist. Ecc 3:5; v. 3, 23; Athanasius, Concil. Alexandrin. Epistol. seu Tomus ad Antiochenses, c. 9; Jerome, Epistol. ad Eustoch. No. 2, 7, ed. vett.; 36, ed. Benedict; 108, § 6, ed. Vallars.; In Rufin. lib. 3:22; Chronicon, ed. Vallars.; Theophanes, Chronog. p. 47, 57, 59, ed. Paris; p. 37, 45, 47, ed. Venice; p. 85, 104, 109, ed. Bonn; Le Quidn, Oriens Christian. vol. ii, col. 715; Tillemont, Memoires, vol. viii; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, 9:314; Neale, Holy Eastern Church (Patriarchate of Alexandria), 1:193 sq.

## Paulinus Of Aquileia, St.[[@Headword:Paulinus Of Aquileia, St.]]

             a noted prelate of the Eastern Church in the second half of the 8th century, is known especially for his exertions to maintain the orthodox standard of the Trinitarian dogma. He was a native of Friaul, and appears to have been a teacher of philosophy, at least Charlemagne calls hint in 773 “artis grammaticae magister.” He was elevated to the patriarchal dignity in A.D. 776, and belongs to that class of scholars upon whom Charlemagne depended for counsel in all literary and ecclesiastical affairs. Paul of Aquileia took part in the synods at Regensburg in 792, and Frankfort in 794, which dealt with the heresy of the Adoptianists (q.v.). He also attended several provincial councils, and labored with zeal for the Christianizing of Carinthia and the Avari. He probably died A.D. 804. His works, whose authenticity is in part called in question, were published by Madrisius at Venice in 1737. His memory is observed on January 21. Panlinus, in the council held at Forum Julium (Friuli) (A.D. 791 or 796), defended the Western Church against the charge of falsifying the creed on the doctrine of the Holy Ghost. He held that if the creed were explained according to the meaning of its author, it could not be said that it was altered. As the fathers of the council at Constantinople had enlarged the Nicene Creed according to the mind of the original framer of it by the statements respecting the Holy Spirit, in the same manner it was added by the Church that the Spirit proceeded from the Son. As Christ himself said, the Father is inseparably in the Son and the Son in the Father, but the Holy Spirit is of the same nature with the Father and the Son, so must we say that he proceeds from both essentially and inseparably. See Neander, Dogmnas, 2:436; Acta SS. Jan. 1, p. 317 sq.; and the biographical sketches prefixed to his works.

## Paulinus Of Biterre[[@Headword:Paulinus Of Biterre]]

             (the modern Beziers), in Gaul, an ecclesiastic of note, was bishop of that city about AD. 420. Some have thought that the Acta S. Genesii notarii Arelatensis are to be ascribed to this Paulinus rather than to Paulinus of Nola, under whose name they have commonly been published. Paulinus of Biterrae wrote an encyclical letter, giving an account of several alarming portents which had occurred at Biterrme. This letter is lost. Oudin has mistakenly said that it is cited in the Annales of Baronius. Possibly Paulinus of Biterree is the Paulinus to whom Gennadius (De Viris Illustribus, c. 68) ascribes several Tractatus de Initio Quadragesirnae, etc. See Idatius, Chron. ad ann. xxv, Arcad. et Honor.; Mirseus, Auctar. de Scriptorib. Eccles. c. 63; Tillemont, Memoires, v. 569; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 410, 1:389: Oudin, De Scriptorib. Eccles. vol. i, col. 923; Fabricius, Bibl.  Groec. 9:315; Biblioth. Med. et Injins. Latinit. v. 205, ed. Mansi; Acta Sanctor. Aug. v. 123, etc.; Gallia Christiana, vol. vi, col. 295 (ed. Paris, 1739); Hist. Litt. de la France, 2:131.

## Paulinus Of Milan[[@Headword:Paulinus Of Milan]]

             an Eastern ecclesiastic of much celebrity near the opening of the 3d century, was the secretary of St. Ambrose, after whose death he became a deacon, and repaired to Africa, where, at the request of St. Augustine, he composed a biography of his former patron. While residing at Carthage he encountered Coelestius, detected the dangerous tendency of the doctrines disseminated by that active disciple of Pelagius, and, having preferred an impeachment of heresy, procured his condemnation by the council which assembled in A.D. 212 under Aurelius. The accusation was divided into seven heads, of which six will be found in that portion of the Acts of the Synod preserved by Marius Mercator. At a subsequent period (217, 218) we find Paulinus appearing before Zosimus for the purpose of resisting the appeal against this decision, and refusing obedience to the adverse decree of the pope. Nothing further is known with reward to his history, except that we learn from Isidore that he was eventually ordained a presbyter. We possess the following works of this author: Vita Ambrosii, which, although commenced soon after A.D. 200. could not, from the historical allusions which it contains, have been finished until 212. This piece will be found in almost all the editions of St. Ambrose. In many it is ascribed to Paulinus Nolanus, and in others to Paulinus Episcopus: — Libellus adversus Coelestium Zosimo Papae oblatus, drawn up and presented towards the close of A.D. 217. It was printed from a Vatican MS. by Baronius in his Annales, under A.D. 218; afterwards by Labbe, in his Collection of Councils (Par. 1671, fol.), 2:1578; in the Benedictine edition of St. Augustine, vol. 10, App. pt. 2; and by Constant, in his Epistole Pontificum Romanorum (ibid. 1721, fol. ), 1:963: — De Benedictionibus Patriarcharum is mentioned by Isidore (De Viris Illustr. c. 4), but was not known to exist in an entire form until it was discovered by Mingarelli in a very ancient MS. belonging to the library of St. Salvador at Bologna, and inserted by him in the Anecdota, published at Bologna (1751, 4to), vol. ii, pt. i, p. 199. A corrupt fragment of this tract will be found in the fifth volume of the Benedictine edition of St. Jerome. where it is ascribed to Rufinus. The three productions enumerated above are placed together in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland (Venet. 1773, fol.), 9:23. See  Cassianus, De Incarn. c. 7; Isidornis, De Viris Illustr. c. 4; Galland, Bibl. Patr. vol. ix, Proleg. c. ii; Schinemann, Bibl. Patrum Lat. vol. ii, § 21.

## Paulinus Of Pella[[@Headword:Paulinus Of Pella]]

             surnamed the Penitent, was born in A.D. 376, at Pella, in Macedonia. He was the son of Hesperius, proconsul of Africa. He was taken at three years of age to Bordeaux, where he appears to have been educated. An illness at the age of fifteen interrupted his studies, and the indulgence of his parents allowed him to pursue a life of ease and pleasure, in the midst of which, however, he kept up a regard for morality. At the age of twenty he married a lady of ancient family and of some property. At thirty he lost his father, whose death was followed by a dispute between Paulinus and his brother, who wished to invalidate his father's will to deprive his mother of her dowry. In A.D. 414 Paulinus joined Attalus, who attempted to resume the purple in Gaul under the patronage of the Gothic prince Ataulphus, and from whom he accepted the title of “Comes Rerum Privatarum,” thinking thus to be secure from the hostility of the Goths. He was, however, disappointed. The city where he resided (apparently Bordeaux) was taken, and his house plundered; and he was again in danger when Vasates (Bazas), to which he had retired, was besieged by the Goths and Alans. He proposed now to retire to Greece, where his mother had rich estates, but his wife would not consent. He then thought of becoming a monk, but his friends diverted him from this plan. Misfortunes now thickened about him:  he lost his mother, his mother-in-law, and his wife; his children forsook him, with the exception of one, who was a priest, and who suddenly died soon after. His estates in Greece yielded him no revenue; and he retired to Massilia (Marseilles), where he hired and farmed some land, but this resource failed him, and alone, destitute, and in debt, he was reduced to depend on charity. During his residence at Massilia he became acquainted with many religious persons, and their conversation combined with his sorrows and disappointments to impress his mind deeply with religious sentiments. He was baptized in A.D. 422, in his forty-sixth year, and lived at least till his eighty-fourth year (A.D. 460), when he wrote a poem embodying his Christian sentiments. Some have supposed, but without good reason, that he is the Benedictus Paulinus to whose questions of various points of theology and ethics Faustus Reiensis wrote an answer (Histoire Litteraire de la France, 2:343, etc., 461, etc.). See also Fabricius, Biblioth. Med. et Infim. Latinit. v. 206, ed. Mansi; and Cave, Hist. Litt. 1:290, in his article on Paulinus Nolanus. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Paulinus Of Treves[[@Headword:Paulinus Of Treves]]

             an ecclesiastic who flourished about the middle of the 4th century as successor to Maximian in the bishopric of Treves, belonged to the most zealous Athanasians of the West. On account of his opposition to Constantine, and those who with him labored for the establishment of the semi-Arian doctrines in the Church, he was exiled, according to Athanasius, during the Council of Milan, A.D. 335; according to Jerome and Sulpicius Severus, much earlier. He died about 358. He is commemorated by the Church of Rome Aug. 31. The Church of Treves continues to revere his memory scrupulously. According to tradition, his remains were brought from Phrygia to Treves, but there is doubt as to the accuracy of this report. See Tillemont, Memoires Ecclesiastiques, vol. vi.

## Paulinus Of Tyre[[@Headword:Paulinus Of Tyre]]

             an Eastern prelate, flourished in the early part of the 4th century. He was the contemporary and friend of Eusebius of Caesarea, who addressed to him the tenth book of his Historia Ecclesiastica. Paulinus is conjectured, from an obscure intimation in Eusebius (Contra Marcel. Ascyr. 1. 4), to have been a native of Antioch. He was bishop of Tyre, and the restorer of the church there after it had been destroyed by the heathens in the  Diocletian persecutions. This restoration took place after the death of Maximin Daza, in A.D. 313; consequently Paulinus must have obtained his bishopric before that time. On the dedication of the new building, an oration (Oratio panegyrica) was addressed to Paulinls, apparently by Eusebius himself, who has preserved the prolix composition (Hist. Ecc 10:1; Ecc 10:4). On the outbreak of the Arian controversy, Paulinus is represented as one of the chief supporters of Arianism. But it is not clear that he took a decided part in the controversy; he appears to have been, like Eusebius, a moderate man, averse to extreme measures, and to the introduction of unscriptural terms and needless theological definitions. Arius distinctly names him among those who agreed with him: but then Arius gave to the confession to which this statement refers the most orthodox complexion in his power (Theodoret, Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 5). Eusebitus of Nicomedia wrote to Paulinus, rebuking him for his silence and concealment of his sentiments; but it is not clear whether he was correctly informed what those sentiments were. Athanasius (De Synodis, c. 17) charges Paulinus with having given utterance to Arian sentiments, but gives no citation from him. He certainly agreed with the bishops of Palestine in granting to Arius the power of holding assemblies of his partisans. but at the same time these prelates recommended the heresiarch to submit to his diocesan. Alexander of Alexandria, and to endeavor to be readmitted to the communion of the Church. Paulinus's concurrence in the steps shows that, if not a supporter of Arianism, he was at any rate not a bigoted opponent (Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. c. 15). Paulinus was shortly before his death translated to the bishopric of Antioch (Eusebius, Contra Marcel. 1. 4; Philostorgius, Hist. Ecc 3:15); but it is disputed whether this was before or after the Council of Nice; some place his translation in A.D. 323, others in A.D. 331. Whether Paulinus was present at the Council of Nice, or even lived to see it, is not determined. The question is argued at considerable length by Valesius (note ad Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. x, i), Hanckius (De Rerum Byzant. Scriptor. pt. i, cap. i, § 235, etc.), and by Tillemont (Memoires, 7:646, etc.). We are disposed to acquiesce in the judgment of Le Quieln, who places the accession of Paulinus to the see of Antioch in A.D. 323 or 324, and his death in the latter year. See, besides Eusebius, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Philostorgius, Tillemont, Memoires, vol. vi and vii; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, vol. ii, col. 708, 803.

## Paulists (Or Paulites)[[@Headword:Paulists (Or Paulites)]]

             also called hermits of St. Paul, are a class of Roman Catholic monastics who profess to imitate the life of the great apostle. They have no written rules, and are not strictly a particular order. They have no superior except the bishop in whose diocese they reside. They usually wear a short cloak, with cowl attached, and go barefooted. They are to be met with in Italy, France, Spain, Germany, and many other countries. There is also a congregation of Paulists sometimes called Barnabites (q.v.). In Hungary a congregation of Paulists was formed in the 13th century, but was made subject to the rules of the Augustinians (q.v.), and ranked with them. During the Reformation movement they became extinct in Hungary; but at Rome the Paulists still maintain a religious house. Their dress is white. They wear a woollen shirt, and hood attached to the collar, which covers  the shoulders. When they go to town they wear a black hat, and a mantle of the same color. In Portugal an order of Paulists was founded in 1652, and their principal monastery is on Mount Ose. They are also subject to the Augustinian rule.

In the United States the “Congregation of the Missionary Priests of St. Paul the Apostle,” commonly called “Paulists,” was established in New York City, ill 1858, by Rev. Isaac T. Hecker and several other priests, whom the pope allowed to leave the Redemptorists for the purpose of founding an independent organization for missionary purposes better suited to this country. This congregation reports a house and church in New York, a superior, six other priests, and twelve students preparing for the priesthood. The Paulists are the originators of the Catholic Publication Society, of its monthly periodical, The Catholic World, etc., and occupy a very influential position.

## Paulitae[[@Headword:Paulitae]]

             an obscure sect of the Acephali, followers of Paul, a patriarch of Alexandria, who was deposed by a council (A.D. 541) for his uncanonical consecration by the patriarch of Constantinople, and who after his deposition sided with the Monophysites (Nicephorus, Hist. Eccles. c. xlix). The Paulitse are mentioned under the name of Paulianists in the treatise on the reception of heretics which was written by Timothy. of Constantinople (Timoth. De Triplici Recept. lueret. in Cotelerii Monument. 3:377).

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

             a missionary of the Presbyterian Church, was born near Connellsville, Fayette Co., Pa., Feb. 3, 1837. He pursued his preparatory studies first under Rev. Ross Stevenson, of Ligonier, Pa., then in the Dunlap Creek Presbyterian Academy, and afterwards under Prof. John Frazer; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1858, in the spring of which year he made a profession of religion, and united with the Church at Connellsville; after leaving college he went South, and engaged in teaching for a time in Mississippi; but, feeling called to preach the Gospel, he returned, and entered the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny City, Pa.; was licensed by Redstone Presbytery in April, 1861, and graduated at the seminary in 1862. He gave his name to the General Assembly's Board of Foreign Missions as a candidate for missionary work, but owing to the embarrassed state of the board, arising from the civil war. he could not be  sent on his mission immediately. For a time, therefore, he supplied the vacant churches of Tyrone and Sewickley, in his own presbytery; then ministered to a weak Church in Morrison, Whiteside Co., Ill., in Rock River Presbytery; but in 1863 he entered on his own chosen work, being ordained as missionary to Africa, by Redstone Presbytery, at Connellsville. He was appointed to take charge of the mission at Evangasimba, where he labored till, in 1865, at his urgent request, he received an appointment to Bonita, a point on the continent where he hoped to build up a new station. His labors of preaching and teaching, together with the superintendence of building, proved too great even for his strong physical powers, and he died May 14, 1865. Mr. Paull was a man who sought to consecrate all his powers to the service of his Divine Master. He was endowed with a comprehensive understanding, sound judgment, and refined tastes. As a preacher, he was eminently popular-his thought always being pungent, tender, earnest, and practical. See Wilson, Presbyterian Historical Almanac, 1866, p. 141. (. L. S.)

## Paulli, Just Henrik Voltelen[[@Headword:Paulli, Just Henrik Voltelen]]

             a Danish Lutheran divine, was born at Copenhagen in 1809. In 1835 he was appointed curate at the church of the Holy Spirit; in 1837 he became chaplain of the Christiansburg palace-chapel; and in 1857 he was elected pastor of the church of the Virgin, and dean of the Zealand diocese. He was for thirty years one of the most noted preachers in Copenhagen. From 1854 till his death, in 1865, he also lectured at the theological seminary. See Barfods, Fortoellinger, p. 859. (R. B. A.)

## Paulo, Antoine De[[@Headword:Paulo, Antoine De]]

             a grand-master of the Order of Malta, was born at Toulouse in 1551, and was descended of a family originally from Genoa. In 1590 he was received Chevalier of Malta, and became successively commander of Marseilles, of Sainte-Eulalie, Grand Cross in 1612, and shortly after prior of Saintfilles. Elected grand-master of the order March 10, 1623, three days after the death of Louis de Vasconcelios, he was in the following year called before the pontifical tribunal, accused of disorderly conduct, and with having purchased his nomination with money. Antoine fully justified himself, but was nevertheless engaged in quarrels with pope Urban VIII on the subject of the commanderies of Italy. Under his command the order experienced several reverses on the part of the Turks, and in 1631 there was a general  chapter, which reformed several statutes of the preceding chapters, especially that of 1602, which gave the illegitimate sons of the dukes and peers of France, and of the grandees of Spain, admission into the order. This privilege was then limited to the illegitimate children of kings and princes only. Paulo died June 10, 1636. See De Vertot, Hist. des Cheval. de Saint Jean de Jerusalem; Biog. Toulousaine; Moreri, Dict. histor. s.v.

## Paulsen, Hermann Christian[[@Headword:Paulsen, Hermann Christian]]

             a German divine, noted for his researches in Palestine, flourished as pastor at Crempe, and died there in 1780. He wrote, in Latin, the ecclesiastical history of the Tartars, with a map of Tartary according to modern geographers, which was published as Mosheim's production, because the latter had furnished the materials and revised the work. Paulsen also wrote Die Regierung des Morgenlandes (Altona, 1755), and Zuverldssige Nachricht vom Ackerbau des Morgenlandes (Helmstadt, 1748).

## Paulus (Or Paululus) Of Fulda[[@Headword:Paulus (Or Paululus) Of Fulda]]

             a convert from Judaism, flourished towards the end of the 11th century. Of his early life we know nothing, not even the year when he embraced Christianity. He entered the monastery at Fulda, and wrote the Life of S. Erhard, bishop of Regensburg (reprinted in Bollandi Acta Sanctorunz, vol. i, Jan. 8), and De Conversione S. Pauli Apostoli. Whether he is the same as  Paulus Bernriedensis, as some suggest, is difficult to say. See Jocher, Allgem. Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B. P.)

## Paulus Canossa[[@Headword:Paulus Canossa]]

             also PARADISUS, a convert from Judaism, flourished in the 16th century in Italy. For about five years, from 1533-1538, he was professor of Hebrew, and wrote Dialogus de modo legendi Hebraica (Paris, 1534). John Quinquarboreus (in Colomesius, Italia et Hispania, p. 68) says of him that, like his great namesake, he was also of the tribe of Benjamin; and in a work which he dedicated to Paradisus he addresses him in his dedication in the following manner, “Omnes in tui admirationem ingenii dexteritate trahis.” Paradisus died in 1543, greatly lamented by Quinquarboreus, who gives vent to his feelings in the following lines: “Descende hue iterum, tui precantur, Nam postquam invida fata to tulerunt, Nemo substitui tibi meretur. Hac ergo ratione nunc necesse est, Ut sis suppositius tibi ipse.” See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:65; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. iii, n. 1811 b; 4:950, n. 1811 f; Jocher, Allgem. Gelehrten - Lexikon, s.v.; Kalkar, Israel und die Kirche, p. 76. (B. P.)

## Paulus Of Prague[[@Headword:Paulus Of Prague]]

             originally named ELCHANAN BEN-MENACHEM; was born of Jewish parents about the year 1540, and embraced Christianity at Nuremberg in 1556. He died near the close of the 16th century. Paulus wrote, in Hebrew verse, a treatise on the Messiah according to the Jewish Kabbalah (Helmstadt, 1580; afterwards translated into Latin, Demonstratio cabbalistica, ibid. 1580): — Solida et perspicua demonstratio de SS. Trinitate, etc. (Leips. 1574): — Confessio fidei et testimonia Scripturae sacrae de resurrectione moartuorum, printed in the 2d edition of his Solida (ibid. 1576): — Symbolum apostolicun ex Vetere Testamento confirmatum (Wittenberg, 1580): — Jona quadrilinguis, the book of Jonah in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and German (Helmstadt, 1580). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:229; 3:69; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:143, 964; 3:910; Saat auj Hoffnung (Erlangen, 1869-1870), 7:374; Fabricii Delectus argumentorum. et syllabus scriptorum (Hamburg, 1725), p. 581. (B. P.)

## Paulus de Heredia Of Aragon[[@Headword:Paulus de Heredia Of Aragon]]

             was born about 1405. When yet in connection with the synagogue he used to dispute with Christian theologians about the merits of Judaism; nevertheless he afterwards became a convert of Christianity. He wrote, Ensis Pauli: — Iggeret ha-Sadot, treating of the divinity, death, and resurrection of the Messiah, which a certain Nechunjah ben-ha-Kanah, who lived towards the end of the second Temple, is said to have written: — De Mysteriis Fidei, against the Talmud: — and Corona Regia, on the immaculate conception of Mary, which he dedicated to pope Innocent VIII. When Paulus died is uncertain, but in 1485 he was yet alive. See  Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:385; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:963; De Castro, Biblioth. 1:363 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8:231 sq. (2d ed. Leips. 1875, p. 232); Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirche, p. 31. (B. P.)

## Paulus, Alvarez, Of Cordova[[@Headword:Paulus, Alvarez, Of Cordova]]

             the biographer of his friend the martyr Eulogius, flourished in the middle of the 9th century. Of his early life nothing is known beyond the fact that he was of Jewish parentage. The times in which Alvarez lived were very troublesome to the Christians. When, in July, A.D. 711, the last Gothic king, Rodriguez, perished at the great fight near Xeres de la Frontera, and Spain had become a province of the Eastern caliphate, an impetuous ambition moved the Arab leaders to extend their conquests beyond the Pyrenees, and from the borders of Catalonia they reached the walls of Tours. Here, however, they had to meet face to face the chivalrous Charles Martel, who utterly overthrew the invading host, thus washing away the insult offered to his country in a deluge of blood. By this most critical and decisive victory the European countries were saved from the ravages of a universal war, and the infamy of subjugation to the Mohammedan power. In the battles fought in those times many Christians fell, while not a few sought martyrdom. Two parties divided the Church, the rigid and the more liberal: the latter thought that under these difficult circumstances everything should be done to preserve and foster the friendly relations subsisting between them and the Mohammedan magistrates, while the  former looked upon such conduct as being a violation of the duty to confess Christ before men, and not be ashamed of him. One of the fiercest representatives of the latter class was Paulus Alvarez, who, in his Indiculus Luminosus, casts it as a reproach upon the Christians that by accepting offices at court they became guilty of participating in infidelity, and styles them leopards, taking upon themselves every color. He justified those who voluntarily entered the Mohammedan circles in order to defy the false prophet, and thus become martyrs for Christ's sake. He compared these martyrs with the witnesses for the truth of olden times, who fearlessly came forward before princes and people.

His zeal was not always in the right direction, but he felt an ardent hatred against the unbelievers, as well as against all priests who would not recognize the glory of martyrdom. Among his many epistles there is one written to a certain Eleazar, in which he confesses his belief that Messiah had already come, and then continues: “Which of us has the most right to the name of Jew; you, who have passed from the worship of idols to the knowledge of one God, or I, who am an Israelite both by birth and faith? Yet I no longer call myself a Jew, because that new name is given to me which the mouth of the Lord hath named! Abraham is in truth my father, but not only because my ancestors proceed from him. Those who have expected that Messiah should come, but who also receive him because he is already come, are more truly Israelites than those who, after long waiting for him, rejected him when he came, and yet cease not to expect his coming.” See Neander, Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church, 3:337 sq. (Torrey's ed. Boston, 1872); Gieseler, Church Hist. 2:95 sq. (Smith's ed. N.Y. 1865); Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 310 sq.; Kalkar, Israel u. d. Kirche, p. 21; Antonii Bibl. Hist. 1:349; Florez, Espania Sagrada (Madrid, 1747-1801. 42 vols. 4to), 11:62, where the works of Alvarez are given; also Migne, Patrol. Lat. vol. 115, where the biography of Eulogius is to be found. (B. P.)

## Paulus, Burgensis, Or De Santa Maria[[@Headword:Paulus, Burgensis, Or De Santa Maria]]

             a noted Christian convert from Judaism, whose original name was rabbi Solomon Levi, was born about 1352, and flourished at Burgos. Until his fortieth year he was a teacher among the Jews, eminent alike for birth and learning. At that age he became acquainted with the writings of Thomas Aquinas, whose treatise De Legibus made so deep an impression upon his mind that his national prejudices against Christianity fell to the ground, and he finally embraced Christianity. In the year 1392 he received baptism, together with his four sons, then young children, but who all in after-life inherited their father's high character and great celebrity. His wife was already dead, but his mother and his brothers followed his example, by making public profession of their faith in Christ. He now devoted himself as assiduously to the study of Christian theology as he had before done to  that of the Jews. He obtained the degree of doctor of divinity at Paris, and preached at Avignon, to a very numerous audience, in the presence of Peter de Luna, afterwards pope Benedict XIII, and then one of the candidates for the papacy. Paulus was made archdeacon of Burgos, bishop of Carthagena, and, lastly, bishop of Burgos, a dignity to which his son succeeded during his father's lifetime. All Spanish historians and chroniclers are unanimous in their praises of this descendant of the house of Israel, both as a bishop and statesman, to which latter position (as high chancellor) he was appointed by king Henry III, who even entrusted to him the education of his son and successor, John II. The historians generally style him the excellent — “el varon excellente” — and speak of him as “a man able to govern his tongue, and in all ways well calculated to guide and advise kings.” Paulus Burgensis died in the year 1435, on a journey which he made to visit the different churches of his diocese, although the bishopric itself had already passed to his son Alphonso. His indefatigable activity as a student and expounder of Scripture is attested by his writings, of which two, in particular, deserve our notice: his Additions to the Postilla of Nicholas de Lyra (q.v.), and his Scrutinium Scripturarum.

The latter is of the later date, although published first, and contains, in the form of a dialogue between Paul and Saul, a refutation of Jewish objections to the Christian faith. The introduction, in which the venerable bishop dedicates his work on the whole Bible to his son Don Alphonso of Carthagena, at that time archdeacon of Compostella; affords us an insight into his character and private feelings. He speaks of his own blindness and incredulity, and how he was called from darkness to light, and from the depth of the pit to the open air of heaven. He gives his son the experience of his past life in order that what he has not seen with his eyes may yet be engraven on his memory as coming from the lips of his father, that in his turn he may tell to those who are younger than himself; and they to their descendants, not to forget the works of the Lord, nor cease from the study of his holy Word. He continued to labor at it in his old age, and had the satisfaction of finishing it a little before his death. It is chiefly intended to bring conviction to his former coreligionists, and for that purpose is filled with striking passages in support of the Christian faith, quoted from rabbinical writers, giving their views of the person, the distinguishing characteristics, and the promised kingdom of Messiah. That the bishop was not only sincere in his convictions, but also in his zeal for the Church and the conversion of his former coreligionists, cannot be denied, but the more remarkable is the malicious manner in which the Jewish historian Gritz  speaks of this convert. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:137; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8:84 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 313-326; Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirche, p. 29 sq.; Basnage, Hist. des Juis, p. 691 (Taylor's English transl.); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:901 sq.; Schudt, Jiidische Merkwiirdigkeifen, 4:291; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Colomesius, Italia et Hispan. Orient. p. 231; Kayserling, Sephardim, p. 61 sq.; Antonii Bibl. veterum Hispan. 2:157 sq.; Fabricius, Delectus argumentorum et syllabus scriptorum, etc., p. 575 sq. (Hamburg, 1752); Schmucker, Hist. of the Modern Jews (Phila. 1867), p. 167 sq.; De Castro, Hist. of the Jews in Spain (Engl. transl. by Kirwan, Lond. 1851), p. 105 sq.; Pick, in the Evang. Rev. July, 1876, p. 35 sq., and reprinted in the Jewish Intelligencer (Lond. Nov. 1876); Diestel, Geschichte des A Ilen Testaments in der christl. Kirche (Jena, 1869), p. 199, 201; Simon, Hist. Crit. etc. (Rotterdam, 1685), p. 415 sq.; Delitzsch, Wissenschaft, Kunst u. Judenthum, p. 128 sq.; Margoliouth, The Hebrews in East Anglia (Lolnd. 1870), p. 57 sq. (B. P.)

## Paulus, Gottfried[[@Headword:Paulus, Gottfried]]

             was a convert from Judaismn, of whom nothing is known. not even the time in which he lived. As he wrote in the Dutch language, he probably lived in Holland. He is the author of Inleiding, waar in bewesen word, dat de Jooden van den Vleeck allsen door Christus verlost worden, item Eenige Bewysen van de Gottheyd Messias uyt Sohar Bereschit, s. 1. et a. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:69; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:906. (B. P.)

## Paulus, Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob[[@Headword:Paulus, Heinrich Eberhard Gottlob]]

             a German theologian of great note in his day, and one of the leaders of the Rationalists at the close of the last and the first quarter of the present century, was born at Leonberg, near Stuttgard, Sept. 1, 1761. He at first intended devoting himself to the study of medicine, but becoming interested in the Pietistic movement, he soon turned all his attention to the study of theology, and proceeded to Tubingen, to devote himself to studies preparatory to entering the ministry. He also spent some time traveling in Franconia and Saxony. Next he gave himself to the study of Oriental languages at Gottingen, and afterwards went to London and Paris to continue his researches. In 1789 he was called to the professorship of Oriental languages at Jena, and in 1793, on the death of Doderlein, became professor of theology. Here he especially signalized himself by the critical elucidation of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments in so far as they present Oriental characteristics. The results of his labors may be seen in his Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar uber das Neue Testament (Lubeck, 1800-1804, 4 vols.): — Clavis uber die Psalnen (Jena, 1791): — Clavis uber den Jesaias, and other writings belonging to this period of his literary activity. In 1803 he removed to Wurzburg; in 1808, to Bamberg; in 1809, to Nuremberg; and in 1811 to Ansbach.

During these various changes he had ceased to be a professor, and became a director of ecclesiastical and educational affairs; but in 1811 he accepted the professorship of exegesis and ecclesiastical history at Heidelberg, and was thus once more given the opportunities of academical life. In 1819 he started a kind of historico-political journal entitled Sophronizon, in which he continued to write for about ten years. His contributions were marked by weighty sense, moderation, and knowledge of his various subjects, and won him great renown at the time. His essays upon passing important subjects, such as proselytizing, the influence of the popish government on the national Roman Catholic Church of Germany, and others, gained great applause. As a theological writer he was anxious to warn his readers equally against a one-sided nationality and a speculative deviation from the original doctrines of Christianity, as from mysticism and Jesuitism. With these ideas he began in 1825 a theological year-book, called Der Denkylaubige, published from 1825 to 1829, and another journal called Kirchenbeleuchtungen, published in 1827. From his numerous writings we select for mention the following: Memorabilien (Leips. 1791-1796): — Sammlung der merkwiirdigsten Reisen in den Orient (Jena, 1792-1803, 7  vols.): — Leben Jesu, als Grundlage einer reinen Geschichte des Urchristenthuns (Heidelb. 1828, 2 vols.): — Aufklrende Beitrege zur Doymnen Kitchen und Religions geschichte (Bremen, 1830): — and Exegetisches handbuch uber die drei ersten Evangelien (Heidelb. 1830- 1833, 3 vols.). His services to Oriental literature are numerous and important. While at Jena he edited the “Repertory of Biblical and Oriental Literature,” the Arabic version of Isaiah by Saadias, and Abdollatif's “Compendium Memorabil. Egypti,” etc. As a theologian, he is generally looked upon as the type of pure, unmitigated rationalism — a man who sat down to examine the Bible with the profound conviction that everything in it represented as supernatural was only natural or fabulous, and that true criticism consisted in endeavoring to prove this. Perhaps none of the German Rationalists have done more to spread the infection of neological opinions and modes of thinking than Paulus. Under the imposing pretense of superior deference to the reasoning power in man, he, with others, had great success in weakening the hold of salutary divine truth on the educated mind of Germany, and bred great skepticism, not only as to the doctrines, but the authority of revelation. Paulus died Aug. 10, 1851, having lived long enough to see his own rationalistic theory of Scripture give place to the “mythical” theory of Strauss, and that in its turn to be shaken to its foundations partly by the efforts of the Tubingen school, and partly by those of Neander and the “Broad Church” divines of Germany. See his Skizzen aus meiner Bildungs- und Lebensgeschichte zum A ndenken an meinninfzigjahrige Jubilaum (Heidelb. 1839); Meldegg, Paulus u.s.Zeit (Stuttg. 1853, 2 vols. 8vo); Kahnis, Hist. of German Protestantism, p. 171; Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 36; Hurst's Hagenbach, Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries; Ebrard, Kitchenu. Dogmengesch. vol. iv.

## Paumier, Louis Daniel[[@Headword:Paumier, Louis Daniel]]

             a Protestant theologian of France, was born at Autretot, February 23, 1789. He studied at Lausanne, and in 1813 accepted a call to a parish in the neighborhood of Bolbec. In 1817 he was called to Rouen, where he spent the remainder of his life. Besides his ministerial functions, he instructed in a parochial school, which he had founded in 1820, organized different Christian societies, and succeeded in opening a Protestant hospital. Paumier died September 15, 1865, highly honored by both Protestants and Roman Catholics. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pauperes Cathollci[[@Headword:Pauperes Cathollci]]

             (i.e. Poor Catholics) was the name of a Romish order which was formed in the 12th century, and confirmed by pope Innocent III. It consisted of Waldenses who had conformed to the dominant Church. Some ecclesiastics from the south of France, who had once been Waldensians, took the lead in the formation of this order, particularly a person named Durand de Osca. It maintained itself for some time in Catalonia. The design of this society is thus described by Neander: “The ecclesiastics and better educated were to busy themselves with preaching, exposition of the Bible, religious instruction, and combating the sects; but all the laity who were not qualified to exhort the people and combat the sects should occupy houses by themselves, where they were to live in a pious and orderly manner. This spiritual society, so remodeled, should endeavor to bring about a reunion of all the Waldenses with the Church. As the Waldenses deemed it unchristian to shed blood and to swear, and the presiding officers of the new spiritual society begged the pope that those who were disposed to join them should be released from all obligation of complying with customs of this sort, the pope granted at their request that all such as joined them should not be liable to be called upon for military service against Christians, nor to take oath in civil processes, adding, indeed, the important clause — so far as this rule could be observed in a healthful manner without injury or offense to others, and especially with the permission of the secular lords. In Italy and Spain also the zeal of these representatives of the Church tendency among the Waldenses seemed to meet with acceptance. The pope gladly lent a hand in promoting its more general spread, and he was inclined to grant to those who came over to it, when they had once become reconciled to the Church, various marks of favor. But he insisted on unconditional submission, and refused to enter into any conditional engagements.” The principles of the Waldenses were too firmly rooted to be seriously affected by the society of the Pauperes Catholici, and accordingly it is said to have died away.

## Pauperes Christi[[@Headword:Pauperes Christi]]

             (i.e. The Poor of Christ), a Roman Catholic order which arose in the 12th century, formed by a zealous ecclesiastic named Robert of Arbriscelles, on whom pope Urban II had conferred the dignity of apostolic preacher. The society was composed of persons of both sexes, and of ecclesiastics and laymen, who wished to learn the way of spiritual living under the direction of the founder of the order.

## Pauperes de Lombardia[[@Headword:Pauperes de Lombardia]]

             (i.e. Poor Men of Lombardny) was a name applied in the 12th century to the Waldenses in the north of Italy. It is derived from the province in which they were chiefly found at that time. SEE WALDENSES.

## Pauperism[[@Headword:Pauperism]]

             is the state of indigent persons requiring help, or, as it is technically called, “relief,” or, as the Bible terms it, “charity.” “The poor shall never cease out of the land” was said ages ago, when land was “free,” and of a “chosen people,” watched over by a “special providence,” pasturing their flocks in fertile valleys, bright with the sunshine of a genial climate — a nature which needed no stimulus from “high-farming,” but flung her wealth with prodigal hand into the lap of a community whose primitive manners ignored fashion, and whose social life was unfevered by the lavish expenditure of a high civilization. As the possession of every natural advantage was no preventive to want, but “the poor” were there, so there and everywhere they will “never cease out of the land,” because human nature is weak, self-contradictory, and therefore sinful; because it is selfsufficient and indolent, and therefore ignorant and miscalculating; because it is proud and ambitious, and therefore liable to fall. Besides, in so far as poverty depends upon passion and error, the poor will increase pari passu with an artificial condition of society, for civilization intensifies the vices as well as the virtues of mankind. Therefore it is not amiss to call the poverty of the masses a product of modern civilization. It may be specially called the product of our progress in the industries, and of the employment of steam instead of simple manual labor. By these, our progressive steps, casualties and accidents have increased in this age at such a ratio among the working people that it must stand out as one of the most provoking causes of pauperism. Besides, the tremendous spread of the bad habits of intemperance, SEE TEMPERANCE, has considerably lessened the  resources of this stratum of society, and thereby provoked a vast increase in paupers.

Pauperism, then, is a subject of our day which requires the gravest consideration of the philanthropist, and forces itself upon the attention of the Church as well as of the State. Indeed, we believe that the suppression of pauperism is a task of Christian ethics, for although the solution of the problem is within the province of politics, it is nevertheless true that Christian ethics must provide the motive and pave the way. It may, therefore, be well to point out in this place the principle on which all poor legislation should rest.

Paley affirms that the claim of the poor is founded on the law of nature, because all things having been originally common, the exclusive possession of property was and is permitted on the expectation that every one should have enough for subsistence, or the means of procuring it. We may doubt whether this opinion is sound, notwithstanding that it has the advocacy of some of the ablest English thinkers, and that even such an unbelieving mind as Mill approved it, but we cannot doubt that the Poor Laws rest upon moral and political considerations of great weight. If statesmen cannot contemplate masses of population in a condition of semi-starvation without anxiety and fear, Christians certainly should not suffer society to be thus endangered so long as the ethical principles of Christianity can be brought to influence not only the private life of the individual, but all conditions and numbers. For the successful, i.e. prompt and general alleviation of all suffering and want, the State has stepped in to enforce obedience to an admitted moral obligation, which might otherwise be recognized by the conscientious and disregarded by the selfish. This is the purpose of the modern Poor Laws. Different states have different methods by which this principle is evolved in practice. The general practice is for the State to delegate to the parochial authorities the proper execution of the Poor-Law principle, supplying homes called workhouses for those who are homeless. and affording assistance in money and provisions for those who are temporarily or permanently out of employment. The charges which are brought against this system are many, and some of them are serious enough to require consideration here.

It was the wise rule of Napoleon the Great that the first duty of a charitable institution is to prevent the need of charity. Hence he favored domiciliary visitation, or what is technically called in the science of pauperism “out-  door relief.” In England, on the other hand, the maxim of the State is that the poor have a right to relief, or, in other words, that charity is a fund on which they can confidently depend. By Napoleon's principle, the object of charity is the reduction of pauperism; by the English, relief is the privilege of the poor, regardless of the consequences. Both systems have been tried nearly all over the Continent, and it is quite clear that Napoleon's rule alone is adapted to modern society, and should govern in the dispensing of charity. Few things degrade men in their own estimation so quickly as the habit of relying on alms for support. The divine plan for developing manhood is to make selfexertion a stern necessity. But when the State makes a working man sure of charitable support in time of need, it takes from him the sharpest spur to self-exertion; it tempts him to form unthrifty habits; it teaches him to lean on its support in his possible emergencies, instead of stores provided by his own economical forethought for the sure- coming “rainy day.” This feeling demoralizes him by sapping his self- respect, his pride of character, and his sense of manly independence. In other words, legal provision making his support certain, prepares him to become a pauper whenever the battle of life waxes hot. That this is not a mere theory, but a condensed statement of historic fact, can be shown by reference to the painful results of the English poor laws. Those laws, strangely enough, were made necessary by the abolition of serfdom in the 14th century. At first they were wisely framed, making provision for the “impotent poor” only, and for the punishment of vagrant laborers. Gradually, however, they gave birth to the idea of the “right of all persons to claim relief of the State.” Then came the erection of almshouses, and the establishment of “poor rates.” Finally, the idea culminated in a law, passed in 1782, granting outdoor relief through the agency of the State officers. The effect was to multiply the number of paupers with fearful rapidity, and, as a writer in the Westminster Review has aptly said, to bring the “country almost to the verge of ruin... Poor rates rose to such an extent that it became hardly worth while in some instances to retain the land in cultivation.” So clearly did this peculiar provision for out-door relief tend to increase the number of paupers, that in 1834 an act was passed chiefly aiming “to check out-door relief, . . . and then, within a few years, both rates and pauperism decreased to no small extent.”

The maxim of Malthus is (Essay on Population, 2:430) that “it is in the highest degree important to the general happiness of the poor that no man should look to charity as a fund on which he may confidently depend,” and  it is a good one to be adopted by those who regard charity as a Christian obligation; but with this maxim should be coupled a recognition of the obligation upon society to make education general and fiee. It is a noteworthy fact that both in England and in France pauperism has been on the increase, although the efforts have been most persistent for its diminution; and it is further evident that in countries where education is general, free, and obligatory, as, e.g. in Germany, school training has acted as a direct counter-agent to pauperism. It may reasonably be supposed that, “had the ‘right of education' been as familiar an axiom with the English masses as the ‘right of relief,' we should not now hear of a million paupers in a population of 22,000,000, and know that the problem of pauperism presents itself as an almost insoluble question to the best of the English reformers” (Charles L. Bruce). The influences of workhouse or almshouse life are pernicious in the extreme to the occupants. It is of the very first importance to society that pauperism should not be inherited and transmitted, from the familiar scientific principle that inherited evil is intensified in each new generation. It has been found that places of refuge for the poor, as such, are the propagators of pauperism, inasmuch as they take from its occupants all self-respect and independence. Hence in our day France and England, as well as Germany, are abandoning the workhouse system, and are adopting, or are taking steps for the adoption of what is called the “our of door relief” principle; but the relief is given by a local relieving officer, and that in time to prevent absolute dependence, or, as it may be really stated, to prevent the needy from acquiring the habits of pauperism.

In the United States of America, where the influence both of general suffrage and of the Protestant faith largely cultivates individual self-respect and independence, pauperism has not yet acquired much hold. Some go so far as to claim that the abundance of arable land, and the comparatively slight pressure of population on subsistence, as well as our methods of popular education, must prevent a development of pauperism. But those who reason in this way lose sight of the fact that the Old World pours in upon us continually such vast numbers of idlers, vagabonds, and poor, to whom dependence is as natural as breathing, and in whom that feeling of self-respect which spurns reliance on public charity has never been developed, and that pauperism is therefore sure to become, sooner or later, a fixed element in our population. In view of this possibility, if not probability, the subject requires most considerate attention from the  Church of Christ. It is true the State has here and there created central boards of charity, which tend to give unity of administration to parish and town management of the poor; classification is introduced into the care of paupers; and above all, the effort has begun in New York State and Massachusetts to withdraw all pauper children not diseased in mind or body from almshouses, and to place them in private families, in order to prevent an inherited pauperism but none of these measures, we fear, adequately meet our coming wants. Were our society stationary we might succeed, but in our surging condition there must be a judicious system of out-door relief, and it can be accomplished only by close personal visitation. This in our body politic the Church alone is fitted to assume. Voluntary associations of the best citizens in every community are alone fit to judge of the deserving character of all claimants for relief; and, as besides these there are many needy ones who, in horror at receiving alms, would rather suffer death by starvation than seek for relief from the public, the noblest type of society, and not the ward politician, are proper persons to counsel and relieve the American pauper. Indeed, we would have it understood that it is not simply relief that the needy ones stand in want of; they should have such counsel as may prevent a recurrence of disaster and failure in life. Christian benevolence should not simply feed the hungry and clothe the naked, it should teach the ignorant and raise the degraded.

The most successful experiment with pauperism is notably that of Elberfeld, a German manufacturing town near Cologne, on the Rhine. This municipality was sorely afflicted, some twenty years since, with a chronic condition of pauperism. The usual machinery of almshouses or of private charity did not diminish it. If people gave freely and indiscriminately, the poor came to depend on alms; if too many public means of relief were afforded, there was a current of paupers thither from the surrounding country. In 1853, with a population of 50,364, there were relieved 4224 paupers, or about one in twelve. A certain benevolent gentleman — Herr von der Heydt, the Prussian minister of commerce — then undertook to introduce a reform in the following manner: He had the city divided for the purpose into eighteen districts, and an overseer, serving voluntarily, appointed by the common council, over each. Every district again was divided into fourteen sections, and a visitor appointed for each section. This visitor was required to be of the male sex, and he was never allowed to visit more than four families, and sometimes only two. These families he was obliged to visit at least once a fortnight, report to the overseer, discuss  their cases of relief, receive their money for the ensuing two weeks, and give account of what they had already spent. The most particular inquiries were thus made into every case relieved, whether each person was doing all in his power for his own support, and whether his relatives were obeying the law in contributing towards his maintenance. The object of the visitors of the poor was not merely to give alms, but to encourage and advise unfortunate and ignorant people, and thus prevent poverty. The whole system was thus one of close supervision and moral assistance of the poor by the more comfortable classes. The fortunate and the unfortunate were brought together; the well-off and intelligent had an official right to direct the ignorant and destitute. To complete the organization, the overseers themselves met and reported to the poor commissioners of the town, and received from them the moneys for out-door relief. The best citizens were found willing to serve gratuitously as visitors or overseers; indeed, the place was considered one of some honor. The commissioners were appointed by the common council and mayor, and served for three years. At the present time the poor administration of this city of nearly 80,000 inhabitants consists of a commission of 9 members, 18 overseers, and 252 visitors, all serving gratuitously. The theory of the system, it will be observed, is a close house-to-house visitation and careful inspection, by citizens serving under officials, whose object is to prevent, not encourage, pauperism. What have been the results? A brief table will convey them best, the reader bearing in mind that the new system was introduced in 1854:

Year.                Population.Paupers relieved.1853 ................. 50,36442241855 ................... 51,25929481860.................... 54,00215211865 ................... 63,68612891873............ (about) 78,000980Or, in other words, before the new plan was introduced, one in twelve was a pauper, and now one in eighty. The cost has also fallen from about $38,000 in 1847 to about $17,000 in 1873. The average cost of relief in 1855-59 was only some $18,000 per annum. A still greater reduction of cost would have been shown but for the increased prices of provisions and all commodities during the past few years.  We realize that in our review of the subject the wandering pauper, or, as he is familiarly called, tramp, has had no consideration. There are everywhere numerous persons so lazy or vicious that they prefer to be supported rather than to labor for their bread; it is scarcely necessary to say that it is not the proper province of either the State or charitable individuals to relieve such drones. The alternative of work or starvation should be forced upon all such with unbending persistence. Those who, away from home and friends, need help, we can safely trust to the benevolent intentions of such individuals as we would see placed in charge of the charities of every town in the land. See Walker, Science of Wealth, p. 411 sq.; Greeley, Political Economy, p. 17 sq.; North Amer. Rev. April, 1875, art. 3, where much important literature is quoted. See also Brit. Quarterly, April, 1876, art. 6; Westminster Review, April, 1874; January, 1875.

## Pausarii[[@Headword:Pausarii]]

             a name given to the priests of His (q.v.) at Rome, because in their religious processions they were accustomed to make pauses at certain places, where they engaged in singing hymns and performing other sacred rites.

## Pauw, Cornelius[[@Headword:Pauw, Cornelius]]

             a Dutch divine, noted as a writer, was born at Amsterdam in 1739. He studied at Gottingen, and was afterwards made canon of Xanten, in the duchy of Cleves. He applied himself to literature, and wrote several works in French on the history and physiology of various nations and countries. His Recherches historiques sur les Amenicains contain some curious information, many sensible reflections, and also many unsupported assertions set forth in a dogmatic tone. Pauw had not visited America, and his object seems to have been to collect all the passages which he could find in other writers, and which could support some preconceived opinion of his concerning the great inferiority of that part of the world, its productions and its native races. (See Pernety, Dissertation sur l'Amerique; et les Americains contre les Recherches historiques de M. de Pauw, which is found at the end of some editions of Pauw's work.) In his chapter on Paraguay, Pauw shows himself particularly hostile to the Jesuits. His Recherhes sur les Grecs, in which he had better guides, is written with greater sobriety of judgment; but even, in this work his dogmatic spirit is perceptible. Pauw published also Recherches sur les Egyptiens et les Chinois. The French Revolution, and the subsequent  invasion of the duchy of Cleves, deprived Pauw of his peace of mind. He became dejected, and burned all his papers, among others his Recherches sur les Allemands, which is said to have been the most elaborate of his works, but which was never printed. He died at Xanten in 1799.

## Pavan[[@Headword:Pavan]]

             a Hindu deity who is believed to preside over the winds. He was the father of Hanuman, the ape-god.

## Pavanne, Jacques[[@Headword:Pavanne, Jacques]]

             a Christian martyr to the Protestant cause, was born in France about the opening of the 16th century. He became an early convert to the Reformation doctrines, but in 1524, at Christmas, recanted. After this he lost his peace of mind, and could do nothing but weep and sigh, until he was one day brought before the tribunal of the Sorbonne because he had been to Meaux, and had had converse with the heretical teachers. This was all that Pavanne desired another opportunity to confess his true Lord and his cause. “He felt his mind relieved as soon as the fetters were fastened on his limbs, and recovered all his energy in the open confession of Jesus Christ” (D'Aubigne). The proceedings against him were conducted with all possible despatch, and a very short time had elapsed before a pile was erected in the Place de Grove, on which Pavanne made a joyful end. See D'Aubigne, Hist. of the Reformation, 3:482, 483.

## Pavels, Claus[[@Headword:Pavels, Claus]]

             a Norwegian prelate, was born Aug. 1, 1769. in Vaudei parish, near Christians and, in Norway. He graduated with the highest honors at the gymnasium in Christians and and at the University of Copenhagen. From 1799 to 1805 lie preached in Copenhagen, but was then called to Christiania, Norway, where he remained until 1817. From 1817 until he died, in 1822, he was bishop of Bergen. He enjoyed a great reputation as a pulpit orator, and published a number of sermons and religious treatises. He also wrote poetry, and kept a diary, in which he recorded all the more important events of his time. His grandson, C. P. Riis, has published two of his writings; the one, Bishop Claus Pavels Autobiographi (Christiania, 1866); the other, Claus Pavels Dagbogs Optegnelser (ibid. 186467). (R. B. A.)

## Pavement[[@Headword:Pavement]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of רַצְפָּה, ritspah', originally a stone heated for baking purposes, and hence a tesselated pavement (2Ch 7:3; Est 1:6; Ezekiel xl, 17, 18; 42:3), once of the cognate term

מִרְצֶפֶת, martse'pheth, a paved floor (2Ki 16:17). In Joh 19:13 it is the rendering of λιθόστρωτος, which is immediately explained by the Heb. equivalent Gabbatha (q.v.). In the account of the sacrilege of Ahab, we read that he removed the brazen oxen upon which the base in the Temple rested, and substituted a stone pavement (2Ki 16:17). The lower stories of Eastern houses and palaces, in later days, were usually paved with marble (Est 1:6), but in the time of Moses marble was not used for pavements. The “paved work of a sapphire stone” mentioned in Exo 24:10 is therefore supposed to refer to the splendid floors known in Egypt, which were formed of painted tiles or bricks. Champollion and Rosellini have given specimens of these ornamented floors, and fragments of such may be seen in the British Museum. This taste still prevails in the East. Le Bruyn tells us that the mosque at Jerusalem is almost all covered over with green and blue bricks, which are glazed, so that when the sun shines the eve is perfectly dazzled; and Dr. Russell likewise mentions that a portion of the pavement of some of the houses in Syria is composed of mosaic work. SEE HOUSE.

## Pavement Of Churches[[@Headword:Pavement Of Churches]]

             From the 4th century churches were carefully paved, as the Jewish Temple had an artificial floor. The narthex was laid with plaster, the nave with wood, and the sanctuary with mosaic. The custom of burying within churches between the 7th and 10th centuries led to the practice of covering the pavement with memorials of the departed; and at length the floors were laid with stone, marble, or tesselated or plain tiles. Rich pavements, like marqueterie in stone or Roman mosaic, occur in most parts of Italy, at St. Omer, St. Denis, in the Rhine country, at Canterbury, Westminster, and in the churches. of St. Mary Major, St. Laurence without the Walls, of the time of Adrian I, and St. Martin of the period of Constantine at Rome. The patterns are usually geometrical, but figures, flowers, animals, and the zodiac are frequently introduced with an effect equal to the richest tapestry. This decoration lasted till the 12th century, but at that time, and in  the subsequent period, marble became rare, and hard blocks of freestone were used, and lastly tiles.

## Pavia[[@Headword:Pavia]]

             a city of Northern Italy, capital of the province of the same name, on the left bank of the Ticino, twenty miles south of Milan, and three miles above the confluence of the Ticino and the Po, was in ancient times called the “city of a hundred towers.” It is a very old city, and many of its antiquities remain to this day; but the palace of Theodoric and the tower where Boethius wrote the treatise De Consolutione Philosophiae no longer exist; among the remaining ones are those of Belcredi and Del Maino, which are each 169 feet high. Its oldest church, and perhaps the oldest in Italy, is that of San Michele, which, although the date of its foundation is uncertain, is first mentioned in 661. The cathedral, containing some good paintings, was commenced in 1484, but was never finished. In a beautiful chapel attached to it are the ashes of St. Augustine, in a sarcophagus ornamented with fifty bassirilievi, ninety-five statues, and numerous grotesques. In the church of San Petro in Ciel d'Auro are deposited the remains of the unfortunate Boethius. The Certosa of Pavia, the most splendid monastery in the world, is four miles without the city. It was founded in 1396. The University of Pavia is greatly celebrated for its learned professors, large libraries, and museums. About 1600 students attend here annually. Pavia is the ancient Ticinum (afterwards Papia, whence the modern name), and was founded by the Ligurii; it was sacked by Brennus and by Hannibal, burned by the Huns, conquered by the Romans, and became a place of consider able importance at the end of the Roman empire. Then it came into the possession of the Goths and Lombards, and the kings of the latter made it the capital of the kingdom of Italy. It became independent in the 12th century, then, weakened by civil wars, it was conquered by Matthew Visconti in 1345. After that period its history is merged in that of the conquerors of Lombardy. Since 1859 it has been included within the reorganized kingdom of Italy.

## Pavia, Council Of[[@Headword:Pavia, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Papiense or Ticiense). Several ecclesiastical councils have been held in Pavia.

I. The first of these was convened in December, 850, by order of the emperor Louis, who attended himself. Bishop Angelbert of Milan presided.  As secular matters were also considered by this body, the ecclesiastical character of the council is sometimes called in question. We append a notice of the principal topics contained in the twenty-five canons of ecclesiastical discipline enacted by this council:

1. Directs that bishops shall keep about them priests and deacons of known probity to be witnesses of their secret acts.

2. Directs that bishops shall celebrate mass not only on Sundays and holy days, but, when possible, every day; and that they shall no nneglect privately to offer prayers for themselves, their fellow-bishops, kings, all the rulers of God's Church, and for all those who have desired their prayers, but especially for the poor.

3. Orders them to exercise frugality at table, to receive pilgrims and poor and sick people, and to exhort them and read to them.

4 and 5. Direct that they shall not hunt, hawk, etc., nor mix in worldly pleasures; bids them read the Holy Scriptures, explain them to their clergy, and preach on Sundays and holy days.

7. Directs that priests shall examine whether penitents really perform their acts of penance, give alms largely, etc.; public offenders to be reconciled by the bishop only.

9. Warns all fathers of families to marry their daughters as soon as they are of age, lest they fall into sill; and forbids the marriage blessing to those who marry after fornication.

14. Orders bishops immediately to re-establish those monasteries in their dioceses which have gone to decay through their negligence.

18. Declares that priests and deacons (acephali) who are under no episcopal jurisdiction are not to be looked Upon as belonging to the clergy.

21. Forbids usury.

22. Enjoins bishops to watch over those who have the care of orphans, and to see that they do not injure or oppress them. If such oppressors refuse to listen to their remonstrances, they are ordered to call the emperor's attention to the case.

23. Orders bishops to arrest clerks and monks who wander about the country, agitating useless questions and sowing the seeds of error, and to bring them before the metropolitan.

25. Condemns to a very severe course of penance those who deal in magical arts, who pretend to cause love or hatred by their incantations, and who are suspected of having caused the death of others; enjoins that they shall not be reconciled except on their death-bed.

See Labbe, Concil. 8:61.

II. A second council was convened at Pavia in A.D. 876 by Charles the Bald. Seventeen bishops from Tuscany and Lombardy attended. The archbishop of Milan presided. Fifteen canons were published. Of these the most noteworthy enactments are:

1. Orders respect and veneration everywhere for the holy Roman Church, as the head of all churches.

2 and 3. Also relate to the respect, etc., due to the Roman see, and to the pope John.

4. Orders respect for the priesthood.

5. Orders respect for the imperial dignity. The three following relate to the duties of bishops. The acts of this council were confirmed in that' of Pontyon, held in the same year. In this council an ancient document was produced, said to have been given to the archbishop of Milan by Gregory the Great, or Charlemagne, by which they claimed for themselves the right of electing the king of Italy fourteen days after the death of the last (Muratori, Rer. Ital. vol. ii, pt. ii col. 148). See Labb, Concil. 9:279.

III. A third council was convened Aug. 1, 1022. Pope Benedict VIII in this council complained of the licentious life of the clergy, and showed that it dishonored the Church; he declared that they consumed the wealth given to them by the liberality of princes in keeping women and providing for their children. A decree in seven articles was published for the reformation of the clergy, which the emperor confirmed, adding temporal penalties against the refractory. See Labbe, Concil. 9:819.

IV. At a council held at Pavia in 1160 the anti-pope, Victor III (Octavianus), was acknowledged as pope instead of Alexander III, by the emperor Frederick I. See Labbe, Concil. 10:1387.

V. At a council held at Pavia in 1423, convoked by the Council of Constance, and opened in the month of May, some deputies from England, France, and Germany were present. On June 22 this council was transferred to Siena, on account of the plague which threatened Pavia, and the enactments are given under the heading of SIENA. See Hefele, Conciliengesch. vol. 4 and 5; Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, 4:292; 7:534.

## Pavia, Giacomo[[@Headword:Pavia, Giacomo]]

             a painter, was born at Bologna Feb. 18, 1655, according to authentic documents. There is much discrepancy as to the time of his birth, and about his instruction. He is said to have studied under Antonio Crespi, who was twenty-six years his junior. Lanzi says he was the pupil of Cav. Giuseppe Maria Crespi, ten years his junior; and the canon Luigi Crespi, son of Giuseppe, states, in the third volume of the Felsian Pittoriae, that he was instructed by Gio. Gioseffo dal Sole, four years his junior. He acquired considerable reputation at Bologna, and executed several works for the churches, which were admired for the fine taste displayed in their composition. The most esteemed of these is a picture of St. Anne teaching the Virgins to read, in S. Silvestro; and the Nativity, in S. Giuseppe. He went to Spain, where he distinguished himself, and executed many works for the churches. He died in 1740.

## Pavie, Jean- Baptiste-Raimond De[[@Headword:Pavie, Jean- Baptiste-Raimond De]]

             abbe De Fourguevaux, grandson of Francois, was born in 1693 at Toulouse. He enlisted in the regiment of the Roi d'Infctnterie, and obtained a lieutenancy. Upon the urgent entreaties of his mother he left the profession of arms, and in 1717 entered the society of Saint Hilaire, in Paris. He died Aug. 2, 1768, at the chateau De Fourguevaux. In devoting him self to works of piety, he took part in religious quarrels, and wrote many books of devotion or controversy: we cite from him, Traitl de la Confiance Chreitiezne (Paris, 1728,.1781), which occasioned great disputes; and Catechisme historique et dogmatigell (ibid. 1729, 2 vols.  12mo; reprinted in 1766 in 5 vols. with the sequels). See Nouvelles Ecclesiast. Feb. 7, 1769.

## Pavilion[[@Headword:Pavilion]]

             the rendering in the A.V. of סֹךְ sok (Psa 27:5; elsewhere “tabernacle,” “den,” or “covert,” which last is the literal meaning), or סֻכָּה(2Sa 22:12; 1Ki 20:12; 1Ki 20:16; Psa 18:11; Psa 31:20), sukkah, which signifies a booth, hut, formed of green boughs and branches interwoven (Gen 33:17; Jon 4:5). It, is rendered “booth” (Lev 23:40-43; Neh 8:15; Neh 8:17); “tabernacles” (Lev 23:34; Deu 16:13; Deu 16:16; Isa 4:6); “cottage” (Isa 1:8). It sometimes signifies tent, tents for soldiers; rendered “tent” (2Sa 11:11); “pavilions,” margin “tents” (1Ki 20:12; 1Ki 20:16)., SEE TENT. It is also used poetically for the dwelling of God (Psa 18:11), where the Psalmist sublimely describes Jehovah as surrounding himself with dark waters, and thick clouds of the skies. as with a tent, or “pavilion” (Job 36:29). SEE TABERNACLE.

Among the Egyptians pavilions were built in a similar style to houses, though on a smaller scale, in various parts of the country, and in the foreign districts through which the Egyptian armies passed, for the use of the king; and some private houses occasionally imitated these small castles by substituting for the usual parapet wall and cornice the battlements that crowned them, and which were intended to represent Egyptian shields (Wilkinson, Anc. Egg. 1:23). The Hebrew word שִׁפְרַיר, shaphrir, rendered “royal pavilion” (Jer 43:10), is properly throne- ornament, tapestry, with which a throne is hung. SEE THRONE.

## Pavilion, Nicolas[[@Headword:Pavilion, Nicolas]]

             a noted French prelate, celebrated especially for his relation to the Jansenistic retreat in Paris known as “Port-Royal,” and one of the ablest of the Gallican Church advocates, was born in Paris Nov. 17, 1597. Even as a boy he displayed purity of character seldom seen in youth, and as a student was all that the most exacting could expect. Gifted with remarkable intellectual power, he was the favorite of St. Vincent de Paul, his  confessor, who employed Pavilion, as soon as his age would permit, in different missions, and finally placed him at the head of the assemblies of charity and the conferences of St. Lazare. Pavilion had great misgivings about assuming any responsibility, and did not enter the priesthood until he was thirty years of age, and then, without being attached to any parish, devoted himself to the exercises of the holy ministry by assisting different curates, especially in the pulpit. He had determined in his own mind never to preach at Paris, but Vincent de Paul prevailed upon him to change his mind, and in 1637 he preached at the church of St. Croix. Crowds were attracted by his eloquence and simplicity, and the city was soon in a general excitement concerning the new preacher. Cardinal Richelieu and others of distinction went to hear him, and were so pleased that he was appointed to the bishopric of Alet, and was consecrated Aug. 21, 1639, at Paris. He left that city Oct. 8, with the resolution of never more returning to it. In his diocese his predecessor, Etienne de Polverel, had maintained a conduct little edifying, and his clergy had imitated him only too well. Nicolas Pavillon set himself at work immediately for the instruction and reform of the clergy, and in consequence of his wise regulations he succeeded in remedying the most deplorable abuses. His diocese very soon changed its condition; ignorance and disorders were banished from it. In 1647 bishop Pavilion got into difficulties with the Jesuits, who refused to acknowledge his diocesan power, and from this time forward his work was more or less impaired by their opposition, which, at first confined to his own see, gradually reached the court, and he fell under a cloud, notwithstanding his devotion to the good work, and his piety and untiring industry. Thus Pavilion had founded a seminary for theological instruction, and one for lady teachers; had paid special attention to the secular school, and by his personal supervision greatly improved their condition. As he was in intimate relations with Dr. Arnauld (q.v.) and his partisans, the Jesuits accused Pavillon of heresy and disloyalty, and by every means in their power plotted his destruction. His friend, Vincent de Paul, made strenuous efforts to draw Pavilion away from his Port-Royalist associations; but Pavilion took no notice of his opponents, and unhesitatingly endorsed the good doctor. After the death of St. Vincent Pavilion pronounced against the spreading of the heretical practices in Mariolatry even more openly.

In the year 1656 Pascal brought out his Provincial Letters, and shortly after Arnauld directed to Pavilion a pamphlet on the Jansenistic propositions which had just been condemned by the Jesuitical  interpretation. The result was that Pavillon was so impressed with the justice of the Jansenistic complaints that, when Pascal was replied to in the Apology for the Consuists, he felt constrained to call a provincial council (in 1658), and by it caused the Apology to be condemned as containing “doctrines false, precipitate, scandalous, and calculated to corrupt the manners and to injure the discipline of the Church” — a censure which the clergy of Paris approved. Of course such a step forever sealed the fate of the bishop of Alet. In 1661, by request of the king, an assembly of the clergy of France pronounced it incumbent upon all bishops to sign the formulary which condemned the five propositions supposed to be contained in the Jansenistic heresy. Pavillon saw in this measure not only injustice to the Jansenists, who rightly claimed that none of Jansenius's true views were embodied in it, but also against the bishops whose authority was thereby impaired. All the bishops of France looked to Pavilion to take the lead. He was not long in deciding. Aware that the king must have been moved to the measure by the intriguing Jesuits, he wrote to the king in remonstrance, but in all kindness, explaining the inconsistent action of a state like France, which had recognized the supremacy of the Church in things spiritual, yet directing her bishops how to judge of and deal with heresy. The king, unable to free himself from the influence that surrounded him, was only the more decided in his course, and in 1662 issued a royal edict for the immediate signature of the formulary. Still years passed on. In 1664 the new archbishop of Paris also demanded compliance with the king's edict. Now Pavilion could no longer hesitate as to his future course. The courageous bishop, disdaining to equivocate under such circumstances, published a mandement, June 1, 1665, in which his views as to the limits of Church authority were set forth with transparent clearness. Truths revealed by God, of which the Church is the ordained guardian, must be accepted on her testimony, with an entire subjection of the reason and of all the faculties of the mind; but with regard to other truths, not so revealed, God has not provided any infallible arbiter; so that when the Church declares that certain propositions are contained in a given book, or that such and such is the meaning of a particular author, she acts only by human knowledge, and may be mistaken. For decisions of this kind the Church cannot require positive internal belief; nevertheless the faithful are not permitted to impugn her judgments, which in all cases must be treated with submission, for the preservation of due order and discipline.

The high character and saintly life of Pavilion added immense weight to his pastoral instructions. His sentiments were shared by other prelates, particularly by  Henri Arnauld, bishop of Angers; Nicolas Choart de Buzanval, bishop of Beauvais; and Francois de Caulet, bishop of Pamiers; these issued mandements of precisely similar import, as did also the bishops of Noyon and Laon; but the two latter, on receiving notice of the displeasure of the court, retracted, and adopted a tone of exact accordance with the papal bull. An arret of the council of state, July 20, canceled the mandements of the four refractory bishops, and forbade the clergy to obey them. It was determined to take judicial proceedings against the prelates who had thus boldly constituted themselves the apostles of Jansenism; but this was an affair of considerable delicacy and difficulty. According to Roman jurisprudence, the pope was the sole judge of bishops; on the other hand, it was one of the most cherished of the Gallican liberties that bishops in France could only be tried, in the first instance, before their metropolitan and his comprovincials. Application having been made to the pope on the subject by the French ambassador at Rome, his holiness proposed to name the archbishop of Paris and two other prelates as delegates for hearing the cause; but the king decidedly objected to this method of adjudication, as an invasion of the privileges which he was bound to defend. After a tedious negotiation, it was at length arranged that the pope should nominate a commission of nine prelates to proceed to the trial of their colleagues; that seven should be competent to act; that the president should have power to appoint substitutes in the room of those who might decline to act; and that the accused should not be at liberty either to challenge the judges or to appeal from their decision. The mandements of the four bishops were at the same time denounced by a decree of the Congregation of the Index; upon which the bishops of Languedoc wrote to the king in terms of energetic remonstrance against the encroachments of the court of Rome on the rights of the episcopate, and Louis replied by assuring them that he would alwavs uphold their lawful jurisdiction and the liberties of the Gallican Church.

The prosecution of the bishops was suspended by the death of Alexander VII, which occurred May 20, 1667. Cardinal Giulio Rospigliosi, who succeeded him under the name of Clement IX, was known to be of moderate opinions, and disposed to a pacification; and measures were immediately concerted in France for taking advantage of this favorable change of circumstances. It was proposed that the bishops, without being required to retract their mandements, should sign the formulary afresh, as if they had taken no steps in the matter before, and should cause it to be signed by their clergy; but any explanatory remarks which they might wish to make should be made by a process-verbal at their diocesan synods, such  written statements not to be published, but to be deposited in the registry of each diocese; and that they should afterwards join in a letter to the pope, informing him of this new act of dutiful submission to his authority. This expedient was approved by the nuncio. accepted on his recommendation by the pope, and ultimately adopted. The bishop of Alet .proved for some time intractable. Courier after courier was dispatched to urge him to compliance, but in vain. At last, persuaded that the peace of the Church would be maintained by his submission, he yielded to the importunate entreaties of the bishop of Comminges, Antoine Arnauld, and other friends, and appended his signature, Sept. 10, 1668. The other prelates assented without difficulty, and the matter was forever closed. In 1675 Pavilion was involved anew in conflict with the state authority.

By the decree of the crown. ratified by Parliament, declaring the law of Regale in general force, in 1673 the question had been forced home to Pavillon whether he would suffer in his own diocese appointments by the crown while he was at the head of the see. The treasurership of his cathedral was conferred in 1679 in Regale upon a young ecclesiastic of Toulouse, who in the absence of the bishop came to take possession. When Pavilion returned, he prohibited this appointee from assuming the duties of the office; and when he appealed to the archbishop of Paris to assist him against the court at which the appointee had sought redress, Pavilion was unfavorably replied to, and he found himself obliged to stand in his own strength. In March, 1676, he published an ordinance against the intrusion of any person into any benefice or dignity in virtue of the Regale. Of course a decree of the ecclesiastical council of Paris, readily granted upon request of the crown, set aside Pavillon's ordinance; and though the good bishop wrote to the king, and pleaded for the rights of the Church as he interpreted them, his position was condemned, and he was only suffered to remain in his see by reason of his great age. He died Dec. 8, 1677. Pavilion published a sort of “Compendium Theologicum,” which he entitled Rituel a l'usage du Diocese d'Aleth (Paris, 1667, 4to, and often), and which was designed especially for his own diocese. It was published anonymously; and, as it was attributed to Arnauld, it was condemned at Rome by a decree of April 9, 1668, though it surpassed anything that had previously appeared for clear statements of doctrine and sound Christian instruction. Pavilion published in July following a pastoral letter against this brief, and, notwithstanding the anathemas, he had his book printed again, adding to it the approvals of twenty-nine French prelates.. The ritual continued to be observed in the diocese of Alet, and was extensively circulated throughout  France. The death of pope Clement only a few months later terminated this unpleasant affair, especially as the casuists could get no encouragement from the new pope, Innocent XI, who became a most ardent admirer of Pavilion. Indeed, our good prelate was highly esteemed by all honorable characters, for he was a brave defender of the Christian doctrine of grace, maintained strictly the rules of Christian morality, and protected, or strove to protect, the rights and immunities of the Church. Other works by bishop Pavilion are, Ordonnances et Statuts Synodaux (Toulouse, 1670; Paris, 1675, 12mo): — Lettre ecrite au Roi (1664, 4to). There was a question of the royal prerogative to which Pavilion refused to submit; and this letter, upon the charge of the general counsellor Talon, was suppressed by a decree of the Parliament of Paris of Dec. 12, 1664. See Vie de If. Nicolas Pavillon, eveque d'Aleth (Saint Hiel, 1738, 3 vols. 12mo); Necrologe de Port-Royal, p. 464; Mrs. Schimrelpenninck, Select Memoirs of Port- Royal; Life of Nicolas Pavilion, by a Layman of the Church of England (Oxf. and Lond. 1869, 12mo): Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 1:465 sq.

## Pavona, Francesco[[@Headword:Pavona, Francesco]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Udine in 1692. He first studied under Giovanni Gioseffo dal Sole. He afterwards studied at Milan, and thence proceeded to Genoa. He next went to Spain, Portugal, and Germany, at all which courts he was well received and executed many works. He resided some time at Dresden, and there married and had a family. He subsequently returned to Bologna, where he remained a considerable time, and executed some works for the churches. Lanzi says he was an excellent painter in oil, and better in crayons. He painted many large altar-pieces, well designed and colored and also excelled in portraits. He died at Venice in 1777.

## Pavonii[[@Headword:Pavonii]]

             priests among the ancient Romans who conducted the worship of Pavor (q.v.).

## Pavor[[@Headword:Pavor]]

             a personification of Fear, worshipped among the ancient Romans as a companion of Mars, the god of war. The worship of this deity is said to have been instituted by Tullus Hostilius.

## Paw[[@Headword:Paw]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of the Heb. כִּ, kaph (Lev 11:27), the palm or hollow “hand” (as elsewhere rendered), and יָד, yad (1Sa 17:37), the open hand (as elsewhere rendered), applied to an animal, in the latter case metaphorically in the sense of power.

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

             a prominent minister in early Methodism, was born at Thorner, near Leeds. November 12, 1787. He was early convicted under Methodist preaching, and after a long struggle was joyfullly brought into the light. He preached his first sermon in 1761, in 1762 Wesley sent him to York, and from that time to February 3, 1806, when he preached his last sermon at Wakefield, he exercised his ministry with marked diligence, ability, and success. He was frequently appointed to the large cities, and in 1785 Wesley ordained him, with Hanby and Taylor, for Scotland, in which country, owing to the Scottish character, creed, and mode of worship, Pawson was convinced Methodism would never make much headway. Triumphantly his busy life was closed at Wakefield, March 19, 1806. Twice Pawson was elected president of the conference (1793 and 1801). "During the trials which followed Wesley's death, he was one of the pillars of the shaken structure of Methodism."

He wrote in favor of giving the sacraments to the societies in 1792, commended Kilham's pamphlet on the same subject, proposed the solution of the difficulties at the conference in London in the same year, published a revised and enlarged copy of the Large Minutes (1797), and An Affectionate Address to the Junior Preachers (1798). He believed Methodist government was not sufficiently articulated, favored the appointment of bishops, and the division of England into four Methodist dioceses, and introduced services in the Established Church hours. He was a man of sound judgment, piety, and zeal, and Adam Clarke published a  worthy eulogy of him in the Methodist Magazine (Lond. 1807). See Jackson, Early Meth. Preachers, 4:1 sq.; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 3:202 (see Index); Smith, Hist, of Methodism 2 (see Index); Crowther, Portraiture of Methodism, 2d ed. page 382 sq.

## Pax[[@Headword:Pax]]

             a personification of Peace, worshipped by the ancient Romans. A festival was celebrated annually in honor of this goddess on April 30.

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

             called also PACIFICALE SEE PACIFICALE (q.v.) and OSCULTATORIUM SEE OSCULTATORIUM (q.v.), is used to designace the so-called ceremony known as the Kiss of Peace (q.v.). It is also employed to describe a small tablet having on it a representation of the crucifixion, or some other Christian symbol, offered to the congregation in the Romish Church to be kissed in the celebration of the mass. It was usually of silver or other metal, with a handle at the back, but was occasionally of other materials; sometimes it was enameled and set with precious stones. The pax was introduced when the osculum pacis, or kiss of peace the custom in primitive times for Christians in their public assemblies to give one another a holy kiss, or kiss of peace — was abrogated on account of the confusion which it entailed, and in consequence of some appearance of scandal which had arisen out of it. The tablet, after it had received the kiss of the officiating minister (priest or bishop), was by him presented to the deacon, and by him again to the people, each of whom kissed it in turn, thus transmitting throughout the whole assembly the symbol of Christian love and peace without the possibility of offense. In the Syrian churches the following seems to be the way in which the same thing is symbolized: In,a part of the prayers which has a reference to the birth of Christ. on pronouncing the words, “Peace on earth, good will towards men,” the attending ministers take the officiating priest's right between both their hands, and so pass the peace to the congregation, each of whom takes his neighbor's right hand, and salutes him with the word peace. In the Romish Church the pax is still used. By the Church of England it was omitted at the Reformation as a useless ceremony. The practice of saluting each other — the men, men, and the  women, women — during public worship, and particularly in the agape, or love-feast, is frequently alluded to by ancient writers, as Cyril of Jerusalem (Catech. 15) and St. Augustine (Sertm. 227). All the ancient liturgies, without exception, refer to it as among the rites with which the Eucharist was celebrated; but they differ as to the time and the place in the Eucharistic service in which it is introduced. In the Eastern liturgies it is before, in the Western after the Offertory (q.v.); and in the Roman it immediately precedes the communion. The ceremony, which is now confined to the priesthood, commences with the celebrating bishop or priest, who salutes upon the cheek the deacon; and by him the salute is tendered to the other members, and to the first dignitary of the assistant clergy. It is only when the mass is celebrated by a high dignitary that the utensil called the pax is used. Having been kissed by the celebrant, and by him handed to the deacon, it is carried by the latter to the rest of the clergy. In ordinary cases the pax is given by merely bowing, and approaching the cheek to the person to whom it is communicated. The pax is omitted in the mass of Maundy-Thursday (q.v.), to express horror of the treacherous kiss of Judas.

## Pax vobis[[@Headword:Pax vobis]]

             or VOBISCUM (i.e. Peace be to you), was an ordinary salutation among the ancient Christians. It was addressed by the bishop or pastor to the people at his first entrance into the church, a practice which is frequently mentioned by Chrysostom, who derives it from apostolic practice. The same form of salutation was employed in commencing all the offices of the Church, but more especially by the reader when beginning the reading of the Scriptures. The custom continued in the African churches until the third Council of Carthage forbade its use by the reader. This form of salutation, “Peace be with you,” to which the people usually replied, “And with thy spirit,” was commonly pronounced by a bishop, presbyter, or deacon in the church, as Chrysostom informs us. It was customary to repeat the Pax vobis before beginning the sermon, and at least four times in the course of the communion service. It was also used when dismissing the congregation at the close of divine worship. The deacon sent the people away from the house of God with the solemn prayer, “Go in peace.” In the Liturgy of the Church of England a similar salutation occurs, “The Lord be with you,” to which the people reply, “And with thy spirit.” SEE PEACE.

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

             D.D., a Scottish divine of note, was born at Dalgowry, East Lothian, in 1762. He entered the work of the ministry before 1789, and was in that year a member of the General Associate Synod, and subsequently under the same authority professor of divinity at Edinburgh. His places of pastoral labors were Kilmaurs and Stewarton. He died in 1837. He was a man greatly respected in the denomination to which he belonged, and possessed in his youth and prime rare-gifts of popular eloquence. He wrote, An Inquiry into the Obligations of Religious Covenants upon Posterity (1801, 8vo): — Illustrations of the Holy Scriptures (Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 8vo; and often in England and America); a valuable supplement to Harmer, containing a large amount of various and useful knowledge on subjects relating to Eastern geography, natural history, and manners and customs. See Orme, Biblioth. Biblia, s.v.; Nevin, Biblical Antiquities (Appendix), p. 441.

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

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Lancaster County, Pa., April 1,1760. His early education was limited, and when the Revolution broke out he joined the Continental army. When about twenty-four years of age he entered the Strasburg Academy, near Lancaster City, Pa., where he greatly distinguished himself, and was by the Newcastle Presbytery licensed to preach April 8, 1790. After supplying for a while the churches of West Nottingham and Little Britain, he was, Oct. 3, 1792, ordained and installed pastor of the churches of Lower Marsh Creek and Toms Creek. After a lapse of some years he devoted himself exclusively to the former congregation, where the greatest success and usefulness attended the forty- nine years of his ministry. His health obliged him to resign his charge Oct. 19, 1841, after which he gradually declined until his death, April 16, 1845. Although his sermons and other literary productions were marked by great talent and profound learning, his modesty prevented their publication. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:554. Payne, Joseph, one of the noted English educators of our times, was born in 1808. He received his educational training at the University of London, and early distinguished himself as a teacher of English. For a number of years he was connected with his alma mater. In 1873 he was appointed to the newly founded professorship of education in the College of Preceptors, the first chair in any public institution in England assigned to that subject. He devoted  himself in this position, and also by his writings, to the promotion of education, making the improvement of methods of teaching his special object. He was the author of Lectures on Education, and numerous lectures and pamphlets on allied subjects. He also took all active part in the work of the Woman's Educational Union. Mr. Payne contributed several papers to the Proceedings of the Philological Society, chiefly on English dialects, and the relation of Old English to Norman French. Among his other publications were text-books in English literature, entitled Studies in English Poetry (5th ed. Lond. 1864, cr. 8vo), Studies in English Prose (1867, cr. 8vo), and Select Poetry for Children; the last of which especially had a very large circulation (15th ed. 1868, 18mo). Payne died at Bayswater April 30, 1876.

## Pay, Stephen De[[@Headword:Pay, Stephen De]]

             a Scotch prelate, was prior of the abbey of St. Andrews, and in 1383 was elected bishop of the same. But he was taken prisoner by the English at sea, on his way to Rome, and died in March 1381. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 26.

## Payne, George, LL.D[[@Headword:Payne, George, LL.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was the son of a Baptist minister at Walgrave, Northamptonshire, and at a very early age gave indications of superior intelligence. He was educated in Hoxton College and the University of Glasgow. In 1807 he became assistant to the Reverend Edwar Parsons, of Leeds, and in the following year to the Reverend George Lambert, of Hull. In 1812 he removed to Edinburgh as pastor of Albany Street Chapel, where he labored eleven years. In 1824 he was called to the theological chair in Lancashire College, Blackburn. After five years in that capacity he became president and theological professor of the Western College, Exeter, where he remained until his death, June 19, 1848, at the age of sixty-seven. He published, Divine Sovereignty. — Original Sin (London Congregational Lectures for 1844): — Elements of Mental and Moral Science: — Elements of Language and a tractate on Congregationalism. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1848, page 234; (Lond.) Evang. Mag. 1848, pages 393, 415.

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

             a missionary bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was consecrated in St. Paul's Church, Alexandria, Virginia, July 11, 1851, as bishop of Western Africa. He resigned his jurisdiction in October, 1871, and returned to the United States, fixing his residence at Oak Grove, Virginia, where he continued to reside until his death, October 23, 1874, aged sixty years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1875, page 144.

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

             D.D., F.R.S., an excellent and learned English divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was rector of St. Mary's, Whitechapel, in 1681, and prebendary of Westminster in 1694. In 1681 he was admitted Fellow of the Royal Society; and died in 1696. His publications are, Learning and Knowledge recommended to the Scholars of Brentwood School, at their First Feast: a sermon on Pro 1:7 (Lond. 1682, 4to): — A Discourse concerning the Adoration of the Host, in Answer to T. G. and Mr. Boileau (Gibson's Preservative, 10:116; originally published 1685): — A Discourse concerning Communion in One Kind, in Answer to the Archbishop of Meaux (Gibson's Preservative, 8:320, and 9:1; originally published anonymously, 1687, 4to): — A Discourse on the Sacrifice of the Mass (Lond. 1688, 4to also in Gibson's Preservative, 6:215): — The Texts examined which Papists cite out of the Bible to prove their Doctrine concerning the Celibacy of Priests and Vows of Continence: in two parts (ibid. 2:382; originally published 1688): — Bellarmine examined, 6th Note: Agreement in Doctrine with the Primitive Church (ibid. 3:292; originally published 1688): — Family Religion, or the Duty of taking Care of Religion in Fatmilies, and the Means of doing it: a sermon on Jos 24:15 (Lond. 1691, 4to): — A Practical Discourse of Repentance, rectifying the Mistakes about it, especially such as lead to Despair or Presumrption, persuading and directing to the true Practice of it, and demonstrating the invalidity of a Death-bed Repentance (ibid. 1693, 8vo): — Discourses upon several Practical Subjects: with a Preface, giving some Account of his Life, Writings, and Death (ibid. 1698,  sm. 8vo). See Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England (Church of the Restoration), 2:70; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. vol. ii, S. V.

## Payson, Charles Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Payson, Charles Henry, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Leominster, Massachusetts, September 28, 1831. He graduated at Amherst College in 1852, and from the Union Theological Seminary, N.Y., in 1857; was ordained pastor of the mission chapel connected with the Madison Square Chapel in 1860, where, with the exception of a year and a half spent at Berlin and Heidelberg, he labored uninterruptedly with great zeal and success until his death, January 24, 1877.

## Payson, Edward[[@Headword:Payson, Edward]]

             D.D., a noted American divine, one of the most illustrious of the orthodox Congregational body, was the son of the succeeding, and was born at Rindge, N. H., July 25, 1783, where his father was then pastor. Both the intellectual and moral powers of young Payson were developed at an unusually early age. He was often known to weep under preaching when three years old, and was a good reader at four. He entered Harvard College in 1800, and graduated in 1803. It was said of him while there, by his fellowstudents, that he had left off taking books from the alcoves of the library because he had read all that were there. His religious awakenings seem to have come powerfully after the death of his brother in 1804; and, when finally resolved to live for God and his cause altogether, he consecrated himself fully to the service in a written covenant. After three years spent as principal of a school in Portland, feeling that he was called to the work of the ministry, he began his theological studies under the direction of his father. His great aim and purpose was to be a thorough Biblical scholar — not so much to acquaint himself with systems of divinity, or to learn about the Bible, but to know the truth. Having completed his theological studies, he was called and ordained colleague of Mr. Kellogg, Dec. 16, 1807, and afterwards the sole pastor of the Congregational Church of Portland, Maine. This was his first and only pastoral charge, and he remained in it for a period of twenty years, though his pulpit utterances were of the most startling and uncompromising character. It may be truly said of Edward Payson that he labored not to please men, but God; and his pulpit thundered and lightened like another Sinai against every form of ungodliness and iniquity. Nor must it be supposed that his pastorate was lengthened in one charge because his labors were not appreciated elsewhere. Calls came to him from Boston and New York, but he persistently declined them. So conscientiously devoted was Payson to his work that he refused to receive an increase of his salary, although it was generously offered him by his people. Over seven hundred persons were received by him under his ministrations, and many happy souls in other places will rise up in the final day to bless the name of Edward Payson. These vast labors heavily taxed his physical strength, and the impaired condition of his health, due to sedentary habits, soon exhausted him when sickness finally came. He died Oct. 22, 1827. In his  distressing sickness he displayed, in the most interesting and impressive manner, the power of Christian faith. Smitten down in the midst of his days and usefulness, he was entirely resigned to the divine will; for he perceived distinctly that the infinite wisdom of God could not err in the direction of events, and it was his joy that God reigneth. His mind rose over bodily pain, and in the strong visions of eternity he seemed almost to lose the sense of suffering. In a letter to his sister, Sept. 19, 1827, he says:

“Were I to adopt the figurative language of Bunyan, I might date this letter from the land of Beulah, of which I have been for some weeks a happy inhabitant. The celestial city is fill in my view. Its glories beam upon me, its odors are wafted to me, its sounds strike upon my ears, and its spirit is breathed into my heart. Nothing separates me from it but the river of death, which now appears but as an insignificant rill, that may be crossed at a single step whenever God shall give permission. The Son of Righteousness has gradually been drawing nearer and nearer, appearing larger and brighter as he approached, and now he fills the whole hemisphere, pouring forth a flood of glory, in which I seem to float like an insect in the beams of the sun; exulting, yet almost trembling, while I gaze on this excessive brightness, and wondering, with unutterable wonder, why God should deign thus to shine upon a silful worm. A single heart and a single tongue seem altogether inadequate to my wants. I want a whole heart for every separate emotion, and a whole tongue to express that emotion.”

Among his uncommon intellectual powers, a rich, philosophical, and consecrated imagination was the most conspicuous. Without any of the graces of the orator. his preaching had the most vivid eloquence of truth and feeling. In his prayers especially there was a solemnity, fullness, originality, variety, pathos, and sublimity seldom equaled. His eloquent address to the Bible Society has been published as one of the tracts of the American Tract Society. He published a discourse on the Worth of the Bible, an Address to Seamen, and a Thanksgiving Sermon. A memoir of his Life, by Dr. Asa Cummings, was published (2d ed. 1830); also a volume of Sermons (1828, 8vo); another volume (1831. 12mo); another, to families (1833). In 1859 Dr. Payson's Complete Works were brought out at Philadelphia. with the memoir by Cummings (3 vols. 8vo). The North British Review (Nov. 1859), in noticing this edition, takes occasion to say of Dr. Payson: “To a close and familiar acquaintance with the Scriptures,  he added great breadth of intellect and varied literary attainments. Intimate knowledge of the human conscience was joined to massiveness of thought vouching the ways of God to man. In several of the sermons we have again and again had suggested to us one in whom these features found an almost perfect expression-the late Edward Irving... We are not acquainted with any recent work in practical theology which better deserves a place in the library of every Christian gentleman and minister than this edition of the memoir and works of Dr. Payson.” We regret to say that the edition of Dr. Payson's life and works is now exhausted. They should certainly be reissued in a more popular and abridged form, so as to have a wide circulation among ministers and Christians of all denominations. The Rev. E. L. Janes, of the Methodist Episcopal Church, has done a good work in extracting from the volumes referred to some of their choice gems, and giving a very concise view of the salient points of his character and ministry. In the absence of the large volumes, this book (N.Y. 1872, 8vo) may be read with great profit. See also Sprague. Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:503; Allen, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; Dr. Levi R. Dunn, in Christian Advocate, 1872; Our Pastor, or Reminiscences of Rev. E. Payson, D.D., by one of his flock (Boston, 1855, 12mo); Sketches of Eloquent Preachers (1864, 12mo); Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2 s.v.

## Payson, Seth[[@Headword:Payson, Seth]]

             D.D., a Congregational minister, father of the preceding, was born in September, 1758. He graduated at Harvard College in 1777, and was ordained pastor at Rindge, N. H., December, 1782. He was made D.D. by Dartmouth College in 1809, and trustee in 1813; and in 1819 was one of a committee to choose a site for Williams College, about to be removed. Immediately after finishing this duty, he was taken sick, and died Feb. 26, 1820. Dr. Payson published “Proofs of the Existence and dangerous Tendency of modern Illuminism” (1802), and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, Annnals of the American Pulpit, 2:209.

## Paz[[@Headword:Paz]]

             SEE GOLD.

## Pazmany, Peter[[@Headword:Pazmany, Peter]]

             a Hungarian cardinal, was born Oct. 4, 1570, at Grosswardein. At the age of thirteen he was converted to Romanism, and shortly after entered the Order of the Jesuits, and taught theology at Gritz. In 1607 he returned to his own country, and devoted himself from that time to combating the progress of Protestantism. Joining to an enchanting eloquence the most charming manners, he succeeded well in his efforts. Appointed in 1616 archbishop of Gran, he used his position as primate of the kingdom to elect to the throne, in 1618, Ferdinand, archduke of Austria. In 1632 he returned to Rome, to negotiate the mediation of pope Urban VIII in favor of the establishment of peace. Three years previously he had been appointed cardinal. He died at Presburg March 19,1637. Pazmany spent more than half a million of florins in founding institutions of learning, such as the University of Tyrnau, which, transported to Pesth, still exists; the Pazmaneum, at Vienna, etc. He wrote in Latin and Hungarian; the latter tongue he used to better advantage and with greater purity than any of his contemporaries. Fifteen works of his are polemic and devotional, and among these we will quote, Hodegus, seu dux ad veritatenm, in quo ostenditur vanitas sectarum Catholicae fidei adversantium (Pesth, 1813, 3 vols. fol.): — Conciones in Evangelia omniumn ominicarum (1636 and 1767, fol.). See Horanyi, Memor ice Hungarorum, vol. iii; Podhradezkv, Life of Paznmany, in Hungarian (Buda, 1836).

## Pazzi, Cosmo[[@Headword:Pazzi, Cosmo]]

             an Italian prelate, was born at Florence in 1467, and was on his mother's side a descendant of the Medicis. He was provided by pope Alexander VI with a canonicate in the church of Olron, in France, and soon after with its episcopal chair, of which he never took possession. The Florentines had already sent him, Sept. 14, 1496, to the emperor Maximilian to mediate concerning the war of Pisa and the league of Italy. On his return he was elected, April 17, 1497, bishop of Arezzo, and he renounced his pretensions to the seat of Oleron. Alexander VI charged him with a diplomatic commission to Spain, and then to France. Pope Julius II transferred him to the archbishopric of Florence, July 5, 1508, and premature death alone deprived Him of the purple, to which he would certainly have been raised by his maternal uncle, Leo X. Pazzi died at Florence April 9, 1515. He first became known by a Latin translation, the Dissertations of Maximus of Tyre. Three editions of this translation  (Rome, 1517; Basle, 1519; Paris, 1554, fol.) preceded the publication of the original Greek text brought out by Estienne at Paris (1517, 8vo). The translation of Pazzi was published under the editorship of his brother, Pierre Pazzi. See Italia Sacra, 1:431; 2:182; Hist. de la Noblesse du Comtat Venaissin, vol. ii, s.v.; Combes-Dounous, Dissertations de Maxime de Tyr (Introd.).

## Pazzi, Pietro Antonio[[@Headword:Pazzi, Pietro Antonio]]

             an Italian engraver, was born at Florence in 1706. It is not known under whom he studied, but he executed many plates of portraits and other subjects, after the Italian masters, which are held in estimation. His works are to be found in the Museo Florentino, Museo Capitolino, and the Museo Etrusco. Among them the following are of interest to us: The Holy Family (after L. Cabiasi); The Assumption of the Virgin (after Raffaelle); The Virgin and Infant Christ (after Vandyck); St. Zanobi resuscitating a dead Person (after Betti); St. Philip refusing the Popedom (id.); A Sibyl (after Crespi).

## Pe(a)Cock, Reginald (Or Reynald)[[@Headword:Pe(a)Cock, Reginald (Or Reynald)]]

             a learned and worthy English prelate, was born in Wales about 1390, and was educated at Oxford, where he became fellow of Oriel College. He took holy orders, and, after filling minor appointments, became successively bishop of St. Asaph and Chichester, by the favor of Humphrey, the good duke of Gloucester. He labored most earnestly for the conversion of the Lollards, by the use of candid arguments; but his moderation turned the Romanists against him, and he was deposed for resisting the papal authority and denying transubstantiation, with other articles of the Roman Catholic faith. He was obliged to recant his notions, and his books were publicly burned; after which he was confined in Thorney Abbey, where he died in 1460. He was the author of a number of works, of which those not destroyed remain in MS., except his Treatise of Faith, which was published by Wharton in 1688; and Repressor of overmuch Blaming of the Clergy (1860), which may be compared to Locke's Reasonableness of Christianity. It is an appeal to reason, but is not open to the charge of Deism. His life was written by the Rev. John Lewis (1744), and it is a sequel to the life of Wickliffe. “It forms a fitting introduction to the history of the English Reformation.” See Hardwick, Church History of the Middle Ages, p. 395, 396; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, lect. iii; Hallam, Lit. Hist. of Europe; Lond. Athen. 1860, 1:878; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vol. 8:s.v. Pecock; Lewis, Life of R. Peacock (1744).

## Peabody, David[[@Headword:Peabody, David]]

             a Congregational minister, was born April 16, 1805, in Topsfield, Mass. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1828; entered the ministry April, 1831. and was ordained pastor of the First Church, Lynn, Mass., November, 1832. from which charge he was, however, soon dismissed, on account of ill-health. He became pastor of the Calvinist Church, Worcester, July 15, of the following year. In 1838 he accepted the professorship of rhetoric at Dartmouth College, but died the next year, Oct. 17, 1839. Mr. Peabody published A Memoir of Horace Bassett Morse (1830): — A Discourse on the Conduct of Men considered in Contrast with the Law of God (1836): — A Sermon on the Sin of Covetousness considered in respect to Intemperance, Indian Oppression, etc. (1838): — The Patriarch of Hebron, or the History of Abraham (1841); and wrote a number of valuable articles for the Amer. Biblical Repository. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:744; Dr. Lord's Sermon on his death.

## Peabody, Ephraim[[@Headword:Peabody, Ephraim]]

             D.D., a Unitarian divine of distinction, was born at Wilton, N. H., in 1807, and was educated at Bowdoin College, class of 1827. He subsequently studied theology at Cambridge, and in 1831 became pastor of a Unitarian  Church at Cincinnati. In 1838 he removed to New Bedford, Conn., as pastor of a Unitarian congregation, and in 1846 accepted a call to the pastorate of King's Chapel. He died in 1846. During his lifetime he published a number of addresses, essays, and sermons; also several review articles. After his death appeared Sermons, with a Memoir by S. A. Elliot (Boston, 1857, 12mo): — Christian Days and Thoughts (1858, 12mo, and often; London, 1868, fcp. 8vo). Dr. Peabody also wrote a number of poems. He was a pious man, and practical in his purposes. He displayed a fertile yet chastened imagination, and vigorous expression in all his writings, and they therefore impress the reader. Favorable notices were given of his works, not only in this country, but also in Europe. See Lond. A then. 1840, p. 626; Westm. Rev. Oct. 1857; North Amer. Rev. July, 1857, p. 278, 521.

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

             an American merchant, whose name deserves to be held in remembrance on account of his munificent philanthropy, was born at Danvers, Mass., Feb. 18, 1795. His parents were poor, and his only education was received at the district school. At the age of eleven he was placed with a grocer, and at fifteen in a haberdasher's shop in Newburyport. When twenty-two years old, he was a partner with Elisha Riggs in Baltimore. In 1827 he went to England to buy merchandise, and to transact financial business for the State of Maryland. In 1837 he permanently removed to London, and in 1843 became a banker. He accumulated a large fortune, but did not forget his humble origin or place of birth. In 1852, on the two hundredth anniversary of the settlement of his native town, he sent home $20,000 to found an educational institute and library, a sum which he afterwards increased to $60,000, with $10,000 to North Danvers. He also contributed $10,000 to the first Grinnell Arctic Expedition, $500,000 to the city of Baltimore for an institute of science, literature, and the fine arts; and in 1863, on retiring from active business in London, he made the splendid donation of £150,000 sterling for the benefit of the poor of London, and in 1866 enlarged this donation by another contribution of £150,000. He also gave to Harvard University $150,000 for a museum, etc.; and in 1867 devoted $2,000,000 to found common schools in the Southern States. He died in London, Nov. 4, 1869. His adopted country honored his remains in many ways, and his native country honored itself by sending a government ship of war to convey the body of this philanthropist to the place of his birth for interment. Great Britain, however, would not suffer any but one of her  own ships to take the remains from her country, and the transportation consequently took place in the British man-of-war Monarch.

## Peabody, Oliver[[@Headword:Peabody, Oliver]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in 1698 at Boxford, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1721, and was immediately employed by the commissioners for propagating the Gospel to preach at Natick (1721). There were then but two families of white people in the town. The Indian Church, which the apostolic Eliot had founded, was now extinct, the Indian preacher, Tahhowompait, having died in 1716; and all records were lost. A new Church was formed, Dec. 3, 1729, consisting of three Indians and five white persons, and Peabody was ordained at Cambridge, Dec. 17. Through his influence many of the Indians were induced to abandon savage life, and to attend to husbandry as the means of subsistence. He had the happiness of seeing many of the Indian families with comfortable houses, cultivated fields, and flourishing orchards. But his chief aim was to teach them the religion of Jesus Christ. There were added to the Church in the first year twenty-two persons, several of whom were Indians; in July, 1743, he stated that in the two preceding years about fifty had been received into the Church. Against the vice of intemperance among the Indians he set himself with great zeal and much success. Altogether during his residence at Natick he baptized one hundred and eighty-nine Indians and four hundred and twenty-two whites; and he received into the Church thirty-five Indians and thirty whites; and there died two hundred and fifty-six Indians, one of whom was a hundred and ten years old. During one season he went on a mission to the Mohicans. He died in great peace. Feb. 2. 1752. Mr. Peabody was eminently pious, and greatly beloved and lamented. He published Artillery Election Sermon (1732): — On a Good and Bad Hope of Salvation (1742). See Panoplist, 7:49-56; Allen, Amer. Biogr. s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 1:318.

## Peabody, William Bourn Oliver[[@Headword:Peabody, William Bourn Oliver]]

             D.D., a Unitarian clergyman, was born at Exeter, N. H., July 9, 1799. He entered Harvard University in 1813, and after graduation also studied theology at Cambridge. He was ordained to preach in Springfield Oct. 12,1820. He was a preacher of so-called liberal doctrines, but he avoided controversy, and sought only to do good. In 1823 he published a Poetical Catechism for the Young. Several pieces were subjoined to this catechism,  including the hymn found in some of our principal collections entitled Autumn Evening — “Behold the western evening sky.” Dr. Peabody's tastes extended over a wide field, including poetry, biography, theology, and natural history. In 1839 he supplied the account of the birds in the report of the survey of the State of Massachusetts. Besides biographical review articles, he wrote several lives in Jared Sparks's “American Biography.” He died May 28,1847. See Christian Examiner, 46:129; Wilson, in Sparks, Amer. Biogr. (S. S.)

## Peace[[@Headword:Peace]]

             The Hebrew word שָׁלוֹב, shalom, usually translated peace, means, properly, health, prosperity, welfare. It is the same as the salam of the modern Arabs, and is in like manner used in salutations (q.v.). The Greek εἰρήνη from having been frequently used as a rendering of the Heb. word, naturally passed over in the same sense into the N.T.

Accordingly “peace” is a word used in Scripture in different senses. Generally it denotes quiet and tranquillity, public or private; but often prosperity and happiness of life; as to “go in peace;” to “die in peace;” “God give you peace;” “Peace be within this house;” “Pray for the peace of Jerusalem.” Paul in the titles of his Epistles generally wishes grace and peace to the faithful, to whom he writes. Our Savior recommends to his disciples to have peace with all men, and with each other. God promises his people to water them as with a river of peace (Isa 66:12), and to make with them a covenant of peace (Eze 34:25).

Peace, properly, is that state of mind in which persons are exposed to no open violence to interrupt their tranquillity.

1. Social peace is mutual agreement one with another, whereby we forbear injuring one another (Psa 34:14; Psalms 132).

2. Ecclesiastical peace is freedom from contentions, and rest from persecutions (Isa 11:13; Isa 32:17; Rev 12:14).

3. Spiritual peace is deliverance from sin, by which we were at enmity with God (Rom 5:1); the result is peace in the conscience (Heb 10:22). This peace is the gift of God through Jesus Christ (2Th 3:16). It is a blessing of great importance (Psa 119:165). It is denominated perfect (Isa 26:3); inexpressible  (Php 4:7); permanent (Job 34:29; Joh 16:22); eternal (Isa 57:2; Heb 4:9). SEE HAPPINESS.

## Peace Of God[[@Headword:Peace Of God]]

             SEE PAX.

## Peace Societies[[@Headword:Peace Societies]]

             SEE WAR.

## Peace, Kiss Of[[@Headword:Peace, Kiss Of]]

             SEE KISS.

## Peace-offering[[@Headword:Peace-offering]]

             (fully, זֶבִח שְׁלָמַים, also simply: שְׁלָמַים[but this sometimes in a singular sense, as Eze 45:15; comp. Lev 7:14; Lev 9:22, etc.], once merely the sing. שֶׁלֶם, Amo 5:22; Sept. usually εἰρηνικὴ ῾θυσία], also σωτήριον or , θυσία σωτηρίου; Vulg. victima pacifica, or simply pacificum), a voluntary sacrifice offered by the pious Jews in token of gratitude — thank-offering (hence Josephus calls it χαριστήριος [θυσία], Ant. 3:9, 1 sq.; comp. 19:6, 1). These sacrifices, which are often mentioned in connection with burnt offerings (Exo 20:24; Exo 24:5; Lev 3:5; Jos 8:31; 1Ki 3:15, etc.), consisted of spotless (yet see Lev 22:23) neat or small cattle of either sex (Lev 3:1; Lev 3:6; Lev 9:4; Lev 9:18; Lev 22:21; Lev 23:19; see Joseph. Ant, 3:9, 2; comp. Exo 24:5; 1Ki 8:63), and were offered, along with meat- offerings and drink-offerings (in the same manner as burnt-offerings), either by individuals or in the name of the people. The latter was customary on occasions of festive inauguration (Exo 24:5; 2Sa 6:17 sq.; 1Ki 8:63; Eze 43:27; comp. 1Ma 4:56); on the election of kings (1Sa 11:15); and upon the fortunate issue of important enterprises (Deu 27:7; Jos 8:31); but they were expressly prescribed at the Feast of Pentecost (the young lambs, Lev 23:19).

Private peace offerings were the result of free impulse (נְדָבוֹת), or in fulfillment of a vow (Lev 7:16; Lev 22:21; Num 15:8), so regularly at the expiration of a Nazaritish vow (Num 6:14), and were often determined upon in consequence of a special favor received from Jehovah (thank-offering, fully זֶבִח תּוֹדִת שְׁלָמַים,-or more briefly זֶבִח הִתּוֹדָה, or simply תּוֹדָה, θυσία αἰγέσεως, Lev 7:12; Lev 22:29). The festivals were honored by peace-offerings (Num 10:10; 2Ch 30:22). Solomon arranged three times a year a  sacrificial festival of burnt-offerings and drink-offerings (1Ki 9:25). All peace-offerings were to be presented with imposition of hands (Lev 3:2; Lev 8:13); only the fat parts (which in the case of cattle and goats consisted of the fat covering the inwards [omentum], all the fat of the inwards [between them], the kidneys with the fat connected with them [leaf-fat], the fat on the thigh-muscles, and finally the large lobe of the liver; in the case of a lamb, of the fat tail [“rump”] and the inside fat; see Josephus, Ant. 3:9, 2; comp. Biahr, Symbol. 3:353 sq.) were burned on the altar (Lev 3:3; Leviticus cf., 9; Leviticus cf., 14 sq.; oomp. 4:9 sq., 26; 6:12; Amo 5:22), and the blood was sprinkled around the altar (Lev 3:2; Lev 7:14; Lev 9:18; Lev 17:6; 2Ki 16:13). The remainder of the flesh belonged, in the peace-offerings of the Pentecost and the other public occasions, to the priests (Lev 23:20); in the case of private offerings, the priests were entitled to the breast and shoulder (Num 6:20; comp. Exo 29:27; Lev 7:31; Lev 10:14), which were the heave- offering and the wave-offering (Lev 7:30; Lev 7:34; Lev 9:21; Num 6:20), and the rest was used by the offerer in joyful meals at the sanctuary (Lev 19:6 sq.; Lev 22:30; Deu 12:17 sq.; Deu 27:7; comp. Jer 33:11).

Yet the whole must be consumed in the case of thank- offerings on the same day (Lev 7:15; Lev 22:29), or in other cases at farthest on the second day (Lev 7:16 sq.; comp. Lev 19:6); if anything remained on the third day it was to be burned. The reason of this last prescription is not to be sought so much in the intention of the lawgiver to set a limit to the feasting, as in the design that the flesh of the offering, instead of being dried and preserved (comp. Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 3:159), should really be employed for the meals at the time. Bahr (Symbol. 2:374 sq.) has not fairly met the point, since putrefaction, which he assigns as the ground of the objection to the retention to the third day (פַּגּוּל, Lev 7:18; Lev 19:7), might be obviated in the mode suggested, as in the modern East. A special rule respecting thank-offerings proper was that, in addition to a slice of leavened dough, unleavened sacrificial cakes (see on the contrary Amo 4:5) must be presented, of which, however, only one belonged to Jehovah, while the remainder went to the priest (Lev 7:12 sq.). But these cakes were deposited in a basket only in the peace-offerings attendant upon a Nazaritish vow (Num 6:15 sq.). The Mishna adds but little to the Biblical ordinances. The Pentecostal peace-offerings were reckoned among the most sacred offerings, in comparison with which all the other pacificat are of trifling esteem. The pieces of the flesh (cooked or roasted) might be eaten anywhere in the  Holy City, and in the enjoyment of the portions of the offering allotted to the priests, their wives, children, and slaves also might share (see Zebach. v. 5 sq.). The quantity of meal to be used in making the thank-offering cakes is prescribed (Menach. 7:1). SEE OFFERING.

The שְׁלָמַיםwere, according to etymology and definition, compensation offerings (from שַׁלֵּם, to requite), i.e. such as, so to speak, repaid Jehovah by way of thanks, praise, or vow, and hence had (especially in the repasts which were peculiar to these sacrifices, Josephus, Ant. 3:9, 1) the character of cheerfulness and joy (see 1Sa 11:15; comp. Baihr, Symbol. 2:368 sq.). This signification, however, as a token of gratitude, sometimes becomes obscure (1Sa 13:9), and occasionally disappears altogether (Jdg 20:26; Jdg 21:4; 2Sa 24:25). In the first instance, just cited, the offering in question was presented before a military undertaking; in the three others it followed a public calamity. The two-fold import of the שְׁלָמַיםis reconciled by the statement of Philo (Opp. 2:244) and the Rabbins (see Outram, De Sacrif. p. 108), that they were offered for a deliverance to be obtained, as well as for one already secured; and thus the Israelitish system of offerings did not lack precatory sacrifices. But that the last-named character altogether belonged to the שְׁלָמֵי נֶדֶרand שְׁלָמֵי תוֹדָה, is not only improbable from the nature of the case, but also from the signification of the term תּוֹדָה, thank-offering, itself; although in some instances (as 2Sa 24:25) the peace-offering had that significance. On the other hand, the other passages cited above, in which שְׁלָמַיםwere offered after a public misfortune, are explainable upon no theory of this kind of sacrifice hitherto adduced, and we are left to conclude that they were irregularly introduced during the ritual confusion of the period of the Judges. See generally Reland, Antiq. Sacr. p. 317 sq.; Outram, De Sacrif. I, ii; Scholl, in the Stud. d. Wurtemb. Geistl. V, 1:108 sq. SEE THANK- OFFERING.

## Peacham, Henry[[@Headword:Peacham, Henry]]

             an English writer who in early life was intending to enter the ministry, but finally became a traveling teacher, is supposed to have been tutor in the  earl of Arundel's family. He was reduced to poverty in his old age, and wrote for bread. He published in early life a Sermon upon the last Three Verses of the First Chapter of Job (Lond. 1590, 16mo). But he is principally known to readers of polite literature. Among his publications are some complimentary poems, The Gentleman's Exercise, intended as a treatise on art; Minerva Britannica, a collection of emblems in verse, illustrated with plates; and The Complete Gentleman. This latter work is the one for which he was most celebrated, and it has been frequently reprinted. He died about 1640. See Chambers, Cyclop. of Engl. Literature; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth.

## Peacock[[@Headword:Peacock]]

             It is a question, perhaps, more of geographical and historical than of Biblical interest to decide whether תֻּכַּיַּים. (tukkiyim; Sept. ταῶνες; Vulg. parni. 1Ki 10:22, also written תּוּכַיַּים, 2Ch 9:21) denotes peacocks strictly so called, or some other species of animal or bird; for on the solution of the question in the affirmative depends the real direction of Solomon's fleet; that is, whether, after passing the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, it proceeded along the east coast of Africa towards Sofala, or whether it turned eastward, ranging along the Arabian and Persian shores to the peninsula of India, and perhaps weirt onwards to Ceylon, and penetrated to the great Australian, or even to the Spice Islands. Bochart, unable to discover a Hebrew root in tukyim, rather arbitrarily proposes a transposition of letters by which he converts the word into Cuthyim, denoting, as he supposes, the country of the Cuthei, which, in an extended sense, is applied, in conformity with various writers of antiquity, to Media and Persia; and Greek authorities show that peacocks abounded in Babylonia, etc. (See AElian, Anim. 13:18; Curtius, 9:1, 13; Diod. Sic. 2:53. Peacocks are called “Persian birds” by Aristophanes, Aves, 484; see also Acharn. 63.)

This mode of proceeding to determine the species and the native country of the bird is altogether inadmissible, since Greek writers speak of Persian peacocks at a much later period than the age of Solomon; and it is well known that they were successively carried westward till they passed from the Greek islands into Europe, and that, as Juno's birds the Romans gradually spread them to Gaul and Spain, where, however, they were not common until after the 10th century. They do not occur on the Assyrian or Egyptian monuments. But even if peacocks had been numerous in Media and Northern Persia at  the time in question, how were they to be furnished to a fleet which was navigating the Indian Ocean, many degrees to the south of the colder region of High Asia? and as for the land of the Cuthei, or of Cush, when it serves their purpose writers remove it to Africa along with the migrations of the Cushites. The tukkyim have been presumed to derive their appellation from an exotic word implying “tufted” or “crested,” which, though true of the peacock, is not so obvious a character as that afforded by its splendid tail; and therefore a crested parrot has been supposed to be meant: so Hudt (Diss. de Nav. Psalms 7, § 6) and one or two others. Parrots, though many species are indigenous in Africa, do not appear to have existed in ancient Egypt; they were unknown till the time of Alexander, and then both Greeks and Romans were acquainted only with species from Ceylon, destitute of crests, such as Psittacus Alexandri (see Antiphanes in Athen. 14:654; Horace, Sat. 2:2, 23; and esp. Bochart, Hieroz. 2:709 sq.); and the Romans for a long time received these only by way of Alexandria, though in the time of Pliny others became known. Keil (Diss. de Ophir, p. 104, and Comment. on 1Ki 10:22), with a view to support his theory that Tarshish is the old Phoenician Tartessus in Spain, derives the Hebrew name from Tucca, a town of Mauretania and Numidia, and concludes that the Aves Aumidicae (Guinea-fowls) are meant: which birds, however, in spite of their name, never existed in Numidia, nor within a thousand miles of that country. Again, the pheasant has been proposed as the bird intended; but Phas. Colchicus, the only species known in antiquity, is likewise without a prominent crest, and is a bird of the colder regions of the central range of Asiatic mountains. Following a line of latitude, it gradually reached westward to High Armenia and Colchis, whence it was first brought to Europe by Greek merchants, who frequented the early emporium on the Phasis. The center of existence of the genus, rich in splendid species, is in the woody region beneath the snowy peaks of the Himalayas, reaching also eastward to Northern China, where the common pheasant is abundant, but not, we believe, anywhere naturally in a low latitude. (Other interpretations are supported in Hase's Biblioth. Brem. 2:468 sq.; Ugolino, Thesaur. vii.)

All versions and comments agree that after the Cebi or apes (probably Cercopithecus Eantellus, one of the sacred species of India), some kind of remarkable bird is meant; and none are more obviously entitled to the application of the name than the peacock, since it is abundant in the jungles of India, and would be met with, both wild and domesticated, by  navigators to the coasts from Camboge to Ceylon, and would better than any of the others bear a long sea voyage in the crowded ships of antiquity. Moreover, we find it still denominated togei in the Malabaric dialects of the country, which may be the source of thuki, as well as of the Arabic tawas and Armenian taus. Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1502) cites many authorities to prove that the tucci is to be traced to the Tamul or Malabaric toyei, “peacock;” which opinion has recently been confirmed by Sir E. Tennent (Ceylon, 2:102, and i, p. 20, 3d ed.), who says, “It is very remarkable that the terms by which these articles (ivory, apes, and peacocks) are designated in the Hebrew Scriptures are identical with the Tamil names, by which some of them are called in Ceylon to the present day — tukeyim may be recognized in tokei, the modern name for these birds.” Thus Keil's objection “that this supposed togei is not vet itself sufficiently ascertained” (Comment. on 1Ki 10:22) is satisfactorily met. With regard to the objection that the long ocellated feathers of the rump, and not those of the tail, as is commonly believed, are the most conspicuous object offered by this bird, it may be, answered that if the name togei be the original, it may not refer to a tuft, or may express both the erectile feathers on the head of a bird and those about the rump or the tail; and that those of the peacock have at all times been sought to form artificial crests for human ornaments. One other point remains to be considered, namely, whether the fleet went to the East, or proceeded southward along the African shore? No doubt, had the Phoenician trade guided the Hebrews in the last-mentioned direction, gold and apes might have been obtained on the east coast of Africa, and even some kinds of spices in the ports of Abyssinia; for all that region, as far as the Strait of Madagascar, was at that early period in a state of comparative affluence and civilization. But in that case a great part of the commercial produce would have been obtained within the borders of the Red Sea, and beyond the Strait; the distance to be traversed, therefore, being but partially affected by the monsoons, never could have required a period of three years for its accomplishment; and a prolonged voyage round the Cape to the Guinea and Gold Coast is an assumption so wild that it does not merit serious consideration; but intending to proceed to India, the fleet had to reach the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb in time to take advantage of the western monsoon; be in port, perhaps at or near Bombay, before the change; and after the storms accompanying the change it had to proceed during the eastern monsoon under the lee of the land to Coodramalli, or the port of Palesimundus in Taprobana, on the east coast of Ceylon; thence to the Coromandel shore, perhaps to the site of the  present ruins of Mahabalipuram; while the return voyage would again occupy one year and a half. The ports of India and Ceylon could furnish gold, precious stones, Eastern spices, and even Chinese wares; for the last fact is fully established by discoveries in very ancient Egyptian tombs. Silks, which are first mentioned in Pro 31:22, could not have come from Africa, and many articles of advanced and refined social life, not the produce of Egypt, could alone have been derived from India. SEE OPHIR.

Though in this short abstract of the arguments respecting the direction of Solomon's fleet there may be errors, none, we believe, are of sufficient weight to impugn the general conclusion which supports the usual rendering of tukyim by “peacocks;” although the increase of species in the West does not appear to have been remarkable till some ages after the reign of the great Hebrew monarch, when the bird was dedicated to Juno, and reared at first in her temple at Samos. There are only two species of true peacocks, viz. that under consideration, which is the Pavo cristatus of Linn.; and another, Pavo Muticus, more recently discovered, which differs in some particulars, and originally belongs to Japan and China. Peacocks bear the cold of the Himalayas; they run with great swiftness, and where they are serpents do not abound, as they devour the young with great avidity, and, it is said, attack with spirit even the cobra de capello when grown to considerable size, arresting its progress and confusing it by the rapidity and variety of their evolutions around it, till, exhausted with fatigue, it is struck on the head and dispatched. The ascription of the quality of vanity to the peacock is as old as the time of Aristotle, who says (Hist. An. 1:1, § 15), “Some animals are jealous and vain like the peacock.”

The A.V. in Job 39:13, speaks of “the goodly wings of the peacocks;” but there the Hebrew words are different (כְּנִ רְנָנַים נֵֶעלָסָה, the wing of the renanim is lifted up, or flutters joyously), and have undoubted reference to the “ostrich” (q.v.). SEE ADRAMMELECH.

PEACOCK in Christian symbolism was an emblem of the resurrection. It is well known that this bird loses its brilliant plumes every year at the approach of winter (“annuis vicibus,” as Pliny expresses it, Hist. Nat. 10:22), and renews them in spring, when nature seems to reissue from the tomb. Hence interpreters of Christian archeology regard this bird as an  unequivocal type of the resurrection (Bosio, Sotl. p. 641; compare Aringhi, Rom. subter. c. 36, p. 612); although Mamachi (Antiq. Christ. 3:92) observes that this opinion rests solely upon the authority of the fathers. Anthony of Padua has made the same representation (Serm. fer. 5 post Trinit.). St. Augustine finds another token of the resurrection in the incorruptibility which his age attributed to the flesh of the peacock (De Civit. Dei, 21:4). These references are corroborated by the figures of this bird found in early Roman cemeteries. We figure one of these from the cemetery of Sts. Marcellin and Peter (Bottari, vol. 2, pl. 97), of a peacock rising from a globe as an emblem of this world. For others, see Boldetti (Civit. p. 163), Lupi (Dissert. II, 1:204); D'Agincourt (Peinture, pl. 2, No. 9), Polidori (Sopra alcuni sepolcri, etc., p. 57).

## Peah[[@Headword:Peah]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Peal, James G.[[@Headword:Peal, James G.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was a native of England; was converted while young; and enlisted as a soldier in May, 1805, and afterwards served in Spain, Portugal, and Germany. During nine years' service he preached much to the soldiers, and formed a considerable society. In 1815 the royal staff corps, to which he belonged, came to Halifax, and thence to Coteau-du-Lac, Lower Canada. Here he was discharged by the governor with honor, that he might enter the itinerant ministry, which he did in 1818, as a member of the Genesee Conference, and labored with much acceptability and usefulness until his death, Dec. 25, 1822. He was a faithful and devoted man, and died from exposure undergone in the duties of his work. The most prominent traits of his character were zeal, firmness, and perseverance in the discharge of his duties. See Minutes of Conferences, 1:405; Conable, Hist. of the Genesee Conference (N.Y. 1875, 8vo), p. 201, 202.

## Pear, Prickly[[@Headword:Pear, Prickly]]

             SEE THORN.

## Pearce, Samuel[[@Headword:Pearce, Samuel]]

             an English Baptist divine, was born at Plymouth July 20, 1766. In 1786 he became a student at Bristol College, and was there converted. He was called to the pastorate of Cannon Street Baptist Church, in Birmingham, in 1790, on recommendation of Robert Hall, who had been one of his tutors. He was one of the founders of the Baptist Missionary Society at Kettering in 1792, and shortly after offered himself as one of its missionaries to India. But as his ministry had been almost one continual revival of religion, and his counsel seemed necessary in the successful management of the society, he was dissuaded from going. He died of consumption Oct. 10,1799. Samuel Pearce was the author of several hymns, of which those entitled Hymn in a Storm and In the Floods of Tribulation have found their way into several collections. He also published, Corporation and Test Acts Exposed (1790, 8vo), and Sermons (Lond. 1791, 8vo). His memoirs were published by Andrew Fuller in 1800, and have passed through numerous editions in England and America. “There have been few men,” says Fuller, “in whom has been united a greater portion of the contemplative and the active; holy zeal and genuine candor; spirituality and rationality; talents that attracted almost universal applause, yet the most unaffected modesty;  faithfulness in bearing testimony against evil, with the tenderest compassion to the soul of the evil-doer; fortitude that would encounter any difficulty in the way of duty, without anything boisterous, noisy, or overbearing; deep seriousness with habitual cheerfulness; and a constant aim to promote the highest degree of piety in himself and others, with a readiness to hope the best of the lowest.” See, besides the Memoirs, Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Brown, Religious Cyclop. s.v.

## Pearce, Zachary[[@Headword:Pearce, Zachary]]

             D.D., an eminent British divine and scholar, and a prelate of the English Church, was born at London in 1690. He was the son of a distiller in Holborn, and went to Westminster Grammar School; thence he passed to Trinity College, Cambridge. where he obtained a fellowship. At Cambridge Pearce was best known as a polite classical scholar, and it was in 1716, before he took orders, that he published his edition of Cicero De Oratore. He inscribed it, at a friend's suggestion, to lord chief justice Parker, afterwards earl of Macclesfield, though he was not known to him, and this circumstance led to a friendship and patronage which were of the greatest use to him. The lord chief justice, being made lord chancellor soon after, took Mr. Pearce into his family as his domestic chaplain. Preferment now opened up to him. He was presented to the living of Stapleford Abbots in Essex, St. Bartholomew, near the Royal Exchange, and finally of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, London. The last appointment was in 1723. He was made dean of Winchester in 1739, in 1748 bishop of Bangor, and in 1756 bishop of Rochester, with the deanery of Westminster annexed. Bishop Pearce, though well fitted for the episcopal dignity, was a man of great modesty and humility, and as anxious to avoid preferments, and to resign them when forced upon him, as most men were to gain and hold them. His anxiety to retire from the high station to which he was thus involuntarily raised was so sincere, as well as strong, that at length, in 1768, the government yielded to his repeated request, and allowed him to resign the more valuable appointment, his deanery, in favor of Dr. Thomas; Pearce retaining, however, the bishopric, to the retiring from which there existed some objections of an ecclesiastical nature. He died at Little Eating Jan. 29, 1774. Bishop Pearce was as distinguished for his charity and munificence as for his learning. He enriched the Widow's College, in the immediate neighborhood of his palace at Bromley, by a donation of £5000. His tracts on theological subjects are numerous and valuable. Of these the principal  are, A Commentary on the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles (2 vols. 4to), greatly praised by Dr. Adam Clarke and other eminent Biblical scholars: — Letters to Dr. Conyers Middleton, in Defence of Dr. Waterland: — A Reply to Woolston on the Miracles; of which Leland says that it was a work deservedly much esteemed: — A Review of the Text of Milton: — and an edition of Longinus On the Sublime, with a Latin translation annexed; and another of Cicero's Offices; also, four volumes of Sermons, etc. See his Life prefixed to his Commentary; Jones, Christ. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v.; Perry, Hist. of the Church of England, 3:331, 333.

## Pearl[[@Headword:Pearl]]

             (גָּבַישׁ, gabish, from a root which in the Arabic means to freeze, but in the Chaldee to collect; Sept. merely Graecizes, γαβίς; Vulg. eminentia). The Heb. word occurs, in this form, only in Job 28:18, where the price of wisdom is contrasted with that of ramdth (“coral”) and gabish; and the same word, with the prefixed syllable el (אֶל), is found in Eze 13:11; Eze 13:13; Eze 38:22, with abne, “stones,” i.e. “stones of ice” (A.V. “hailstones”). The ancient versions contribute nothing by way of explanation. Schultens (Comnment. on Job, l.c.) leaves the word untranslated: he gives the signification of “pearls” to the Heb. term pennim (A.V. “rubies”) which occurs in the same verse. Gesenius, Furst, Rosenmüller, Maurer, and commentators generally, understand “crystal” by the term, on account of its resemblance to ice. Lee (Comment. on Job, l.c.) translates ramoth ve-gabish, “things high and massive.” Carey renders gabish by “mother-of-pearl,” though he is by no means content with this explanation. On the whole, the balance of probability is in favor of “crystal,” since gabish denotes “ice” (not “hailstones,” as Carey supposes, without the addition of abne, “stones”) in the passages of Ezekiel where the word occurs. There is nothing to which ice can be so well compared as to crystal. The objection to this interpretation is that crystal is not an article of much value; but perhaps reference may here be made to the beauty and pure luster of rock crystal, or this substance may by the ancient Orientals have been held in high esteem. Pearls (μαργαρῖται), however, are frequently mentioned in the N.T.: comp. Mat 13:45-46, where the kingdom of heaven is likened unto “a merchantman seeking goodly pearls.” Pearls formed part of women's attire (1Ti 2:9; Rev 17:4). “The twelve gates” of the heavenly Jerusalem were twelve pearls (Rev 21:21); perhaps “mother-of-pearl” is here more especially intended. In Mat 7:6 pearls are used metaphorically for anything of value; or perhaps more especially for “wise sayings,” which in Arabic, according to Schultens (Harsiri Consess. 1:12; 2:102), are called pearls. See Parkhurst, Gr. Lex. s.v. Μαργαρίτης) Other words supposed by some to mean pearls (besides פְּנַינַיםabove) are בְּרֹלִח, bedolach (“bdellium,” Gen 2:12); and דִּר, dar (“white,” Est 1:6). See each in its place.

The above intimations seem to indicate that pearls were in more common use among the Jews after than before the Captivity, while they evince the estimation in which they were held in later times (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 9:54; 12:41; Elian, Anim. 10:13; comp. Ritter, Erdkunde, 2:164; Wellsted, Travels, 1:181 sq.). The island of Tylos (Bahrein) was especially renowned for its fishery of pearls (Pliny, 6:32; comp. Straboi xvi, p. 767; Athen. 3:93; Heeren, Ideen, I, 2:244 sq.); the Indian Ocean was also known to produce pearls (Arrian, Indica, p. 194; Pliny, 9:54; 34:48; Strabo, 15, p. 717). Heeren feels assured that this indication must be understood to refer to the strait between Taprobana, or Ceylon, and the southernmost point of the mainland of India, Cape Comorin, whence Europeans, even at present, derive their principal supplies of these costly natural productions (Ideen, I, 2:224). See further, Bochart, Hieroz. 3:601 sq.; Hartmann, Hebr. 3:84 sq.; Rosenmüller, Alterthum, IV, 2:458 sq.; Gesen. Thes. p. 24,1113.

The excessive passion for the use of pearls in decorative costume which prevails at the present day in the East is shown by the state costume of the shall of Persia. Sir Robert Ker Porter, describing it, mentions “the diamonds, pearls, rubies, and emeralds” of which the tiara is composed, “the pear-formed pearls of an immense size” with which the plumes are tipped; the “two strings of pearls, probably the largest in the world,” which crossed the king's shoulders; and the “large cushion encased in a network of pearls,” against which he reclined (Travels, 1:325). Sir Harford Brydges dilates on other objects: “The king's tippet . . . is a piece of pearl-work, of the most beautiful pattern; the pearls are worked on velvet, but they stand so close together that little, if any, of the velvet is visible. It took me an hour to examine this single article, which I have no fear in saying cannot be matched in the world. The tassel which on such occasions is appended to the state dagger is formed of pearls of the most uncommon size and  beauty; and the emerald which forms the top of the tassel is, perhaps, the largest perfect one in the world” (Mission to Persia, p. 383). Sir William Ousely, describing the “royal apparel” of Futteh Ali Shah, says: “Of the king's dress I could perceive that the color was scarlet, but to ascertain exactly the materials would have been difficult, from the profusion of large pearls that covered it in various places, and the multiplicity of jewels that sparkled all around; for the golden throne seemed studded at the sides with precious stones of every possible tint, and the back resernbled a sun of glory, of which the radiation was imitated by diamonds, garnets, emeralds, and rubies. Of such, also, was chiefly composed the monarch's ample and most splendid crown, and the two figures of birds that ornamented the throne, one perched on each of its beautiful enameled shoulders” (Travels, 3:131). From the immutability of custom in the East we are ready to conclude that the elements of this magnificence must have been common to the ancient Oriental courts. But there are some circumstances which seem to militate against the very great antiquity of the use of pearls, at least to an extravagant extent. The costume of the monarchs of Egypt, as depicted in the numerous paintings which have come down to us from their own times, is comparatively simple; the principal article of adornment which canl be called jewelry being the collar. This indeed was rich and elaborate, and seems to have been composed either of gold or of gems set in gold. Yet pearls do not seem, so far as we can judge from the representations, to have taken a prominent place in the construction of these or similar articles.

Many examples of ladies' jewelry, as necklaces, bracelets, and earrings, have been found in the tombs, and are preserved in the museums and cabinets of Europe. In these pearls are sometimes mounted, as well as gems; but their occurrence is by no means profuse. The discovery of Ninevite remains has made us comparatively familiar with the appearance and usages of the Assyrian court and people at a much later period than that of the Egyptian monuments. The portraits of successive monarchs have been exhumed, and numerous representations exist of royal costume. Generally this is gorgeous enough, but there is little evidence to show that pearls were much used in personal decoration. The circlets of the tiara, the ear-rings, necklaces, and collars, the armlets and bracelets, the sword and dagger hilts, all show the jeweller's art; but for the most part these objects were evidently wrought in gold. In settings and strings of gems do occur, but the angled and faceted forms of these almost invariably show that stones or imitations of stones are intended. According to Colonel Rawlinson's reading of the inscription on the Black Obelisk, however,  Temenbar received as “tribute from the kings of the Chaldees gold, silver, gems, and pearls.” What we think manifest from the evidence of Egyptian and Assyrian monuments is not the absolute lack of pearls in costume, but great moderation in the use of them. “A necklace of twenty-seven pearls” is mentioned in the Ramdyana (i, sect. 14), a Hindu poem of an antiquity probably at least as great as that of the Assyrian remains.

The possession of the rich pearl-banks in the Persian Gulf would naturally make the court of Shushan the chief depository of these elegant luxuries; and the taste for effeminate luxury in costume which has always distinguished that court, at least from Grecian times, would suggest the manner of appropriating them. We know that the fishery was actively prosecuted, both in the gulf and the Indian Ocean, in the time of Pliny and Strabo. The island called Tylos, the modern Bahrein, on the southern shore of the Persian Gulf, was the seat of the former, and that of the latter probably the strait between Ceylon and the shore of India; and these two constitute the chief sources of pearls to this day. From the Persian court the taste for pearls spread to that of the Ptolemies. Cleopatra, at a supper with Antony, of which Pliny has given us the details, took from her ear one of a pair of pearls of the value of £80,000 sterling — “the singular and only jewels of the world, and even nature's wonder;” and having dissolved it in vinegar, swallowed the absurdly precious draught; and would have done the same with its fellow had it not been rescued from her “pride and wanton trauverie.” From Egypt the fashion passed to Rome; and the degenerate descendants of the iron republicans rivaled even the Persian monarchs in their ambition to

——— “Wear The spoils, of nations in an ear, Chang'd for the treasure of a shell.”

Pliny's picture of a Roman lady is amusing enough, especially as seen through the glass of old Philemon Holland's translation: “I myselfe haue seen Lollia Paulina (late wife, and after widdow, to Caius Caligula the emperor), when she was dressed and set out, not in stately wise, nor of purpose for some great solemnity, but only when she was to go to a wedding supper, or rather unto a feast, when the assurance was made, and great persons they were not that made the said feast; I have seen her, I say, so beset and bedeckt all over with hemeraulds and pearles, disposed in rows, ranks, and courses one by another; round about the attire of her head, her cawle, her borders, her peruk of hair, her bond grace and chaplet; at her eares pendant about her neck in a carcanet, upon her wrest in  bracelets, and on her fingers in rings; that she glistened and shon again like the sun as she went. The value of these ornaments she esteemed and rated at four hundred thousand sestertii, and offered openly to prove it out of hand by her bookes of accounts and reckonings,” etc. Julius Caesar is reported to have presented Servilia, the mother of M. Brutus, with a pearl worth a quarter of a million of dollars; and Claudius, the son of AEsop the successful Roman actor, imitated and even exceeded the wanton folly of Cleopatra.

Pearls are accidental concretions of shelly matter deposited within the valves of certain bivalve Mollusca, of which the most celebrated species is the Avicula margaritifera, which is spread over the whole of the tropical parts of the Indian and Pacific oceans. In all bivalves the surface of the mantle has the power of depositing calcareous matter in thin layers, which hardening forms a shelly coat on the inner side of the valves, and in most species this lining has a pearly lustre. A pearl is nothing but an abnormal shell, reversed; that is to say, the nacreous coat is here external. The peculiar lustre of nacre is dependent on the fact that the surface is not perfectly smooth, but covered with the irregularly sinuous edges of innumerable layers of inconceivable thinness, which are deposited one over the other. The distance of these edges from each other varies indefinitely, the pearls of the finest water having them closest; they are always, however, too fine to be detected by the naked eye. These edges make so many steps, so to speak; and the iridescence is produced by the mutual interference of the rays of light reflected from these thousands of angles. For their water, or lustre, as distinguished from iridescence, pearls are indebted to their being composed of thin layers, which allow light to pass through them, while their numerous surfaces disperse and reflect the light in such a manner that it returns and mingles with that which is directly reflected from the exterior. The thinner and more transparent the constituent lavers, the more perfect is the lustre (Kelaart and Mobius, Annals of Nat. Hist. Feb. 1858). The immediate occasion of the production of a pearl appears to be always the presence of some extraneous substance, such as a grain of sand, an egg either of the mollusk or of some other animal, some parasitic intruder, or the silicious shell of one of the Diatomacece on which the oyster feeds. Hence pearls may be artificially educed by inserting foreign matters properly shaped and fastened inside the shell. Though pearl-fisheries have been established in various parts of the world, yet the most productive are still those which have been worked  from antiquity. The annual produce of the Bahrein bank — the ancient Tylos — is set down at $1,000,000. The fishery near Cape Comorin — probably the Perimula of Pliny — yielded to the British government (in 1867) a net revenue of 81,917 star-pagodas. That on the western coast of Ceylon is, however, stated to be the richest of all; it is a monopoly in the hands of the British government, but we have no statistics of its actual value. The fullest details of the pearl-fishery are those given of this last by Captain Percival (Hist. of Ceylon); by Dr. Kelaart in his Report of the same, and by Dr. Mobius in his general resumd of the subject (Die echten Perlen, Hamb. 1857). The Unio margaritiferus, Mytilus edulis, and Ostrea edulis (common oyster) of our own country, occasionally furnish pearls. The shell of the pearl-oyster constitutes the well-known mother-of-pearl, which is extensively used for ornaments, especially in Bethlehem. Those of Palestine are procured from the Red Sea. SEE GEM.

## Pearne, William N[[@Headword:Pearne, William N]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Rochester, England, and came to this country in 1822. He resided at New York Mills some years as the principal business agent and accountant of a large manufacturing establishment. We are not able to state at what time he became a member of the Methodist Church. Most likely it was before his immigration to this country. His social relations in England were of a high order. Dr. Paddock, when stationied in Utica, formed a class in Pearne's house and made him leader. He sustained an unblemished character, and his powers rapidly developing, he soon became an able minister. He was calm and dispassionate, but there was enough of emotion and of thought to command a deep and profound attention. In 1833 he joined the late Oneida Conference, and filled acceptably some of the most important appointments, among which were Binghamton, Cortlandville, and Utica. He was possessed of an amiable disposition, was a faithful friend and a Christian gentleman. As a minister he was clear. chaste, practical, and fearless, and a passionate admirer of the beautiful. His poetical productions found admirers, and as an amateur painter in his later years he manifested a measure of genius. When inquired of concerning the state of his mind in his last hours he exclaimed, “Happy! Happy!” while his beaming countenance and uplifted eye told better than words could do the rapture of his closing hour. He died in Kingiton, N.Y., April 30, 1868. He had the happiness and honor of giving to the ministry of the Church two sons well and extensively known, Rev. William Hall Pearne, of Memphis, and Rev. Thomas Hall  Pearne, D.D., of Knoxville, Tenn. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1868.

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

             an English Dissenting divine, was born at Kidderminster in 1698, and was educated at Jones's Academy in Tewkesbury. After having been ordained for the ministry, he became pastor at Bromyard, Herefordshire, where he remained ten years; was then made pastor at Warminster, and sixteen years later became pastor at Taunton, where he served his congregation for fifteen years. He died in 1772. He published, Power and Pleasure of the Divine Life (Lond. 1744, 8vo): — Sermons (1758, 8vo): — Reliquioe Sacroe, or Meditations on select Passages of Scripture, etc. (1765, 12mo), of which last named Hervey says that “refined fancy and a delicate philosophy compose a chaplet for evangelical divinity.” See Allibone, Dict of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.

## Pearse, Edward[[@Headword:Pearse, Edward]]

             an English Nonconformist divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was minister of St. Margaret's, Westminster, but was ejected at the Restoration for nonconformity, though a pious man and a useful preacher. He died in 1673, about forty years old. He published, The Best Match, or the Soul's Espousal to Christianity (Glasgow, 1672, 12mo; Lond. 1673, sm. 8vo; new ed. 1843, 8vo): — A Beam of Divine Glory, and the Soul's Rest in God (1674, 8vo; 1704, 12mo): — The Grand Concern (17th ed. 1692, 12mo; new ed. 1840, 18mo). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2:2317, 2318.

## Pearse, James[[@Headword:Pearse, James]]

             an English Dissenting divine, flourished near the middle of last century as minister in Tadley, Hants. He published Twenty-one Sermons (Lond. 1763, 8vo), which are “excellent. but of rare occurrence.” See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2:2318.

## Pearson, Edward[[@Headword:Pearson, Edward]]

             D.D., a learned English divine, and the great champion of Arminianism in the Church of England near the close of last century and the opening of this, was born about 1760 at Ipswich, Sussex, and educated at Sidney College, Cambridge. He was for a while fellow and tutor of Sidney  College, and afterwards master (1808), and was elected the Christian advocate in 1809. He was also appointed rector of Rempstone, in Nottinghamshire. He died August 17, 1811. Dr. Pearson was considered an excellent preacher, and one of the most learned men of his times. Besides numerous single sermons preached by him on public occasions, he was the author of a volume of Thirteen Sermons addressed to Academic Youth (delivered in St. Mary's Church, Cambridge). He published also A Collection of Prayers for the Use of Families: — Twelve Lectures on the Subject of the Prophecies relating to the Christian Church; being a portion of the Lectures founded at Lincoln's-Inn Chapel by the late Bishop Warburton (Lond. 1811, 8vo), and various tracts in divinity not professedly controversial. But his fame chiefly rests on his controversial writings against antagonists of necessitarian proclivities.

There are two treatises of his against those who adopt Dr. Paley's views on the general theory of moral obligation, and those who follow him in some of the practical conclusions to which that celebrated divine and moralist conducts his readers. These treatises, entitled Annotations on the Practical Part of Dr. Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy (Ipswich, 1801, 8vo): — Remarks on the Theory of Morals: in which is contained an Examination of the Theoretical Part of Dr. Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy (ibid. 1800, 8vo), excited, when first published, great-attention, and well deserve to be read by all in connection with the treatise on Moral and Political Philosophy to which they relate. On the other side, Dr. Pearson was among the first to sound an alarm respecting the danger to which the Church was exposed by the spread in it of Calvinistic views of Christian doctrine. On this subject he published various tracts at the beginning of the present century, several of which were expressly directed against Mr. Simeon, who was the great maintainer of Calvinism in the university to which Dr. Pearson belonged. In fact, Dr. Pearson was the champion of the Arminian clergy in the Church, and the champion of the Church itself against whatever seemed to threaten its integrity and its perpetuity. The most important on this subject are, Remarks on the Doctrine of Justification by Faith; in a Letter to the Rev. John Overton (Lond. 1802, 8vo): — Remarks on the Controversy subsisting, or supposed to subsist, between the Arminian and Calvinistic Ministers of the Church of England; in a second Letter to the Rev. John Overton (ibid. 1802, 8vo). We have not room, nor does it seem necessary, to give the titles of all his writings; but it may be useful to say that a complete list, arranged chronologically, may be seen in the Gentleman's Magazine for 1811. where it is also said of him  that he was a good man, of gentle and benevolent manners, kind and charitable, easy and pleasant in conversation, modest, unassuming, much respected, and beloved. See also Hunt. Memoirs of the Life of E. Pearson (1845); English Review, 3:441; Collier, Eccles. Hist.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. 2, s.v.

## Pearson, Eliphalet[[@Headword:Pearson, Eliphalet]]

             LL.D., an eminent Congregational minister, was born June, 1752, in Byfield, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1773, and was soon after licensed to preach. In April, 1778, he was made preceptor of Phillips Academy, then just started, in which place he remained until 1786. when he was elected professor of Hebrew in Harvard College, and after president Willard's death, in 1804, he acted as president. In 1806 he resigned and removed to Andover, where he was very active in founding the theological seminary, in which he was chosen professor of sacred literature in 1808, but resigned this position after serving only one year. He remained a trustee of the seminary, and was a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society and other associations. He died Sept. 12, 1826. He published a Lecture on the Death of President Willard (1804), and four separate Sermons (1811, 1812, 1813, 1815). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:126-131; North Amer. Review, 64:181.

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

             an English prelate of high celebrity, and one of the greatest divines of his age, was born in 1612 at Snoring, in Nnorfolk, of which place his father was rector. He was educated first at Eton, and then at King's College, Cambridge, and took the degree of M.A. in 1639. In the same year he took orders, and was collated to a prebend in Salisbury Cathedral. In 1640 he was appointed chaplain to Finch, lord-keeper of the great seal, and on the outbreak of the civil war became chaplain to lord Goring, and afterwards to Sir Robert Cook, in London. In 1650 he was appointed minister of St. Clement's, Eastcheap, London; and this was the chief scene of his labors as a parochial minister. In 1659 he published the great work by which he will be remembered as long as the English tongue shall last and Christian theology continue to have any interest for men, An Exposition of the Apostle's Creed. It was dedicated to his flock, to whom the substance of it had been preached some years before in a series of discourses. The laborious learning and the judicial calmness displayed by the author in this  treatise have long been acknowledged, and command the respect even of those who take exception to his elaborate argumentation.

It was republished, with the author's corrections, in folio, first in 1676, and again in 1686; since that time it has gone through many editions, and still sustains its reputation. It is used as a text-book at the universities, and is regarded as one of the principal standards of appeal on doctrinal matters in the Church of England. It was translated into Latin for use on the Continent. It has also been republished in this country in Dobson's edition of 1840 (see Allibone); besides which there are editions by Burton (1847) and Chevalier (1849). It is generally acknowledged to be one of the most remarkable productions of what is usually called the greatest age of English theology — the 17th century. Dibdin says: “The Exposition of the Creed has nothing superior to it in any language. Metaphysics, logic, classical and theological erudition, are all brought to bear upon that momentous subject, in a manner so happy and so natural that the depths of research and variety of knowledge are most concealed by the felicitous manner of their adaptation. Well might the great Bentley say of this yet greater man that his ‘very dust was gold' (Literary Companion, p. 56). Dr. Samuel Johnson recommends Pearson as one of the three authors (Dr. Clarke and Grotius are the others) whom every man whose faith is unsettled should study. During the same year which brought out the Creed, Dr. Pearson published The Golden Remains of the ever-memorable Mr. John Hales, of Eton. At the Restoration a proper regard was had for Pearson's eminent merits, and honors and emoluments were lavishly showered upon him. Before the close of 1660 he received the rectory of St. Christopher's, in London; was created D.D. at Cambridge; installed prebendary of Ely and archdeacon of Surrey, and made master of Jesus College, Cambridge. In 1661 he obtained the Margaret professorship of divinity, and was one of the most prominent commissioners in the famous Savoy Conference; in 1662 he was made master of Trinity, Cambridge, and assisted in the course of that year in the revision of the Liturgy — a task for which his previous publications had indicated him as peculiarly well fitted. In 1673 he was promoted to the bishopric of Chester. The year preceding he had published his Vindiciae Epistolarum S. Ignatii, in answer to Daille, who had denied the genuineness of the Epistles. It was imagined for years that Pearson had triumphed in this controversy, but recent investigations have weakened Pearson's arguments. SEE IGNATIUS.

In 1682 bishop Pearson published Annales Cyprianici, together with bishop Fell's edition of Cyprian. SEE FELL. He edited, with a preface of 19 pp., Vetum Testamentum Graecum  ex Vers. LXX (1665, 12mo), and was one of the editors of the Critici Sacri. Bishop Pearson died July 16,1686. His Opera Posthuma Chronologica were published by Dodwell (Lond. 1688, 4to, in Le Clerc's Bibl. Univ. 9:127). They contain (1) the Annales Paulini, which bishop Randolph inserted in his Enchiridion Theologicum, of which an English translation, with notes, was published by Williams (Cambr. 1825, and often)-a critical dissertation on the series of events in the life of the apostle Paul; (2) the Lectiones in Acta Apostolorum, which extend from the first to the ninth chapter of the Acts, “and (as might be expected) contain many valuable critical and chronological observations for the elucidation of the apostle Luke's narrative” (Horne, Bibl. Bib. p. 315). Both the lectures on Acts and Annals of St. Paul were brought out in an English version by Crowfoot, also with notes (1853, 8vo). Besides these writings were published, Adversaria lesychian2a (Lond. 1844,2 vols. 8vo): — Minor Theological Works, with memoir, notes, and index by Churton (Qxf. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo). His Orationes, Conciones, et Determinationes Theologicae contain much valuable matter. Bishop Burnet thought Pearson “in all respects the greatest divine of his age.” See Burnet, My Own Times (ed. 1833), 3:142 sq.; Biogrophia Brit. s.v.; Macaulay, Hist. of England, vol. ii, ch. vi; Hallam, Literary Hist. of Europe; Perry, Ch. Hist. of Elnnglland, 2:323, 661; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England (Ch. of the Restor.); Whewell, Moral Philos. p. 174; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. vol. ii, s.v.; (Lond.) Gentleman's Magazine, February, 1848, p. 158 sq.

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

             LL.D., an English divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was prebend of York in 1689, archdeacon of Nottingham in 1690, subdean of York in 1695, and then chancellor of York and residentiary of the church of York. He died Feb. 6, 1716. He published three separate Sermons, and after his death appeared Thirteen Sermons on several Occasions, preached at the Cathedral of York (Lond. 1718, 8vo). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. vol. 2, s.v.

## Pearson, William Wesley[[@Headword:Pearson, William Wesley]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Morgan County, Ala., Sept. 27. 1837. His father, Edmund Pearson, was a minister; hence his son was brought in daily contact with religious example in his  boyhood, and early led to seek an interest in religious topics. At the age of sixteen he connected himself with the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. He was educated at Sarepta and Pontotoc; afterwards taught school a while, but becoming impressed that God had called him to the work of the ministry, he entered the itinerancy in the Memphis Conference about 1860. He filled eight regular appointments in the Conference; then, his health failing, he sustained a supernumerary relation one year, and the last two years of his life he was superannuated. tie died Nov. 3,1872. Pearson was a good practical preacher. His sermons were plain, earnest, and forcible. His life was an example of uniform, unpretending piety, and in death he testified that all was well with him. When he found that his end was near, he said, “My preparation for death was made long ago. All is well; I shall rest in heaven.” See Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the Meth. Episc. Church, South, 1872, p. 707.

## Peasants War[[@Headword:Peasants War]]

             is the name given to the great insurrection of the German and Swiss peasantry in the Reformation period. It is a subject so intimately connected with the origin of Protestantism that we briefly refer to it here. The war broke out in the beginning of the year 1525. Zschokke has described it as the “terrible scream of oppressed humanity.” The oppression of the peasants had gradually increased in severity as the nobility became more extravagant and the clergy more sensual and degenerate. The example of Switzerland encouraged the hope of success, and from 1476 to 1517 there were risings here and there among the peasants of the south of Germany. A peasant rebellion, called in popular phrase the Bundschuh (Laced Shoe), took place in the Rhine countries in 1502, and another, called the “League of Poor Conrad,” in Wurtemberg, in 1514, both of which were put down without any abatement of the grievances that had occasioned them. The Reformation, by the mental awakening which it produced, and the diffusion of sentiments favorable to freedom, must be reckoned among the causes of the great insurrection itself; although Luther, Melancthon, and the other leading Reformers, while urging the nobles to justice and humanity, strongly reprobated the violent proceedings of the peasants. The Anabaptists, however, and in particular Munzer, encouraged and excited them, and a peasant insurrection took place in the Hegau in 1522. Another, known as the “Latin War,” arose in 1523 in Salzburg, against an unpoplar archbishop, but these were quickly suppressed.

On Jan. 1, 1525, the peasantry of the abbacy of Kempten, along with the townspeople, suddenly  assailed and plundered the convent, compelling the abbot to sign a renunciation of his rights. This proved the signal for a rising of the peasants on all sides throughout the south of Germany. Many of the princes and nobles at first regarded the insurrection with some measure of complacency, because it was directed in the first instance chiefly against the ecclesiastical lords; some, too, because it seemed likely to promote the interests of the exiled duke of Wurtemberg, who was then upon the point of reconquering his dominions by the help of Swiss troops; and others, because it seemed to set bounds to the increase of Austrian power. But the archduke Ferdinand hastened to raise an army, the troops of the empire being for the most part engaged in the emperor's wars in Italy, and entrusted the command of it to the Truchsess Von Waldburg, a man of stern and unscrupulous character, but of ability and energy. Von Waldburg negotiated with the peasants in order to gain time, and defeated and destroyed some large bodies of them, but was himself defeated by them on April 22, when he made a treaty with them, not having, however, the slightest intention of keeping it. Meanwhile the insurrection extended, and became general throughout Germany, and a number of towns took part in it, as Heilbronn, Muhlhausen, Fulda, Frankfort, etc., but there was a total want of organization and cooperation. Towards Easter, 1525, there appeared in Upper Swabia a manifesto, which set forth the grievances and demands of the insurgents. They demanded the free election of their parish clergy; the appropriation of the tithes of grain, after competent maintenance of the parish clergy, to the support of the poor and to purposes of general utility; the abolition of serfdom, and of the exclusive hunting and fishing rights of the nobles; the restoration to the community of forests, fields, and meadows which the secular and ecclesiastical lords had appropriated to themselves; release from arbitrary augmentation and multiplication of services, duties, and rents; the equal administration of justice, and the abolition of some of the most odious exactions of the clergy. The conduct of the insurgents was not, however, in accordance with the moderation of their demands. Their many separate bands destroyed the convents and castles, murdered, pillaged, and were guilty of the greatest excesses, which must indeed be regarded as partly in revenge for the cruelty practiced against them by Von Waldburg. A number of princes and knights concluded treaties with the peasants conceding their principal demands. The city of Wurzburg joined them, but the castle of Liebfrauenberg made an obstinate resistance, which gave time to Von Waldburg and their other enemies to collect and strengthen their forces.

In  May and June, 1525, the peasants sustained a number of severe defeats, in which large bodies of them were destroyed. The landgrave Philip of Hesse was also successful against them in the north of Germany. The peasants, after they had been subjugated, were everywhere treated with terrible cruelty. In one instance a great body of them were perfidiously massacred after they had laid down their arms. Multitudes were hanged in the streets, and many were put to death with the greatest tortures. Weinsberg, Rothenburg, Wurzburg, and other towns which had joined them, suffered the terrible revenge of the victors, and torrents of blood were shed. It is supposed that more than 150,000 persons lost their lives in the Peasants' War. Flourishing and populous districts were desolated. The lot of the defeated insurgents became harder than ever, and many burdens of the peasantry originated at this period. The cause of the Reformation also was very injuriously affected. See Sartorius, Versuch einer Geschichte des deutschen Bauernkriegs (Berlin, 1795); Oechsle, Beitrage zur Geschichte des deutschen Bauernkriegs (Heilbronn, 1829); Wachsmuth, Der deutsche Bauernkrieg (Leipsic, 1834); Zimmermann, A hgeneine Geschich to des grossen Bauernkriegs (Stuttgard, 1841-43, 3 vols.).

## Pease, Calvin[[@Headword:Pease, Calvin]]

             D.D., an eminent Presbyterian minister (O. S.), was born in Canaan, Conn., Aug, 12, 1813. He graduated at the University of Vermont in 1838, became a teacher in Montpelier, and professor of Greek and Latin in the University of Vermont in 1842. He held this post until 1855, when he was ordained to the ministry, and appointed president of the university. In 1861 he became pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Rochester, N.Y., and died on a visit to Burlington, Sept. 17, 1863. His scholarly culture was wide, yet thorough; and both in the university and in his parish he measured fully up to the demands of duty. He published several Sermons, and contributed a number of articles to the Bibliotheca Sacra. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864. p. 188; Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1863, p. 737; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v.

## Pease, Ebenezer[[@Headword:Pease, Ebenezer]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Georgia, Franklin County, Vt., Sept. 9, 1802. At the age of fourteen he was converted, and soon after united with the Methodist Church, and became a bright example of youthful piety. He received a license to exhort in 1823.  His first local preacher's license was granted in 1826. In 1845 he joined the Black River Conference, and successively served the following charges: Brasher and Massena, two years; Chateaugay, two years; Heuvelton and Depeyster, two years; Massena, two years; Lisbon, one year; Bangor, two years; next, and last, Hopkinton. He served all of these charges with great acceptability and profit to his people. He was a clear, instructive preacher, and a faithful pastor. A few years previous to his death he was afflicted with what was supposed to be softening of the brain. His mental attention to religious and temporal affairs entirely failed him, so that he had to be treated as a child. He died at Lawrenceville, St. Lawrence County, N.Y., Dec. 1, 1873. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, p. 72; Smith, Memorials of N.Y. and N.Y. East Conf.: p. 226.

## Peck, Francis[[@Headword:Peck, Francis]]

             a learned English divine, noted especially as an industrious antiquary, was born at Stamford, in Lincolnshire, May 4, 1692. He received his preparatory education in his native town. He afterwards went to Trinity College, Cambridge, where he took the degree of B.A. in 1715, and M.A. in 1727. In 1723 he was presented to the rectory of Godeby Maureward, in Leicestershire: and in 1736 he received a prebendal stall in the cathedral of Lincoln. He died in 1743. His principal works are, The Antiquarian Annals of Stanford, in Lincoln, Rutland, and Northampton Shires (Lond. 1727, fol.): — Desiderata Curiosa, the first volume of which was printed in folio, London, 1732, followed by the second in 1735, both reprinted in 4to in 1779: — A Catalogue of all the Discourses written both for and against Popery in the Time of King James II (Lond. 1735, 4to): — Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Oliver Cromwell (1740, 4to): — New Memoirs of the Life and Poetical Works of John Milton (1740, 4to). He also published some sermons and discourses. His first publication was Τὸ ὕψος ἄγιον , or an Exercise on the Creation, and a Hymn to the Creator of the World; written in the express Words of the Sacred Text, as an Attempt to show the Beauty and Sublimity of the Holy Scriptures (1716, 8to). See Chalmers, Biogr. Dict. 24:235; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. vol. ii, s.v.

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

             D.D., a noted minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, one of the pioneers in American Methodism, and a most valued leader in the literary  department of this branch of the Wesleyan body, was born in Middlefield, Otsego County, New York, August 8,1797. His parents were from Danbury, Connecticut, descendants of sturdy Puritan stock. His mother was gifted with a strong mind and possessed great force of character; she was eminently pious and devotional which constituted her a remarkable woman in her religious and social influence, and enabled her to give all her five sons to the Methodist ministry. His father was a Methodist class- leader, and to the time of his death a devoted Christian. Under these genial influences George united, in 1812, with the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1816 he commenced his useful career as a Methodist preacher, being then only nineteen years of age. He traveled circuits till 1821. and that year he took charge of Paris station, and the two following years of the station at Utica. So rapidly did the young, gifted preacher advance in his earnest pulpit efforts and devotion to the work, that he was appointed, in 1824, presiding elder of the Susquehanna District, which large district embraced all the territory contained in the Wyoming Conference previous to the General Conference of 1868, and nearly as much more now within the bounds of the Central New York and Genesee Conferences.

The same year he was elected delegate to the General Conference, and he was chosen a delegate to every General Conference since, except the last, during his lifetime. Early in his history the youthful preacher was drawn into controversy, and soon gave evidence of special talents in that direction. In 1825 he was challenged to a public debate by a Unitarian preacher at Kingston, Pennsylvania; so decisive was the victory in favor of tie young champion of Methodism that his opposer was completely vanquished. One year afterward he accepted a challenge to write in a Universalist magazine, which event led to his first appearance as an author. In 1835 he was elected principal of the Oneida Conference Seminary. His uniform, well-balanced, strong mind, combined with the great interest and enthusiastic devotion he felt in the cause of education and the establishment of this young, promising seat of learning, peculiarly adapted him to fill successfully this new, honorable sphere of usefulness. After four years of trials and labors as the head and controlling spirit of this now so well-known school, he determined to return once more to the active duties of the ministry, and was again appointed to the eldership of the Susquehanna District, the early field of his achievements and triumphs. In 1840 he was elected editor of the Methodist Quarterly Review, which position he filled with honor and credit to the Church for the period of eight years. Under his able management the Review took its place among the first literary journals of the country,  commanded the esteem and favorable criticism of the most erudite and cultivated scholars, and exerted a benign and salutary influence even beyond the pale of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1846 the New York Central Conference appointed Dr. Peck delegate to the great General Convention of the Evangelical Alliance in London, and in that extraordinary meeting the doctor took a leading and prominent part in the deliberations. In 1848 Dr. Peck was elected editor in chief of the Christian Advocate and Journal, published at New York, and he served the Church in that distinguished position for four years. It was during this period that the great political debates took place which at one time threatened to convulse the country into anarchy and rebellion. Being naturally averse to exciting political discussions and exhibitions of violent partisanship, and not liking the animus of the controversy on such subjects, he declined a re- election to the editorial office in 1852, and returned to his early home and the scenes of his early ministry in the beautiful Valley of Wyoming, where he was cordially received by his many friends. He was successively made preacher in charge of Wilkesbarre, Scranton, Providence, and Dunmore, and presiding elder of the Lackawanna District and Wyoming District. He was superannuated in 1873, and died May 20, 1876. In Church and Conference Dr. Peck was always eminent and useful, whether as counselor or advocate.

The faithful discharge of all important trusts committed to him insured for him a high position in the Church. He was conservative, but at the same time eminently progressive. Says one of his contemporaries: “I view him as one of the most remarkable men of our times — one whose genius and piety are indelibly stamped on the ecclesiastical polity and wonderful growth of the Church — whose wise counsels and herculean labors are interwoven in its development for the past fifty years. His whole life has been distinguished by devoted love to the Church, and unswerving loyalty to honest convictions of truth. Young preachers have ever found in him a friend and counselor — one to whom they could look as a ‘father in Israel.' I have for the past twenty-five years mingled with all classes of professional and business men in our valley, but I have never yet heard one word of censure from preacher or layman against Dr. Peck, which fact I esteem as the highest tribute to his manly Christian character.” As a preacher, Dr. Peck ranked among the foremost and ablest pulpit orators in our country. The symmetrical structure of his mind. and his analytical powers, were of the highest order, combined with a clearness of perception and convincing force of unerring logic. Whenever the strong powers of his mind were brought into full play on a subject, and he felt the heavenly  unction on his sympathetic heart, the effect of his preaching was overwhelming. His public labors included a period of sixty years. It thus appears that he entered the Methodist itinerancy in time to test his consecration and integrity by pioneer exertions requiring the heroism of the fathers. He “endured hardness as a good soldier,” on very large circuits, with no railroads or steamboats, in the new and uncultivated regions of the states of New York and Pennsylvania, traveling immense distances on horseback, through forests, and in the midst of wild beasts and rude people, preaching in log shanties, schoolhouses, barns, and groves, all without a murmur, and taking his appointments without being consulted, and in the most unquestioning loyalty. He had therefore original experience in the great circuit system to prepare him for any other work to which he might be called. When stations were demanded and cautiously conceded, and George Peck was one of the younger men called to fill them, he was found to have the habits of devotion and study which they required. His library had grown (one can hardly tell how) to be large and valuable, and he was master of its contents.

The progress in available scholarship which ministers of other churches made with tuition, he made largely without. He preached two or three sermons every Sunday to the same congregation, with fresh research and elaborations, characterized by thorough originality and great spiritual power. He was besides a faithful pastor. He had marked success in revivals, and fully equal success in the nurture and edification of the Church. As a presiding elder he shrank from no hardships of travel or labor or discipline, and rendered available marked executive ability in every department of official responsibility. As an educator he promptly qualified himself to teach in studies nearly as new to him as to his students, and when he resigned the principalship of the seminary, he with unimpaired zeal pushed forward the enterprises of learning in the Church, and gave to young ministers the guidance and help of his large intelligence and ripe experience. In the most responsible editorial chairs of the Church he held with a firm hand all the historical positions of Methodism, and advanced every Christian enterprise in the true spirit of progress. When by reason of age he found his strength failing, in a calm, dignified manner he resigned the effective relations, and gracefully accepted superannuation. When complicated diseases gathered in strength upon him, he laid him down to die with the same composure and dignity which characterized his most difficult life-labors when in health. The humility so marked in his history was more conspicuous, mellow, and tender as he approached the cold river. The faith which gave him a lifetime near the cross made him a  conqueror in his struggle with the last enemy. Dr. Peck's published works are, Universalism Examined (1826): — History of the Apostles and Evangelists (1836): — Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection (1841; abridged 1845. and revised in 1848): — Rule of Faith (1844): — Reply to Bascorn (1845): — Manly Character (1852): — History of Wyoming (1858), a work which received high commendations not only in this country but in Europe (see North Amer. Rev. July, 1858, p. 280; Lond. Athencumn, Aug. 28, 1858, p. 260): — Early Methodism within the Bounds of the Old Genesee Conf. from 1788 to 1828 (1860), of which the North Amer. Review says that “it has the charm of romance, together with the edifying qualities of religious annals:”Our Country, its Trials and its Triumphs (1865). Dr. Peck was literally a “father of ministers,” having left two sons and two nephews in the pastoral work in his own Conference, and one daughter, Mrs. Rev. Dr. Crane, of the Newark Conference. See Ladies' Repository, 1871; Pulpit and Pew, 1871, p. 90 sq.; Northern Christian Advocate, 1876, June 22; Life and Times of Geo. Peck, D.D., written by Himself (N.Y. 1874, 12mo); Conable, Hist. of the Genesee Conf. ch. i, § 4, 7, 8. 9; ch. iv, § 3 and 53; Meth. Qu. Rev. Oct. 1874, p. 693-696.

## Peck, James[[@Headword:Peck, James]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of whose early history we have no data, was one of the four ministers who constituted the Washington Conference, organized by bishop Scott Oct. 27, 1864. He was then appointed to Asbury Church, in Washington, D. C. After six months he was appointed presiding elder of the Potomac District, in which capacity he served until he was appointed to Sharp Street, Baltimore; but after eight months he was reappointed presiding elder of the Potomac District. He was elected delegate to the General Conference held in Brooklyn, N.Y., 1872. He was next sent to Asbury Church, Baltimore, where he died in peace, March 6, 1874. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, p. 14.

## Peck, Jesse Truesdell, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Peck, Jesse Truesdell, D.D., LL.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Middlefield, Otsego County, N.Y., April 4, 1811. He was converted when sixteen years old, immediately united with the Church, and commenced a course of study preparatory to the ministry. After two years he was licensed as a local preacher, and in 1832 was admitted into the Oneida Conference, and sent to Dryden Circuit. The next year he was appointed to Newark, and successively to Skaneateles and Potsdam, when he became principal of Governeur High School, and remained four years. In 1841 he was elected principal of Troy Conference Academy, at Poultney, Vermont, a position which he retained till 1848. In 1849 he was chosen president of Dickinson College at Carlisle, Pennsylvania; in 1852 he became senior preacher of the Foundry Church in Washington, D.C. in 1854 secretary of the Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church; in 1856 he was appointed pastor of Greene Street Church, N.Y.

He was next stationed at Powell Street, San Francisco; in 1860 was made presiding elder of San Francisco District. At the close of that year he became pastor in Sacramento City, and after two years was stationed at Santa Clara. From 1864 to 1865 he was pastor of Howard Street Church, San Francisco, and was for several years president of the board of trustees of the University of the Pacific, also president of the California State Bible Society, In 1866 he was appointed to Peekskill, N.Y.; in 1867 to Hudson Street, Albany, where he remained three years, and was then stationed at Centenary Church, Syracuse. In 1872 he was elected bishop, and: at once entered upon the duties of that office with great earnestness and intensity of interest, also striving to advance the interests of Christianity, wherever his influence was felt, He was a delegate to the Methodist OEcumenical Conference, held in London in 1881, where he distinguished himself by his able and dignified manner of presiding. He died at Syracuse, May 17, 1883. Bishop Peck's religious  experience was especially rich and full, and his life most consistent and irreproachable. He was devoted to Methodism, but his broad, catholic spirit led him to regard Christians of all denominations as brothers in Christ. His sermons were clear and strong; as a pastor he was loving and faithful; and as a bishop, untiring in his energy till attacked by disease, which rendered further labor impossible. He was author of, The Central Idea of Christianity: — The True Woman: — What must I Do to be Saved? — and The History of the Great Republic. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1883, page 76; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

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

             a Baptist minister, was born in Stanford, Dutchess County, N.Y., Sept. 11, 1780. His early education was limited. He began preaching as a licentiate in 1800 at Norwich and Sherburne, N.Y., and in 1804 became pastor of the First Baptist Church in Cazenovia, N.Y., where he was ordained June 11, 1806, and remained until November, 1834, during which time he had the  satisfaction of witnessing several revivals among his congregation. He had been appointed general agent of the Baptist Missionary Convention in 1824, and after resigning his pastoral charge he devoted himself entirely to that institution. In May, 1839, he was appointed general agent of the Baptist Home Mission Association. He traveled extensively in that connection, and his services proved very valuable. He continued to preach whenever opportunity presented until his death, Dec. 15, 1849. Mr. Peck was associate editor of a religious periodical called The Vehicle, and afterwards of The Western Baptist Magazine, which was commenced in 1814, and some twelve years after merged in The New York Baptist Register. in 1837, in connection with the Rev. John Lawton, he published A Historical Sketch of the Baptist Missionary Convention of the State of New York, etc. He also published a Scriptural Catechism, and two Discourses in 1845. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:431.

## Peck, John Mason[[@Headword:Peck, John Mason]]

             D.D., a Baptist minister of note, was born at Litchfield. Conn., Oct. 31.1789. He had limited early advantages for education, bit made such use of them as to find employment as a school-teacher. He removed in 1811 to Greene Count-y, N.Y., where he united with a Baptist Church, and in 1812 was licensed to preach, becoming in 1814 pastor of a church in Amenia, N.Y. In 1816 he repaired to Philadelphia, and spent some time in study with the Rev. Dr. Staughton, who was accustomed to receive students for the ministry into his family. In 1817 Peck went as an itinerant missionary to the West. laboring in Illinois and Missouri. He visited New England in 1826 to plead for missions, and solicit aid for a literary and theological seminary. A school was established at Rock Spring, Ill., on laind given by him for the purpose, of which he was the principal in 1830-31. In 1832 he was connected with the Rev. Dr. Jonathan Going in originating the “American Baptist Home Mission Society.” Shurtleff College having been established at Upper Alton, Ill., in 1835, the Rock Spring Seminary was merged in it. Mr. Peck traveled 6000 miles, and raised $20,000 — a small sum compared with the millions given for educational endowments in recent years, but for the time an important contribution. He was also actively interested at a later period in founding the “Covington, Ky., Theological Seminary,” and in 1843-45 was secretary of the “American Baptist Publication Society.” He was the pastor of several churches at different times, and an industrious writer. He established in 1829 a periodical, The Pioneer, which was published several years. As an  antiquarian he was an assiduous and successful collector of books and pamphlets. He died March 15.1858. He published in 1832 The Emigrant's Guide, which had a large circulation, and in 1834 a Gazetteer of Illinois. He was the author of the Life of Daniel Boone, in Sparks's “American Biography,” and of a Life of Father Clarke, a Western preacher. See Forty Years of Pioneer Life; Memoir of ‘John Mason Peck, D).D., edited from his journals and correspondence by Rufus Babcock (Phila. 1864, 12mo); Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:402; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s.v.; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v.; New- Englander, 1865. (L. E, S.)

## Peck, Jonas Oramel, D.D[[@Headword:Peck, Jonas Oramel, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Groton, Vermont, September 4, 1836. Of hardy robustness and active habits from youth, he was converted in early years, graduated from Amhierst College in 1862, and immediately entered the New, England Conference, in which he held important charges; in 1873 was transferred to Chicago, thence successively to Baltimore, Brooklyn, New, Haven, and again tot Brooklyn, with increasing usefulness both as a preacher and a pastor. In 1888 he was elected one of the corresponding secretaries of the missionary society of his denomination, re-elected in 1893, and rendered efficient service in that capacity until his death in New York city, May 17, 1894. He left ready for the press the MS. of a work on Revivals.

## Peck, Solomon[[@Headword:Peck, Solomon]]

             D.D., another Baptist minister, was born at Providence, R. I., Jan. 25, 1800; graduated at Brown University in 1817. and served his alma mater as tutor. He spent four years in Andover Theological Seminary, one year as a resident graduate, and was elected in 1825 to a professorship in Amherst College. He was an instructor in Brown University in 1834-5, but declined a professorship offered to him, and urged upon him by Dr. Wayland. He was appointed in 1836 assistant corresponding secretary, and in 1838 corresponding secretary of the American Baptist Missionary Union, holding the office till 1856. During his period of service as secretary he visited the Baptist missions on the continent of Europe, and also, as one of a deputation, visited the missions in Southern India and in Burmah. He was pastor of a colored Church at Beaufort, S. C., from 1861 to the close of the war, and was chaplain of the Disabled Soldiers' Home, Boston, and secretary of the Freedmen's Aid Society. He died at Rochester, N.Y., June 12, 1874. (L. E. S.)

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

             SEE PECKHAM.

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

             a noted English prelate of the Middle Ages, was a native of Sussex, and of very humble parentage. He was born probably in 1240. He received his early education in the poor-school of the Cluniac monks of Lewes. He then went to Oxford, and was there a favorite student of St. Bonaventura. To continue his theological studies, Peckham also went to Paris University, and had the honor to be a doctor of both these schools. He also made the  tour of all the Italian universities, and in the pope's own palace lectured on sacred letters to a crowd of bishops and cardinals who were proud to be his attentive listeners, and who every day, as he passed through their ranks to his pulpit, arose from their seats to show him reverence. He subsequently became a Minorite friar, but was suddenly drawn from his retirement by the pope in 1278, and elevated to the archbishopric of Canterbury. The crown did not oppose the appointment, and Peckham so zealously discharged the duties of the primacy that al parties in England esteemed him. He began his administration by calling a provincial synod, and among its most memorable acts is the one enjoining every parish priest to explain to his flock the fundamentals of the Christian faith, laying aside all the niceties of school distinction. Peckham not only visited his whole diocese, but traveled over the greater part of England, informing himself of the exact state of ecclesiastical affairs in the country.

He also took an active interest in the university reform at Oxford. He was such a rigid disciplinarian that he made many enemies, and was by them accused of a too great love of money, and of having favored his own family in the disposition of offices. But these charges seem unreasonable when we consider his simplicity of character and habits, and his studious application to the wants of all, poor or rich, exalted or humble. Thus he hesitated not to remonstrate with king Edward I for his tyranny and to rebuke the great earl of Warren for allowing his deer and cattle to trample down a poor man's field of corn. It is a significant fact that he always retained a prebend attached to the see of Lyons, in case he might at any time be forced to quit England; and Godwin tells us that after Peckham's time this benefice continued to be annexed to the see of Canterbury, in order to provide against the case of the more than probable exile of the primates. He died in 1292. He is spoken of in appearance as “stately in gesture, gait, and outward show, vet of an exceeding meek, facile, and liberal temper” (Harpsfield). Archbishop Peckham was a voluminous writer. Besides his theological and scholastic works, there are poems, treatises' on geometry, optics, and astronomy, others on mystical divinity, others on the pastoral office intended for the use of the parochial clergy, and some apparently drawn up to facilitate the instruction of the poor. His most important works are, Pithsani Archiepi-Canthuariensis, Ordinis fratrum minorum, liber de oculi morali (s. 1. et a.; but published by A. Sorg., c. 1475, fol.): —Perspectiva Communis (Venice, 1504, 4to; Norimb. 1542, 4to; Paris, 1556, 4to; Colon. 1592, 4to): — De Summa Trinitate, et Fide Catholica (Lond. 1510, 16mo):—-Collectanea Bibliorum, libri quinque (Colon.  1510, 1591; Paris, 1514). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Wood, Annals; Wharton, Anglia Sacra; Archceol. vol. x; Churton, Hist. of the Early English Church, p. 370 sq.; Collier, Eccles. Hist. of England, vol. i, bk. v, p. 484; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, 18:562; Green, Short Hist. of the English People, p. 174.

## Pecori, Domienico Aretino[[@Headword:Pecori, Domienico Aretino]]

             a painter of Arezzo, who flourished about 1450, studied tinder Dol Bartolomeo della Gatta, and afterwards improved himself by studying the works of other masters. In the parochial church of his native city is a picture by him of the Virgin receiving under her mantle the people of Arezzo, who Are recommended to her protection by their patron saint. Lanzi says it is a judicious composition, enriched with good architecture, the airs of the heads resembling those of Francia. He used less gilding than was usual at the time.

## Pecthelmus[[@Headword:Pecthelmus]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the see of Galloway about 730. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 271.

## Pectoral[[@Headword:Pectoral]]

             a square plate of gold or silver, either jewelled or enamelled, sometimes worn by English and, other bishops on the breast, over the chasuble, at mass. It is sometimes called a rationale or rational. Its use appears to have been common during the Middle Ages, for several examples occur on monumental effigies, but since the 14th century it seems to have been disused. It was placed round the neck, and hung on the breast, either by a chain of gold or by three or more silver-gilt pearl-headed pins.

## Pectorale[[@Headword:Pectorale]]

             (breast-covering), the same as pallium (q.v.).

## Peculiar[[@Headword:Peculiar]]

             (Fr. peculier, i.e. private) is in English ecclesiastical law a particular parish or church having jurisdiction within itself, and which is not subject to the ordinary of the diocese in which it is locally situated, but has an ordinary of its own. There are various kinds of peculiars:

1. Royal peculiars, subject only to the king. The king's chapel is a royal peculiar, reserved to the immediate government of the king himself.

2. Archbishops' peculiars, exclusive of the jurisdiction of bishops and archdeacons. The archbishop has many such peculiars, it being an ancient privilege of the see of Canterbury that whenever any manors or advowsons belong to it, they forthwith become exempt from the ordinary, and are peculiars to that see.

3. Bishops' peculiars, exclusive of the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese in- which they are situated.

4. Peculiars of bishops in their own diocese, exclusive of archidiaconal jurisdiction.

5. Peculiars of deans, deans and chapters, prebendaries, and the like, which are places wherein, by ancient compositions, the bishops have parted with their jurisdiction. Under the statute 1 George I and II, c. 10, all donatives (which are in their nature peculiars) receiving augmentation from queen Anne's bounty are thenceforth to become subject to the jurisdiction of the bishop of the diocese. SEE DONATIVE.

## Peculiar People[[@Headword:Peculiar People]]

             is the name of a recently founded religious sect which originated in England, and is to be met with chiefly in the county of Kent, but they themselves claim to be strong in numbers also in Essex, Sussex, and Surrey. Their principles are very similar to those of the American Tunkers (q.v.). They are a sort of Perfectionists. They claim to be the real exemplars of true and undefiled religion. If a man cannot say he lives without sin, they set him down as no Christian. Religion has no difficulties for them, no mysteries; nothing beyond the reach of man; neither heights to which he cannot ascend, nor depths which he cannot fathom. To come together and declare their unspeakable joy is all that they have to do. For this the beginner is as competent as the gray-haired believer, the sister as well as the brother, the ignorant as well as the learned; and thus, in turn, they all preach and pray. In Church membership they have no preliminaries. All who come are of the Church; those whom the Lord calls will surely join them. They consider that every service is the sacrament, and they have no special form. In the same way they have no baptism; infant or adult creeds, confessions of faith, forms of prayer, ministers-all these things they have done away with. They profess to have no leaders; yet they have elders, but they claim that they are simply elders by lapse of time alone. They have great faith in prayer. If one lack anything, it is to be looked for by asking of God. Hence it is a prime article of faith of this denomination never, under any circumstances, to call in a doctor. They believe only in anointing with oil and prayer as a means of restoring the sick. The English government has therefore interfered with them in recent times, and several trials of members of this sect have occurred. Thus, at Plumstead, a little girl of an elder of the Peculiar People had the smallpox. The elders prayed over her; they laid hands on her; they anointed her; and, generally speaking, “put their trust in God.” In eleven days, without the administration of any medicine, with only a little arrow-root and wine to nourish the body, the poor thing died. Of course the Peculiar People are consistent enough to believe neither in vaccination nor contagion. In this case a jury returned a  verdict of “manslaughter” against the father. There are no statistics or extensive data from which to judge of their number and the power of the sect. We have given all that is accessible to outside parties by personal observation.

## Peculium Clericale[[@Headword:Peculium Clericale]]

             is that property of a priest which is derived from benefices conferred on him, and from the performance of clerical duties. Ancient ecclesiastical usage did not permit the disposal of its surplus either by gift or will, but this was returned to the Church; and so also the Council of Trent ordered (sess. 25, cap. i, De Reform.). But in modern times the priest has the same privileges in disposing of the “peculium clericale” as over his own private property and private earnings.

## Pedagogics[[@Headword:Pedagogics]]

             SEE PAEDAGOGICS.

## Pedahel[[@Headword:Pedahel]]

             (Heb. Pedahel', פְּדִהְאֵל, preserved of God; Sept. Φαδαήλ), the son of Ammihud, and the prince or chief man of the tribe of Naphtali, appointed by Moses, in connection with one from each of the other tribes; to divide Western Palestine (Num 34:28). B.C. 1618.

## Pedahzur[[@Headword:Pedahzur]]

             [many Ped'ahzur] (Heb. Pedahtsur', פְּדָהצוּר, preserved of the Rock; Sept. Φαδασούρ, Φαδασσούρ), the head of a family in the tribe of Manasseh; father of the Gamaliel who was appointed with others to aid Moses in numbering the people (Num 1:10; Num 2:20; Num 7:54; Num 7:59; Num 10:23). B.C. cir. 1657.

## Pedaiah[[@Headword:Pedaiah]]

             [some Pedai'ah] (Heb. Pedayah', פְּדָיָה,l preserved of Jehovah; written also Pedaydhu, פְּדָיָהוּ, with the same meaning, 1Ch 27:20; Sept. Φαδαϊvα or Φαδαϊvας), the name of at least six Hebrews.

1. The father of Joel, which latter was ruler of the half-tribe of Manasseh during the latter part of David's reign (1Ch 27:20). B.C. ante 1013.

2. A citizen “of Rumah,” and the father of the Zebudah who was wife to Josiah, and mother of Jehoiakim (2Ki 23:36). B.C. ante 648.

3. The father of Zerubbabel, by the widow of his brother Salathiel (1Ch 3:18), under the Levirate law (comp. Strong's Harmony, p. 17). B.C. ante 536.

4. A “son of Parosh;” an Israelite who aided in repairing the walls of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Neh 3:25). B.C. cir. 446.

5. Son of Kolaiah, and father of Joed of the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned only in the genealogy of Sallu (Neh 11:7). B.C. ante 445.

6. A Levite whom Nehemiah appointed one of the sacred treasurers, or disbursers (Neh 13:13); apparently the same who stood on the left of Ezra while he read the law, but of whom nothing further is known (Neh 8:4). B.C. 445.

## Pedalia[[@Headword:Pedalia]]

             is an ecclesiastical term used to denote (1) foot-cloths in front of the altar; (2) collections of the creeds and canons of general councils in the Greek Church.

## Pedaries[[@Headword:Pedaries]]

             is an ecclesiastical term used to designate consecrated sandals for pilgrims.

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

             an able and judicious English divine, was born at Perth in 1759. He entered the University of Edinburgh in 1775; was admitted a student in the divinity hall of the Secession Church, under the Rev. John Brown, of Haddington, in 1777; was ordained minister of Bristo Street congregation, Edinburgh, in 1783, and continued in that charge until his death in 1845. His sermons are eminently clear, well arranged, scriptural, and instructive. In expository lectures he greatly excelled. He published, The Revolution the Work of God, and a Cause of Joy; two sermons on Psa 136:6 [Nov. 5] (Edinb. 1789, 8vo): — The Perpetuity, Advantages, and Universality of  the Christian Religion; a sermon preached before the Edinburgh Missionary Society on Psa 72:17 (ibid. 1796, 8vo): — Jehovah's Care to perpetuate the Redeemer's Name; a sermon preached before the Missionary Society on Psa 45:17 (Loud. 1809, 8vo): — A practical Exposition of the Book of Jonah, in Ten Lectures (Edinb. 1842, 12mo). After his death appeared Discourses, with a Memoir of his Life, by his son, the Rev. William Peddie, D.D. (ibid. 1846, 8vo).

## Pedersen, Christiern[[@Headword:Pedersen, Christiern]]

             one of the most noted characters of Denmark and Sweden in the Reformation period, was born at Swendborg, in Denmark, in 1480. He studied in Roskilde, and, after completing his course there, he became a canon in Lund. Later he studied for several years in Paris, and upon his return to Denmark he was appointed chancellor under Hans Weze, archbishop of Lund. When the archbishop fled, Pedersen remained to take charge of the affairs of the diocese, but he was constantly suspected and persecuted by his enemies. When Soren Nordby entered Skaane, in 1525, he joined him as a faithful adherent of the legitimate king; but for this reason he was found guilty of high-treason, his goods were confiscated, and he was obliged to leave Denmark. He sought his fugitive king, Christian II, in the Netherlands, and there he spent several years advocating the cause of the Reformation. But when king Christian II was taken prisoner in 1532, and confined in Sonderborg, Christiern Pedersen was permitted to return and live in Malmo, where he is said to have acted as Jirgen Kok's secretary during the Count's Feud. The last ten years of his life he spent with a relative who was minister at Helsinge, in the northern part of Zealand. He died there, Jan. 16, 1554. He was not one of the leading Reformers in Denmark, partly because he was absent during the most important struggle, and partly because he lacked courage and force of character, and oftentimes thought the Reformers proceeded too violently. He had always loved peace and quiet, and during the most turbulent times he withdrew to his friends.

Besides he was not, like so many of the friends of the Lutheran Reformation in his day, an enemy of the past, and he sought to reconcile his love of the old songs and stories of his fatherland with his love of the emancipated Gospel. During his whole life, both while he was yet a Catholic and after he had become a Protestant, he labored zealously for the enlightenment of his countrymen, and he is justly considered the founder of modern Danish literature. At Antwerp he published in 1529 a Danish translation of the New Testament and of the  Psalms of David, and he was one of the main workers in the translation of the so-called Christian III's Bible, published in 1550. His principal theological works are his book on the Mass and his Book of Miracles, both of which he wrote while he was yet a Catholic. His Right Way to Heaven, On Marriage and the Bringing-up of Children, and On Study and the Education of Children are free translations from Luther. His patriotism led him to rescue from oblivion the famous work of Saxo Grammaticus, which, at the request of Christian II, he published in Paris in 1514. This work, translated into Danish by Gruntowig, is deservedly the most popular of all secular books in the Danish tongue. He fought against the absurdity of using Latin instead of Danish, and insisted that if the apostles had preached in Denmark, they would have talked Danish. By his translation of the Bible and other works he accomplished for Denmark what Luther had already accomplished for Germany. See Barfods, Fortaellinger, p. 427-429. (R. B. A.)

## Pedigree[[@Headword:Pedigree]]

             SEE GENEALOGY.

## Pedilavium[[@Headword:Pedilavium]]

             SEE FOOT-WASHING.

## Pedobaptism[[@Headword:Pedobaptism]]

             SEE PEDOBAPTISM.

## Pedrali, Gracomo[[@Headword:Pedrali, Gracomo]]

             an Italian painter of Brescia, was born about 1590. It is not known with whom he studied; but he associated himself with Domenico Bruni, in conjunction with whom he executed some perspective pieces for the churches in his native city, and also in Venice, which are highly commended by Orlandi. He died about the year 1660.

## Pedrella[[@Headword:Pedrella]]

             is a name for the thing on which the altar-shrine rests, or cases in which formerly the relics of saints were kept.

## Pedretti, Giuseppe[[@Headword:Pedretti, Giuseppe]]

             a Bolognese painter, was born in 1694. He studied under Marc Antonio Franceschini, whose manner he adopted. Soon after leaving his master, Pedretti passed through Germany to Poland, where he resided many years in the employment of the court. He afterwards returned to his native city, and painted a great many pictures and altar-pieces for the churches: the most esteemed are the Martyrdom of St. Peter, in S. Petronio; Christ Bearing the Cross, in S. Giuseppe; ntot St. Margaret, in the Annunziata. He died in 1778.

## Pedro, Alfonso[[@Headword:Pedro, Alfonso]]

             a noted convert from Judaism, whose original name was Moses Cohen, a native of Huesca, in Aragon, was born in the year 1062. At the age of forty-four he was baptized in the cathedral of his native city, in 1106, on St. Peter's day; and, in honor of the saint, and his godfather, king Alfonso VI, he took the name of Pedro Alfonso. He afterwards wrote a defense of Christianity and a refutation of Jewish incredulity, in the form of a dialogue between Moses and Pedro Alfonso, under the title Dialogi in quibus impice Judaeorum opiniones evidenfissinmis tamn natusalis quam ccelestisphilosophiae arounmentis conafutantur, quaedamque Prophetarum abstrusiora loca illustrantur (Cologne, 1536). This work is spoken of in high terms, and has been of'great use in Spain. We have also by him a Disciplina clericalis, under the title of “Proverbs,” in which he seems to have borrowed from the Arabic writers, especially the tales and fables of Pilpay. A part of this work still exists in the Hebrew translation, and is known as the Book of Enoch (Idris). See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 1:36; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 312; Finn, Sephardiis, p. 181; Lindo, Jews in Spain, p. 56; Kalkar, Israel und die Kirche (Hamb. 1869), p. 22; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 174; Catal. libr. liebr. in Bibl. Bodlej. No. 3546; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthuns, 3:38; De Castro, History of the Jews iin Spain (Cambridge, 1871), p. 57; Adams, History of the Jews (Boston, 1812), 1:260; Delitzsch, Jeschurun- (Grimma, 1838), p. 137 sq.; id. Saat auf Hoffnung (Erlangen, 1876), 13:142 sq.; Evangelical (Lutheran) Rev. (Gettysburg, 1876), p. 359 sq. (B. P.)

## Pedroni, Pietro[[@Headword:Pedroni, Pietro]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Pontremoli, in the Florentine territory. He first studied at Florence, and afterwards at Parma and Rome. He executed  a few excellent works for the churches at Florence, and in his native place; but, in consequence of ill-health, he opened an academy under the protection of the senator Martelli, which produced many able artists. “If not a rare painter,” says Lanzi, “he was at least an able master, profound in theory and eloquent in conveying knowledge to his pupils, of whom history will treat in the ensuing age. Their success, their affection and esteem for Pedroni, is the best eulogium on him which I can transmit to posterity.” He died in 1803.

## Pedum rectum[[@Headword:Pedum rectum]]

             (straight staff) is a name for the straight shepherd crook of the pope, adorned with a cross on the top. SEE CROOK.

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

             a Scotch prelate, after, enjoying several praiseworthy positions, was preferred to the archdeaconry of St. Andrews, constituted lord chancellor in 1377, and in the same year became bishop of Dunkeld. He died in 1396. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 85.

## Peet, Stephen[[@Headword:Peet, Stephen]]

             a somewhat noted missionary of the Congregational Church in Wisconsin, was born at Sandgate, Vt., in 1795. He was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1823, and after entering the ministry preached seven years at Euclid, near Cleveland, Ohio; was afterwards a chaplain at Buffalo, editing the Bethel Magazine and Buffalo Spectator; became minister of Green Bay, Wis., in 1837; assisted in founding Beloit College and thirty churches; was settled as minister of Milwaukee; afterwards took charge of an institute at Batavia, Ill., and was then made agent of an association in Michigan to found a theological seminary. He died at Chicago March 21, 1855. He published Hist. of the Presb. and Cong. Churches and Ministers of Wisconsin (1851, 18mo).

## Pegasus[[@Headword:Pegasus]]

             in Greek mythology, a winged horse which arose with Chrysaor from the blood of the Gorgon Medusa, when she was slain by Perseus. He is said to have received his name because he first made his appearance beside the springs (πηγαί) of Oceanus. He afterwards ascended to heaven, and was believed to carry the thunder and lightning of Zeus. According to later authors, however, he was the horse of Eos. The myth concerning Pegasus is interwoven with that of the victory of Bellerophon over the Chimaera. Bellerophon had in vain sought to catch Pegasus for his combat with this monster, but was advised by the seer Polyidos of Corinth to sleep in the temple of Minerva, and the goddess appearing to him in his sleep gave him a golden bridle and certain instructions, upon which he acted, and made  use of Pegasus in his combat with the Chimaera, the Amazons, and the Solymi. Pegasus is also spoken of in modern times as the horse of the Muses, which, however, he was not. The ancient legend on this subject is that the nine Muses and the nine daughters of Pieros engaged in a competition in singing by Helicon, and everything was motionless to hear their song, save Helicon, which rose ever higher and higher in its delight, when Pegasus put a stop to this with a kick of his hoof, and from the point arose Hippocrene, the inspiring spring of the Muses. But that Pegasus is the horse of the Muses is entirely a modern idea, being first found in the Orlando Innamorato of Boiardo.

## Pegge, Samuel, Ll.D., F.A.S.[[@Headword:Pegge, Samuel, Ll.D., F.A.S.]]

             an eminent English divine, noted especially as an industrious antiquarian, was born at Chesterfield, Staffordshire, in 1704. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow in 1726. He became vicar of Godmersham, Kent, in 1731; and rector of Whittington, Staffordshire, in 1751. He was also rector of Heath, perpetual curate of Wingerworth, and prebendary of Lichfield and of Lincoln. He died in 1796. He published, An Examination of the Inquiry into the Meaning of Daemoniacs in the New Testament. Inn a Letter to the Author. Wherein it is shown that the word Daemon does not signify a Departed Soul, either in the Classics or the Scriptures; and, consequently, that the whole of the Inquiry is without Foundation (Lond. 1739): — Popery, an Encourager of Vice and Immorality; a sermon on Isa 5:20 [on occasion of rebellion] (ibid. 1746, 8vo): — The Life of Robert Groteste, the celebrated Bishop of Lincoln, with an Account of the Bishop's Works, and an Appendix (ibid. 1793, 4to). Other works of his are, Dissertations on some Anglo-Saxon Remains (ibid. 1756, 4to): — Memoirs of Roger de Wesehan — (ibid. 1761, 4to): — Essay on the Coins of Cunobelin (ibid. 1766, 4to): — The Forme of Cury (ibid. 1780, 8vo): — Anonymiana (ibid. 1809), etc. See Darling, Cyclop. of Bibliog. s.v.; (London) Gentleman's Magazine, 1796, pt. ii, p. 66 sq.; Nichol. Literary Anecdotes, 7:1813-1816.

## Peguese Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Peguese Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Peguese is still spoken in Pegu, a country which formerly included all the sea-coast and the mouths of the rivers of the Burman empire, but the Burmese portion of which, comprising by far the greater part of its extent, is now a province of the British Indian empire. The Peguese language is supposed to be more ancient than the Burmese, although the alphabet is the same, except two additional consonants. A translation of the New Test.  was printed at Maulmein in 1847. This is the only part of the Bible now extant. See Bible of Every Land, page 11 sq. (B.P.)

## Pehlevi[[@Headword:Pehlevi]]

             (Valor, Power) is the name of an ancient West-Iranian (Median and Persian) idiom, in use chiefly during the period of the Sassanidee (A.D. 235-640), who, wishing fully to restore the ancient Persian empire, endeavored also to reinstate the primitive national language, fallen into  disuse as a court-language since the time of Alexander's conquest. Yet they did not fix upon the pure Persian as it was still spoken in the interior, but upon the dialect of the western provinces. largely mixed with Shemitic words, to which Aryan terminations were affixed. The grammatical structure of the Pehlevi presents almost the same poverty of inflections and terminations as the present Persian. Although, however, less rich than Zend (q.v.) in inflection and accentuation, it yet boasts of the same copiousness of words as that dialect, to which it in reality succeeded. It is written from right to left, and the letters are mostly joined. The remnants of Pehlevi extant consist of coins, inscriptions (found at Hajiabad, Persepolis, Kirmanshah, etc.), and a number of books, all relating to the religion of Zoroaster. The most important of these are the translation of the chief part of the Zend-Avesta (Yazna, Visparad, and Vendidad), and such original religious works as the Bundehesh, Shikandgumani, Dinkart, Atash Baram, etc. The Pehlevi of the books differs from that of the inscriptions and coins to such a degree-according to the larger or smaller preponderance of the Shemitic element — as to have misled investigators (Westergaard and others) to assume that two utterly distinct languages, a purely Iranic and a Shemitic one, had been used somewhat indiscriminately at the time. The non-Iranian element is called Huzvaresh (Huzfiresh) by the Parsee priests, who, taking advantage of the ambiguity of the Pehlevi alphabet, often substitute the corresponding Persian for the foreign words. The Iranian part of the Pehlevi differs little from the Persian of our own day, and, in fact, the Pehlevi changed first into Parsee, and subsequently into modern Persian, simply by getting rid first of its Chaldee and then of those of its Iranian words which had become obsolete. The chief use of the Pehlevi dialect at present is the assistance it offers towards the elucidation. of the Zend itself. SEE PERSIA.

## Peip, Albert[[@Headword:Peip, Albert]]

             a Christian philosophical writer of Germany, who was born at Zirke, Posen, in 1830, and died September 29, 1875, professor of philosophy at Gottingen, is the author of, Christus und die Kunst (Berlin, 1853): Die Wissenschaft und das geschichtliche Christenthum (eod.): — Beweis des Christenthums (1856): — Christosophie (1858): — Philosophie und innere Mission (Dresden, 1860): — Jacob Bchme (Leipsic, eod.): — Die Kirchenund Staats-Parteien (1861): — Jacob Bohme, in seiner Stellung zur Kirche (Hamburg, 1862): — Zum Beweis des Glaubens (Gutersloh, 1867): — Das Kreuz und die Weltweisheit (Hanover, 1869): — Religions philosophie (published by Theodore Hoppe from Peip's academical lectures, 1879). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:981 sq. (B.P.)

## Peirce, Bradford Kinney, D.D[[@Headword:Peirce, Bradford Kinney, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Royalton, Vermont, February 3, 1819. He graduated from Wesleyan University in 1841, and joined the New England Conference in 1846. He was editor of the Sunday-School Messenger and Sunday-School Teacher, 1844-45, and agent of the Sunday-School Union, 1854-56; superintendent and chaplain of the State Industrial School at Lancaster, Massachusetts, 1856-62; chaplain of the House of Refuge on Randall's Island, N.Y., 1862-72; editor of Zion's Herald for sixteen years, and finally financial agent for Boston University. He died April 19, 1889. See Minutes of Annual Conferences (Spring), 1890, page 104.

## Peirce, Cyrus[[@Headword:Peirce, Cyrus]]

             a Congregational minister, noted as an American educator, was born at Waltham, Mass., Aug. 15, 1790. He was educated at Harvard University, where he graduated in 1810. He taught a private school in Nantucket two years; then studied theology at Cambridge three years, and resumed his school at Nantucket. He commenced preaching in 1818; was minister of a Congregational Church at North Reading from May, 1819, to May, 1827, but, preferring the vocation of a teacher, opened a school at North Andover; from 1830 to 1836 he managed a large school at Nantucket; became principal of its high school in 1837; and from 1839 to 1842 was  principal of the first Normal School in America, at Lexington, Mass. After two years of rest he took charge of the Female Normal School at West Newton, where he continued till his death. He published A Letter on Normal Schools, addressed to the Hon. Henry Barnard (1851), and a prize essay on Crime, its Cause and Cure (1853). He died April 5, 1860. See National Teachers' Monthly, Sept. 1875, p. 325 sq.; Barnard's American Journal of Education, December, 1857.

## Peirce, James[[@Headword:Peirce, James]]

             a learned English Dissenting divine, is noted for the part he took in the Exeter Disputes of the last century, which resulted in the weakening of Presbyterianism in England and the establishment of Unitarianism. He was born in the city of London in 1673. Losing his parents early, he was placed under the care of Mr. Matthew Mead (one of the ejected ministers of 1662, and then pastor of a Nonconformist congregation at Stepney), who had him educated, along with his own sons, under his own roof; after which Peirce went to Utrecht, where he had his first academical instruction. He afterwards removed to Leyden, where he studied for some time; and having passed between five and six years at these two celebrated universities, attending the lectures of Witsius, Leydecker, Graevius, Spanheim, and other learned men, he returned to England.

On his arrival he took up his abode for some time in London, and set up a Sabbath-evening lecture at Miles's Lane, which he continued for two years, when he accepted an invitation from a congregation of Dissenters at Cambridge to become their pastor. In 1713 he was unanimously invited by the three dissenting congregations in Exeter to succeed one of their ministers, lately deceased, the surviving ministers joining the people in the invitation. He accepted the offer, and accordingly settled in that city, where his residence, for the first three years, proved exceedingly agreeable to him. During this period he published his Vindication of the Protestant Dissenters, written first in Latin, but by him translated into English, and published with large additions (Lond. 1717, 8vo). Peirce compares the constitution of the Established Church, its forms and ceremonials, its ritual, and the origin of the administration of its revenues, with the practices which prevailed in the early ages of Christianity. The work became in a brief period the most popular defense of Nonconformity, and was one of two subsequently recommended by Doddridge for the education of Nonconformists. But, notwithstanding his popularity, Peirce was much suspected of Arian principles; and when in 1718 the excitement ran high, not only in Exeter  but also in London, on the Trinitarian doctrine, and Peirce did not so clearly pronounce himself as to be beyond the suspicion of heresy, and even refused to sign a document clearing himself from the charge, he was ejected from his chapel by the trustees, although the majority of his congregation were opposed to it. These summary proceedings against him and others implicated in a like charge had a tendency to arouse public opinion in their favor, and a chapel was promptly built for him and the other ejected ministers. Those who had hoped to break up Arian sentiments had by their rash measures only strengthened it, and at Exeter in a very short time very little was known of Presbyterianism. It is needless to add here that the same course pursued in other parts of England finally resulted in the dismemberment of the Presbyterian Church in England. SEE PRESBYTERIANISM.

Peirce continued to preach at Exeter until his death in 1726. He is charged with double-dealing. But there seems to be no reasonable ground for so severe an accusation. He was probably semi- Arian in tendency, but not in principle. At a conference of ministers, when all were asked to give individually their declaration on the Trinitarian doctrine, Peirce said: “I am not of the opinion of Sabellius, Arius, Socinus, or Sherlock. I believe there is but one God, and can be no more. I believe the Son and Holy Ghost to be divine persons, but subordinate to the Father; and the unity of God is, I think, to be resolved into the Father's being the fountain of the divinity of the Son and the Spirit.” Opposition drove him into Latitudinarianism (q.v.), and finally he came out a Unitarian. His publications are numerous, amounting in all to about twenty-four; but that by which he is best known is his continuation of Mr. Hallett's Paraphrase and Notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews (Lond. 1733, 4to). This work was translated into Latin by Michaelis, and published at Halle in 1747. That great divine speaks in the highest terms of admiration of the profound learning and acute discernment of Peirce. He also gave to the public a volume containing Fifteen Sermons on various Occasions, and an Essay on the Ancient Practice of giving the Eucharist to Children. See Jones, Christ. Biog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Bogue and Burnett, History of Dissenters, vol. iii; Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 302-10; Prot. Dissenter's Magazine, vol. ii.

## Pekah[[@Headword:Pekah]]

             (Heb. Pekach, פֶּקִח, an opening, as of the eyes; Sept. Φακεέ; Josephus, Φακέας; Vulg. Phacee), son of Remaliah, originally a captain of Pekahiah, king of Israel, murdered his master, seized the throne, and became the eighteenth sovereign (and last but one) of the northern kingdom. His native country was probably Gilead, as fifty Gileadites joined him in the conspiracy against Pekahiah; and if so, he furnishes an instance of the same undaunted energy which distinguished, for good or evil, so many of the Israelites who sprang from that country, of which Jephthah and Elijah were the most famous examples (Stanley, Sin. and Pal. p. 327). Under his predecessors Israel had been much weakened through the payment of enormous tribute to the Assyrians (see especially 2Ki 15:20), and by internal wars and conspiracies. Pekah seems steadily to have applied himself to the restoration of its power. For this purpose he sought the support of a foreign alliance, and fixed his mind on the plunder of the sister kingdom of Judah. He must have made the treaty by which he proposed to share its spoil with Rezin, king of Damascus, when Jotham was still on the throne of Jerusalem (2Ki 15:37); but its execution was long delayed, probably in consequence of that prince's righteous and vigorous administration (2 Chronicles 27). When, however, his weak son Ahaz succeeded to the crown of David, the allies no longer hesitated, and formed the siege of Jerusalem. The history of the war, which is sketched under AHAZ, is found in 2 Kings 16 and 2 Chronicles 28; and in the latter (2Ch 28:6) we read that Pekah “slew in Judah one hundred and twenty thousand in one day, which were all valiant men,” a statement which, even if we should be obliged to diminish the number now read in the text, from the uncertainty as to numbers attaching to our present MSS. of the books of Chronicles (Kennicott, Hebrew Text of the Old Testament Considered, p. 532), proves that the character of his warfare was in full accordance with Gileaditish precedents (Jdg 11:33; Jdg 12:6).

The war is famous as the occasion of the great prophecies in Isaiah 7-9. Its chief result was the capture of the Jewish port of Elath, on the Red Sea; but the unnatural alliance of Damascus and Samaria was punished through the final overthrow of the ferocious confederates by Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, whom Ahaz called to his assistance, and who seized the opportunity of adding to his own dominions and crushing a union which might have been dangerous. The kingdom of Damascus was finally suppressed, and Rezin put to death, while Pekah was deprived of at least  half of his kingdom, including all the northern portion, and the whole district to the east of Jordan. For though the writer in 2Ki 15:29 tells us that Tiglath-Pileser “took Ijon, and Abelbeth-maachah, and Janoah, and Kedesh, and Hazor, and Gilead, and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali,” yet from comparing 1Ch 5:26, we find that Gilead must include “the Reubenites and the Gadites and half the tribe of Manasseh.” The inhabitants were carried off, according to the usual practice, and settled in remote districts of Assyria. Pekah himself, now fallen into the position of an Assyrian vassal, was of course compelled to abstain from further attacks on Judah. Whether his continued tyranny exhausted the patience of his subjects, or whether his weakness emboldened them to attack him, we do not know; but, from one or the other cause, Hoshea the son of Elah conspired against him, and put him to death. Josephus says that Hoshea was his friend (Ant. 9:13, 1). Comp. Isa 8:16, which prophecy Hoshea was instrumental in fulfilling. Pekah ascended the throne B.C. 757. In order to bring down the date of Pekah's murder to the date of Hoshea's accession, some chronologists propose to read twenty-nine years for twenty in 2Ki 15:27. Most, however, prefer to let the dates stand as at present in the text, and suppose that an interregnum, not expressly mentioned in the Bible, occurred between those two usurpers. The words of Isaiah (Isa 9:20-21) seem to indicate a time of anarchy in Israel. SEE CHRONOLOGY.

Pekah must have begun to war against Judah B.C. 740, and was killed B.C. 737. The order of events above given is according to the scheme of Ewald's Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 3:602. Mr. Rawlinson (Bampton Lectures for 1859, lect. 4) seems wrong in assuming two invasions of Israel by the Assyrians in Pekah's time, the one corresponding to 2Ki 15:29, the other to 2Ki 16:7-9. Both these narratives refer to the same event, which in the first place is mentioned briefly in the short sketch of Pekah's reign, while, in the second passage, additional details are given in the longer biography of Ahaz. It would have been scarcely possible for Pekah, when deprived of half his kingdom, to make an alliance with Rezin, and to attack Ahaz. We learn further from Mr. Rawlinson that the conquests of Tiglath-Pileser are mentioned in an Assyrian fragment, though there is a difficulty, from the occurrence of the name Menahem in the inscription, which may have proceeded from a mistake of the engraver. Comp. the title, son of Khumri (Omri), assigned to Jehu in another inscription; and see Rawlinson, note 35 on lect. 4. As may be inferred from Pekah's alliance with Rezin, his  government was no improvement, morally and religiously, on that of his predecessors. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

## Pekahiah[[@Headword:Pekahiah]]

             (Heb. Pekachyah', פְּקִחְיָה, opening [of the eyes] by Jehovah; Sept. Φακεσίας v.r. Φακείας; Josephus, Φακείας, Ant. 9:11, 1; Vulg. Phaceja), son and successor of Menahem, was the seventeenth king of the separate kingdom of Israel. After a brief reign of two years (B.C. 758, 757), a conspiracy was organized against him by “one of his captains” (probably of his body guard), Pekah, son of Remaliah, who, at the head of fifty Gileadites, attacked him in his palace at Samaria, assassinated him and his friends Argob and Arieh, and seized the throne. This reign was no better than those which had gone before; and the calf-worship was retained (2Ki 15:22-26). SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

## Peking-Mandarin Version[[@Headword:Peking-Mandarin Version]]

             SEE CHINESE VERSIONS, s.v. "Mandarin Dialect."

## Pekod[[@Headword:Pekod]]

             (Heb.Pekod', פְּקוֹד, visitation),a symbolical appellative applied to the Chaldaeans in Jeremiah 1, 21, and to the Chaldaeans in Eze 23:23, in the latter of which passages it is connected with Shoa and Koa, as if these three were in some way subdivisions of “the Babylonians and all the Chaldaeans.” Authorities are undecided as to the meaning of the term. It is regularly formed from the root pcakd, “to visit,” and in its secondary senses means “to punish,” and “to appoint a ruler:” hence Pekod may be applied to Babylon in Jeremiah 1 as significant of its impending punishment, as in the margin of the A.V. “visitation.” But this sense will not suit the other passage, and hence Gesenius here assigns to it the meaning of “prefect” (Thesaur. p. 1121), as if it were but another form of pakid. It certainly is unlikely that the same word would be applied to the same object in two totally different senses. Hitzig seeks for the origin of the word in the Sanscrit bhavan, “noble” — Shoa and Koa being respectively “prince” and “lord;” and he explains its use in Jeremiah 1 as a part for the whole. The Sept. treats it as the name of a district (Φακούκ; Alex. Φούδ) in Ezekiel, and as a verb (ἐκδίκησον) in Jeremiah. Fiirst, however, remarks (Heb. Lex. s.v.) that the name is selected in Jeremiah by assonance with פָּקִד, to punish (1, 18), and , פְּקֻדָּה(1, 27, 31), while the association in Ezekiel shows it must have been a people. Hence he suggests the Poetyrians of Herodotus (3:93; 7:67), and the city of Pekod in the Talmud (Jerus. Nedarim, 10), both in Babylonia. SEE KOA.

## Pelagianism[[@Headword:Pelagianism]]

             is the system of doctrine respecting sin promulgated by Pelagius (q.v.) in the early Christian Church.

I. Origin of these Views. — From a very early period the Church discussed the question of the origin of the human soul, and the speculations indulged in on this subject tended very directly to give form and complexion to the views held on the doctrines of sin and of grace. “Whence sprang the soul of each individual human being?” “What is its precise relation to the body as regards the time when they both began to exist?” Such questions as these presented matter of deepest interest to many of the most thoughtful minds among the writers in the early ages of Christianity. The influence of Grecian philosophy still lingered among them, and blended itself with their speculations. This influence is very apparent in the manner in which these questions are discussed by them. The Greek philosophy, however, specially prevailed in the East, while other and healthier influences controlled the practical mind of the West; thus there arose in process of time a divergence between the anthropology of the Eastern or Greek Church and that of the Church of the West. In the Eastern Church, particularly in that of Alexandria, the doctrinal system of Origen, and his peculiar manner of interpreting Scripture, prevailed. They further maintained the doctrine that all human souls, in the aggregate, were created by God in the beginning before the creation of man; that these souls were at their first creation angelic beings, but that, having sinned in their angelic state, they were, as a punishment, doomed to dwell in human bodies, and to sojourn for a certain time on this earth, where, by the discipline through which they must pass, they would all in due time be prepared for resuming again their original angelic life. This strange theory has its roots in the Pythagorean doctrine of metempsychosis, and in the speculations of Plato, though Origen attempts to find support for it in the teachings of Scripture, by his favorite mode of allegorizing, according to his own particular fancy, the narrative of the earlier chapters of the book of Genesis, and certain other portions of Scripture, which he regarded as furnishing illustrations of the same principle. This “stulta persuasio” of Origen's, as Jerome styles it. found but few to embrace it; nay, it met with very strenuous opposition from many quarters, and by the end of the 4th century was almost wholly forgotten.

There were, however, two other opinions propounded regarding the origin of the human soul which gained more currency.

1. The theory advanced by Jerome, that God “quotidie fabricatur animas.” This view was mainly advocated in the East, although it also found a few advocates in the West. According to this theory, each human soul is a distinct and separate creation out of nothing. This position, it is obvious, leaves no room for such a doctrine as that of original sin; for every separately created soul, coming directly from the Creator's hands, must be absolutely pure and holy. If so, how comes it to be polluted by sin? If polluted by sin at all, this must be by the direct act of God; and, therefore, the restoration and recovery of such a soul must be an act of justice on the part of God, and not of grace.

2. The theory that is specially associated with the name of Tertullian, because it was first maintained and defended by him, viz. that human souls are propagated per traduciamn. This, which is generally styled the theory of traducianism — as Jerome's is called the theory of creationism — affirms that the souls as well as the bodies of men are propagated; that God's work of creating de nihilo was finished absolutely on the sixth day, and that since that time there has, properly speaking, been exerted by God no creative energy; that the soul has the power of reproducing itself in individual souls, just in the same manner as the first created seed of any given kind in the vegetable world possesses the power of reproducing others of the same kind. Mainly through the influence of Augustine, who adopted it, the traducian theory was almost universally embraced in the North African and the Western churches. True, that father nowhere in his writings formally exhibits and advocates it, yet all his discussions on the doctrine of sin, and on the relation of men individually to Adam, are evidently based upon it, and take it for granted.

These speculations regarding the origin of individual human souls imparted, to a very large extent, a particular complexion to the opinions promulgated regarding sin. Both in the East and the West the great doctrinal conflict of the early Christians was against the assaults of Gnosticism. The Gnostic idea that man, by his very creation, is sinful; and that he has no freedom of will, was keenly opposed by them. They strenuously affirmed, on the contrary, that man at his creation was holy, that he was absolutely free from all taint of moral evil, and that he became a sinner only by his voluntary rebellion against God. The prevalence of Gnosticism led them to give much prominence to the doctrine that man is a free moral agent, and that he is the author of his own sin. But while strongly and rightly maintaining against the Gnostics that man was a free  responsible moral agent, they did not at all entertain the question of the influence of depravity and apostasy from God on the actings of the human will. This question did not arise till the time of the Pelagian controversy, and then it was found that there existed a diversity of opinion concerning it. The Alexandrian school, e.g. Origen and Clement, strongly affirmed man's entire freedom of will, his full power to believe or not to believe, to obey God or not to obey him. The fathers of that school asserted that the first movement of man towards holiness was wholly the spontaneous self- caused action of his own will; although they acknowledged that he afterwards needed the help of the Divine Spirit to bring his own effort to a satisfactory issue.

They taught that the soul has an inherent power to begin the work of renewal; that God concurs with and helps this willingness on the part of man; that the beginning of all right:action was wholly of man, although its completion depended on divine help; that original sin did not dwell in the πνεῦμα, the soul, the pre-existent spiritual nature which came down from the angelic sphere to inhabit the body assigned to it, but that it had its seat only in the σῶμα and the ψυχή, the body and the sensuous nature; and that the πνεῦμα, though living, so to speak, in contact with sin, was not necessarily defiled by it, but, on the contrary, had the inherent power of warring against it, and of finally overcoming it. Hence it followed that there was no guilt in this corruption, since guilt could only be predicated of the πνεῦμα, being only possible when the πνεῦμα transgressed God's law. While corruption therefore descends from Adam, lodging in the bodily and physical nature, guilt, properly speaking, does not descend, because it is only the result of the action of the individual πνεῦμα; and where the πνεῦμα does transgress, and thereby incur guilt, its doing so is of its own free choice, and not because of any connection with Adam or with his transgression.

This doctrine, fully developed by Clement and Origen, was universally accepted in the East, and was also received with much favor in the West. It experienced some modification from the fathers of the Antiochian and the later Alexandrian school, by their adoption of Jerome's theory of the origin of the soul of man; and in this modified form continued dominant in the East. Here we may find all the germs of Pelagianism. In his Liber apologeticus contra Pelagium de arbitrii libertate, as quoted by Worter, Orosius affirms that in Pelagius and Coelestius Origen lived and spake: “Haec venenatissimorum dogmatum abominatio habet etiam nunc viventes mortuos, mortuosque viventes. Nam Origines et Priscillianus et Jovinianus, olim apud se mortui in his vivunt; et non solum vivunt verum etiam loquuntur: nunc vero Pelagius ct Coelestius,  si in his perseveraverint viventes mortui, ecce adversus ecclesiam, quod miserum est, et quod multo miserins est, in ecclesia palam sibilant,” etc. Pelagianism is certainly countenanced by the Greek anthropology. The latter prepared the way for Pelagianism when it taught that original sin exists only as a disorder in the sensuous nature of man; and that it is not culpable, not guilt, till the πνεῦμα yields to the temptation which arises from this disorder; that our physical nature has, in virtue of its derivation from Adam, strong animal and sensual passions which tempt to sin, and that this is all the corruption we inherit from Adam; that sin is not inherited, but is the result of the action of the individual will of man, and that the will is in no respect whatever influenced or biased one way or another because of our descent from Adam, further than what is implied in its being tempted by the sensuous nature; which temptation it has abundant power to resist. Holding such a doctrine regarding sin, the fathers of the Eastern Church, as a natural consequence, held also the doctrine of Synergism in regeneration. They maintained that man in his natural state has a certain tendency towards that which is good; and that by giving free scope to this tendency he works together with God or with the Divine Spirit, towards the attainment of holiness. The Spirit and man, they said, cooperate in this great work; but the first step towards its accomplishment is taken by man. The natural result of teachings such as these was Pelagianism.

There was, however, a current of thought at the same time moving in a different direction. Tertullian occupies a prominent and chief place among those who guided and gave intensity to the force of this current. He found existing in the public opinions expressed by the fathers in the West indistinct traces of the theory of traducianism — the theory which affirms that man in his entire humanity, soul as well as body, is procreated; that the entire of human nature was originated by God in creation, and that that nature is individualized by procreation. Tertullian gave form and prominence to that theory, which was afterwards embraced as the true theory of the origin of human souls by the whole Western Church. Hence it was rightly argued, if the soul is propagated, there must be also a propagation of sintradux animce, tradux peccati. Juster views then began to be entertained regarding the innate sinfulness of the soul, and as a consequence also regarding the true nature of regeneration as the effect of the agency of the Divine Spirit alone — monergism — seeing that the soul, the πνεῦμα, has no tendency, no inclination, and can have none towards  holiness till it is acted upon by the power of the Spirit of God. Man has no desire towards holiness in himself. That desire is originated and carried forward solely by the Spirit of God. Tertullian did not fully evolve these doctrines, but he led the way to that result. The North African Church gave them fuller development, till in the time of Augustine they received their amplest exhibition.

Cyprian in the 3d, and Ambrose and Hilary in the 4th century, made very considerable advances on Tertullian. They were more separated from those influences of the Greek anthropology than Tertullian was, and hence presented in a clearer light than he did the doctrine of man's original sinfulness, and of his utter moral inability and disinclination towards holiness. They began to grapple with the doctrine of the distinction between the guilt and the corruption of man, both of which they assumed had descended from Adam, and to exhibit the doctrine with considerable clearness of statement, according to the mode of argument adopted by the apostle in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans.

At the close of the 4th century, when this was the state of matters in the Christian Church, touching the opinions that had been published on the subjects of sin and of divine grace, Pelagius appeared, and developed, and gave full expression to, the doctrines which he had learned from the Oriental Church teachers. The opposite system of doctrine that had already in some degree been unfolded in the writings of Augustine influenced him also in the direction of leading him to assume more decidedly the attitude of antagonism. He conceived that certain practical consequences resulted from Augustine's doctrine of man's moral inability and of grace, which in his view were hurtful to the interests of holiness. He saw around him, in Rome and elsewhere, many errors of practical life among professing Christians, which he supposed had their roots in the system of doctrine taught by Augustine, and generally accepted throughout the Church.

Thus we may regard Pelagius as influenced by two tendencies in the development of his doctrinal views: by the false elements which had in the course of the past ages mingled themselves with the speculations on Christian doctrine, partly in the West, but more especially in the East; and by the tendency to pervert Christian truth, and convert the doctrine of human depravity, and of the necessity of divine grace, into a cloak to practical ungodliness. Such a perversion of Christianity gave strength and activity to his opposition to the doctrines with which it was connected.  From the beginning there had been those who had said, “Let us continue in sin, that grace may abound.” His abhorrence of such a principle, together with other influences operating in the same direction, led him to construct a system by which he might counteract the evils which he looked upon as resulting from the doctrine of “salvation by grace,” as it may have been imperfectly or falsely taught by some, especially as it was falsely and perversely practiced by many. His effort was in the interests, as he supposed, of virtue and holiness. He ignored altogether the doctrine of the sinfulness of human nature and the necessity of divine grace, and constructed a system of pure naturalism — a system from which everything peculiar to the Gospel as a revelation of God's plan of mercy towards man is eliminated.

II. Life and Writings of Pelagius. — Very little trustworthy information can be obtained regarding the personal history and character of Pelagius, though his name is associated with one of the most extensive and important controversies within the domain of Christian doctrine. He usually has the name, among his contemporaries, of Pelagius Brito, and hence it has been concluded that he was a native of Britain. Jerome also speaks of him as “Scotorum pultibus praegravatum.” He seems to have spent the earlier and greater part of his life in the retirement of the cloister, where he probably gave himself to the diligent study of the writings of the fathers of the Eastern Church, who were held to be of authority in Britain. These writings undoubtedly moulded his forms of thought, and gave a complexion to all his theological speculations. He was a man of great learning, but there is no evidence in his writings of profundity of thought or of depth of feeling. Augustine says of him, “Istum, sicut eum qui noverunt, loquuntur bonum ac praedicandum virum.” He appears to have borne among his contemporaries the reputation of a man of blameless moral excellence, but the development of his character in its relation to sin seems to have been altogether imperfect. In forming an estimate of his character from the spirit and tendency of his writings, Neander remarks that it is manifest he had never passed through any great mental struggle like that which his great opponent Augustine has passed through ere he attained to fixed conceptions of Christianity. He had never known any deep inner conflicts with sin. He had never vividly realized the true nature and the need of Christian holiness. His whole system proves that he failed to recognize the difference between morality and true evangelical holiness;  and indeed this was an error into which his whole training as monk was very apt to lead him.

About the beginning of the 5th century we find Pelagius at Rome. Acted upon by such influences as we have described, he began his great enterprise. He wrote a commentary on the Pauline epistles: Expositionum in Epistolas Pauli libri 14. This Work, in which he brings out his peculiar views, consists of brief comments on all the epistles of Paul, with the exception of that to the Hebrews. It has a place in the Benedictine edition of Jerome's works. Indeed, all that remains to us of the writings of Pelagius, with the exception of extracts which are found in Augustine's controversial treatises, are usually printed along with the works of Jerome. For a long time they were regarded as the genuine works of that father. The original editors of Jerome's works considered it as a part of their duty carefully to purge away everything that, to them, savored of heresy from his productions, and therefore they used great liberties with the books which passed through their hands. We have the works of Pelagius therefore only in a mutilated form.

In 411 Pelagius passed over to North Africa, in company with his disciple and admirer Coelestius. The name of Coelestius now becomes prominently mixed up with the controversy which soon began to agitate the whole Church. He was probably a native of Scotland. Mercator says of him, “Pelagio adhaesit Coelestius, nobills natu quidem, et illius temporis auditorialis scholasticus.” On reaching Carthage, Pelagius wrote a respectful letter to Augustine, who was bishop of Hippo, and received from him a friendly reply. He does not seem to have given prominence to his peculiar opinions, and he escaped at this time all suspicions of heresy. After a short time Pelagius proceeded to Palestine, where he was warmly welcomed by Jerome, then residing at Bethlehem as the head of a theological school of great repute. Meanwhile Ccelestius, whom he had left behind him in Carthage, came under the particular notice of the Church there. He gave himself forth as a candidate for the office of presbyter, and his doctrinal opinions were therefore narrowly inquired into. Paulinus, a deacon of Milan, challenged them as heretical. A council of the Church of Carthage was convened (412), presided over by bishop Aurelius, to investigate the accusations of unsoundness in the faith that had been laid against him. Marius Mercator, in his Commonitorium adversus haeresin Pelagii et Coelestii, published in 429, records the charges brought against  Ccelestius on this occasion by Paulinus. They are the following, as quoted by Worter:

“1. That Adam was created mortal, and would have died whether he had sinned or not.

2. That Adam's sin injured himself alone, and not the human race.

3. That new-born infants are in the same condition in which Adam was before his transgression.

4. That since neither by the death nor transgression of Adam the whole human race dies, so neither will the whole human race rise again from the dead on account of Christ's resurrection.

5. That the law guides into the kingdom of heaven as well as the Gospel.

6. That there were men who lived without sin (intpeccabiles, i.e. sinepeccato) before the advent of our Lord.” Thus far quoting Mercator, Worter continues: “If we add,

7. That the grace of God is not absolutely necessary to lead men to holiness; and,

8. That grace is given to men in proportion to their merit, we will then have a pretty complete summary of the doctrines taught by Pelagius and his followers.”

Coelestius, in his defense, endeavored to argue that the points of difference between him and his accusers were quite unimportant, and, therefore, that he ought not to be condemned for his opinions. The council, however, judged differently. They would make no compromise. They unanimously declared the opinions of Coelestius to be heretical; and, on his refusing to retract his errors, excommunicated him. This is the first of a succession of ecclesiastical decisions come to by different synods and councils of the Church of that age on the great Pelagian controversy.

Up to this time the controversies that had been carried on within the Church had reference mainly to the doctrines of the person of Christ and of the Holy Trinity, as the Arian, the Nestorian, the Eutychian, and the Monophysite controversies. But now, for a number of years, the whole energies of the Church were concentrated on the discussion of the  doctrines of sin and of grace in connection with the Pelagian controversy. The controversy did not terminate with Pelagius and his immediate associates. Others arose after them. The forms and aspects of the controversy gradually changed. In some respects, indeed, that controversy may be said to be continued to the present day; for it is the old opposition to the doctrine of the sovereignty of divine grace, the old overestimating of the value of human effort, which lies at the root of many of the doctrinal controversies of modern times. But still, in its first, and what may be called its grossest form, Pelagianism rose to its maturity, and again sunk from view in the time of Pelagius himself.

At the time of the meeting of this synod at Carthage, by which Coelestius was condemned, Orosius, a young Spanish ecclesiastic, happened to be in that city with the view of consulting Augustine regarding the errors of the Priscillianists. He afterwards went, by the advice of Augustine, to study theology under Jerome at Bethlehem. On his arrival there he reported what had occurred at Carthage in the matter of Coelestius and his doctrines. The report of Orosius at once gave rise to suspicions regarding the orthodoxy of Pelagius, whose friend and disciple Coelestius was known to be. At a synod assembled in Jerusalem, under the presidency of the bishop John, these suspicions were examined into. Orosius appeared as his accuser. The president was inclined to shelter Pelagius. The presbyters who were assembled there were, for the most part, inclined to adopt the opinions of John, and hence the accuser of Pelagius was received with little favor. When Orosius quoted the opinion of Augustine, whose name was an authority in the Western Church, as opposed to that of Pelagius, the latter replied, “And what is Augustine to me?” (et quis est mihi Augustinus). This was a bold saying; yet it pleased the Orientals, who had not yet learned to venerate the name of the great bishop of Hippo. The doctrinal points having been gone into, and explanations given by Pelagius, his judges declared themselves quite satisfied with his orthodoxy. In the same year (415) another council, consisting of fourteen presbyters, was held at Diospolis (Lydda) in Palestine — Jerome styles it a “miserable synod” — under the presidency of Eulogius, metropolitan of Caesarea, before which Pelagius was again accused of holding and propa. gating unsound opinions.

Two bishops from the Gallican Church, viz. Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aqua (Aix), took a prominent part in the proceedings against him. They appeared, indeed, as his chief accusers. Here again Pelagius did not find it difficult to persuade his judges of his orthodoxy. Their own opinions were  not very greatly different from those of the accused. They understood not the distinctions on which the doctrinal system prevalent in the West was formed. By the use of ambiguous phraseology, and by abstaining from giving any definition of what he really meant by “grace” and “free will,” he easily convinced them that his views were quite in accordance with the doctrines of the Church. The learned Jesuit historian, Petavius (Rationar. Temp. 1:257), thus describes the appearance he made on this occasion: “Ab iis interrogatus Pelagius, facile Graecos homines lingune illius ac fraudis ignaros captiosis responsibus elusit.” The following was the sentence pronounced by his judges: “Since we are satisfied with the declarations of the monk Pelagius, here present, who acknowledges the holy doctrine, and condemns whatsoever is contrary to the faith of the Church, we declare that he is in the communion of the Catholic Church.” This singular condition, however, was attached to the sentence, that he should anathematize all who taught the contrary opinions, not as heretics, but as fools — “tanquam stultos, non tanquam haereticos!” The Eastern Church had never, with such fullness and precision of expression as the Western, given an authoritative deliverance on the doctrines of sin and of divine grace. The anthropology there prevailing, and moulding all their forms of thought, was still that of the second and third centuries, and thus Pelagius escaped so easily when his opinions were inquired into.

It seemed as if in the East the cause of Pelagius and his followers would triumph. They exulted at the victories they had gained over their opponents. But the Western bishops were roused to more resolute efforts than ever to expose and condemn the deadly errors which were growing up under the sanction, seemingly, of the Eastern synods. Jerome condemned these synods as themselves heretical. The vigilant and energetic Augustine now girded on his armor, and stood in the foreground as the great champion for the doctrine of grace. His penetrating and philosophic mind, and the deep insight he had gained in the school of Christian experience into the true nature of the Gospel, enabled him to see through the disguise under which the system of Pelagius was concealed, and to discover the fatal character of its doctrines. He contended earnestly for the faith. He agitated the African Church to investigate the whole matter, and to give forth an unambiguous decree on the subjects in dispute. At the same time he published his first work on the controversy, entitled De gestis Pelagii, in which he spoke strongly against the Eastern bishops in allowing themselves to be so grievously misled by the plausible reasonings and ambiguities of  Pelagius. This was the first of a series of works which Augustine published from time to time during the space of about twenty years, during which he was engaged mainly in conducting this controversy.

Two provincial synods were held in the year following (416); one at Mileum, in Numidia, composed of sixty-one bishops, among whom was Augustine, presided over by Silvanus, and the other at Carthage, presided over by Aurelius, by both of which the opinions promulgated by Pelagius and Coelestius were examined, and being found heretical were solemnly condemned, These synods respectively sent letters to Innocent I, the Roman bishop, giving him an account of their proceedings, and asking his concurrence in the sentence they had pronounced. A third letter, sent in the names of five African bishops — Augustine, Aurelius, Alypius, Enodeus, and Possidius — conveyed to him fuller information regarding the heretical character of the opinions entertained by Pelagius. They at the same time also sent him one of the books published by Pelagius, that he might examine it for himself. Innocent, in reply to those letters, expresses himself well pleased with the dutiful conduct of the North African bishops in referring the matter to the bishop of Rome, the successor of Peter, and the legitimate head therefore of Christendom! He then declares his full concurrence in the sentence they had pronounced against the heresy. “We can neither affirm nor deny,” he says, “that there are Pelagians in Rome; because, if there are any, they take care to conceal themselves, and are not discovered in so great a multitude of people.” It had been reported to him that the Eastern Council had acquitted Pelagius. With reference to this he says, “We cannot believe that he has been justified, notwithstanding that some laymen have brought to us acts by which he pretends to have been absolved. But we doubt the authenticity of these acts, because they have not been sent us by the council, and we have not received any letters from those who assisted at it. For if Pelagius could have relied on his justification, he would not have failed to oblige his judges to acquaint us with it. And even in these acts he has not justified himself clearly, but has only sought to evade and perplex matters. We can neither approve nor blame this decision.

If Pelagius pretends he has nothing to fear, it is not our business to send for him, but rather his to make haste to come and get himself absolved. For if he still continues to entertain the same sentiments, whatever letters he may receive, he will never venture to expose himself to our sentence. If he is to be summoned, that ought rather to be done by those who are nearest to him. We have perused the book said to be written  by him, which you sent us. We have found therein many propositions against the grace of God, many blasphemies, nothing that pleased us, and hardly anything but what displeased us, and ought to be rejected by all the world.” Pelagius, being made aware of the anathema which had been pronounced against him and Coelestius, immediately drew up a confession of his faith, and sent it with a letter to Innocent; but that pope meantime dying, the communication fell into the hands of his successor, Zosimus, who came probably originally from the East, a man whose knowledge of Christian truth was superficial and indefinite. Coelestius went to Rome to prosecute in person his appeal against the decree of the African synods. Zosimus readily favored the appeal to his judgment. He was so far influenced by the written statements and explanation of Pelagius (“subdola Pelagii epistola deceptus,” says Petavius), and by a letter in favor of Pelagius from bishop Praylus of Jerusalem, as well as by the more detailed oral explanation and promises of submission to the papal decision made by Coelestius, that he reversed the sentence of his predecessor Innocent, and declared in very strong terms his disapproval of the decision of the councils of Mileum and Carthage. He sent two letters to the African Church in which he, declared that they were guilty of doing a great wrong to Pelagius and his associate, by condemning them as heretics on grounds altogether insufficient. He complained that they had too hastily given heed to the representations of Heros and Lazarus. “whose ordinations,” says he, “we have found to be irregular: and no accusation ought to have been received from them against an absent person, who being now present explains his faith and challenges his accusers. If these accusers do not appear at Rome within two months, to convict him of having other opinions than those which he professes, he ought to be deemed innocent to all intents and purposes.”

The African clergy were by no means satisfied with this result, as might be expected. They accordingly again met in general council in Carthage in 418, and drew up a full statement of their views, showing why they could not accept the explanation of Pelagius and Coelestius, and why they still adhered to their former sentence against them. In their letter to pope Zosimus they say, “We have ordained that the sentence given by the venerable bishop Innocent shall subsist until they shall confess without equivocation that the grace of Jesus Christ does assist us not only to know, but also to do justice in every action; insomuch that without it we can neither think, say, nor do anything whatever that belongs to true piety.  Coelestius's having said in general terms that he agrees with Innocent's letter is not satisfactory in regard to persons of inferior understanding, but you ought to anathematize in clear terms all that is bad in his writings, lest many should believe that the apostolical see approves of their errors.” The council having entered fully into an examination of the various heretical opinions of Pelagius and Coelestius, drew up and published in nine separate propositions — canones — doctrinal statements in opposition to the errors which they condemned.

Zosimus was induced, by the various representations that were made, to reconsider the matter. He accordingly summoned Coelestius before him, that he might examine into his opinions. He fled, however, from Rome without submitting to such a trial, whereupon Zosimus recalled the sentence of approval he had formally given, and confirmed that of his predecessor, “haereticorum calliditate detecta.” At the same time he sent an “Epistola Tractoria,” or circular letter, in accordance with the new decision he had come to, accepting the decision of the Council of Carthage against Pelagius, addressed to all the bishops of the Western Church for their approval. They all subscribed it, with the exception of eighteen Italian bishops, the chief of whom was Julian, bishop of Eclanum, a small village in Apulia, “a man of a penetrating genius, learned in the Scriptures, and an accurate scholar both in the Greek and Latin languages.” These refractory bishops were all deposed from their office as favorers of the opinions of Pelagius. They afterwards fled to Constantinople, where they associated with Nestorius and his party. Some of them, however, again returned to Rome, and, retracting their errors and professing penitence, they were restored to their office. Julian continued to espouse the cause of Pelagius, whereupon, as Petavius remarks, “Cum Augustino grande certamen iniit, homo lingua promptus ac disertus sed procax et temerarius.”

The civil as well as the ecclesiastical authorities were now moved to pronounce against Pelagianism. The case having been represented to the emperor Honorius, he issued a “Sacrum Rescriptum,” dated from Ravenna, in April, 418, addressed to the praetorian prefect of Italy, who immediately, in conjunction with the prefects of the East and of Gaul, published an edict, commanding that all who were convicted of holding the errors of Pelagius should suffer banishment and confiscation of their goods. Such an appeal to the civil powers was quite in accordance with the opinions which Augustine had already propounded during the Donatist controversy as to the sphere of the magistrate's authority. In replying to  Julian, who complained that an appeal had been made to the civil magistrate in a matter that ought to be decided by an appeal to “reason,” he says — “Vis non timere potestatem? bonum fac. Non est autem bonum, contra apostolicurn sensum exserere et asserere hbereticum sensum. Damnata ergo haeresis ab episcopis non adhuc examinanda, sed coercenda est a potestatibus Christianis.”

From the time of these decrees against him Pelagius passes away from the field of history. It is not known what was his subsequent career. it is conjectured by some that he returned to his native country, and there continued to teach the same doctrines which had already elsewhere involved the Church in so much controversy.

III. Subsequent Controversies On the Subject. — In 429 Marius Mercator published in the East, and dedicated to Theodosius II, his work entitled Commonitorium adversus haeresin Pelnagii et Caelestii. It was translated into Latin, and published in the West in 431. That work contains a powerful vindication of the Christian doctrine of sin and of grace, in opposition to Pelagianism, very much after the manner of Augustine. The Eastern Ecumenical Council of Ephesus, also held in 431, gave forth a sentence in harmony with those that had been issued at Carthage against Pelagius and his opinions. Thus it became manifest that the agitations of these years had resulted in a triumphant overthrow of the heresy which was taught by Pelagius. Yet it is obvious that the influence of the teachings of Origen, which prevailed so generally in the East, mitigated and modified to a great degree the opposition of the Church there to Pelagius and his opinions.

There was a violent antagonism, on the subject of divine grace, between the views of Pelagius and those of Augustine. Augustine held the doctrine of salvation by grace in the strictest Calvinistic sense of the phrase — that every one who is saved owes his salvation entirely to divine grace, without any meritorious cooperation of his own.

There were some, even opponents of Pelagianism, who held that such a view necessarily led to the conclusion that the withholding of divine grace must be the cause of the eternal ruin of the non-elect, and that hence they are not responsible for their perdition. This led to the adoption of a middle course between Pelagianism and Augustinianism. Hence there sprang up a sect at first known by the name of Massiliensians, but afterwards styled by the schoolmen Semi-Pelagians. They adopted the Synergistic theory of  regeneration. They said that the efficacy of grace depended on the manner in which it was received by man. This form of doctrine became dominant in the Church of Rome. Augustinianism had but few to defend it. It was as a system of doctrine almost forgotten, till at the time of the Reformation it once more rose to new life, and was embodied in the theology of Luther and Calvin. The Council of Trent gave full sanction in its canons to the doctrine of Pelagius on the subjects of sin and of regeneration. This is evident from the expositions given to these canons by such divines as Bellarmine. The Tridentine theologians vigorously maintain the Synergistic theory of regeneration, and as vigorously condemn the Monergistic theory taught by Augustine, and entering as an essential part into the theology of the Reformation.

IV. Analysis of Pelagianism. — Much importance attaches to the forms which the Pelagian controversy assumed when it appeared for the first time on the field of Church history. What are called the “doctrines of divine grace,” although always forming an essential part in the system of truth which pervaded and gave life to the Christian Church, had never been the subject of controversy, and, consequently, had never been stated with any definiteness or precision of form till the time of Pelagius. The controversy, as at first conducted, while it cannot be said to have been exhausted, was carried on with so much skill, both on the one side and on the other, that scarcely anything new in the form of argument can be adduced. In the writings of Augustine, the great defender of the catholic truth of that age, there is found such a vast store of arguments, both philosophical and scriptural, in support of the cardinal doctrines of divine grace, that modern controversialists find little else remaining for them than to gather and present them anew. They are as valid now as when first exhibited in opposition to the ingenious and plausible reasonings of Pelagius and his immediate followers, Coelestius and Julian of Eclanum.

The fathers before Augustine, in making reference to the doctrine involved in the controversy, certainly do not always use language which is sufficiently explicit, or which may not be interpreted as giving countenance to Pelagianism; yet the manner in which they quote the Scripture, and the whole tone and tendency of their teachings, sufficiently demonstrate that they held substantially the same doctrines that Augustine afterwards fully developed into a system. Augustine quotes the fathers that preceded him as agreeing with him in his doctrinal views. The principal discussions of the fathers of the earlier centuries were with Gnosticism in its various  manifestations. This led them to magnify unduly the power of man's free will. At this point the divergence in the direction of what afterwards was known in history as Pelagianism first made its appearance. The roots of that system may indeed, in this respect, be found in the ambiguous and frequently inconsistent language of the earlier fathers when speaking of man's possessing a freedom of will — a power of will in the direction of that which is good. They said more than they were warranted, more than consistency with the other truths they maintained required, in affirming that man had a power to obey God. They failed to give due weight and importance to the influences of human depravity on the human will; and thus, while acknowledging that depravity, they attributed a power to the human will in the doing of good which it does not possess. They moreover confounded morality with evangelical holiness. A power to perform outward duties which belong to the sphere of morality is not to be confounded with a power to perform the duties which belong to the sphere of evangelical holiness — the relation we bear to God. Thus it was that, while in the main they held the doctrines of human depravity and of salvation by grace, they at the same time spoke of them with much indefiniteness, so that a Pelagian will not have much difficulty in persuading himself that the germs of his system are to be found in the writings of the fathers.

A scientific exhibition of the system of Pelagianism must rest on its primary or central principle, and must trace the connection of its several parts with that principle. Theologians are not at one as to what this fundamental principle in reality is. Starting from the circumstance that Augustine, in his first anti-Pelagian work, De peccatorum meritis et remissione, combats the opinion that physical death is purely natural, and that the first man would have died even though he had not sinned, Jansen and Garnier have maintained that this doctrine is the root of the whole system of Pelagius, out of which all its parts have sprung. Wiggers begins his development of the system with the doctrine of infant baptism, because that doctrine, though not the first, was one of the first about which the controversy arose. Another theologian of our own time, Julius Muller, finds the ground-principle of the Pelagian heresy in a superficial apprehension of sin — in the want of a true, heartfelt knowledge of sin. Such a defective knowledge must rest on a superficial knowledge of holiness which God demands of us, and which Christ, the living law, shows us in the mirror of his own life. The existence of sin, with its dominion in the soul, is the  fundamental supposition of Christianity, and its subjective recognition is the condition of its pardon; therefore error as to the' inner being and operation of in must result in a false doctrine of the saving grace of Christ. But since the chief and most general contrast does not lie between sin and holiness, but between nature and grace, it is plain, argues Worter, that we must look for the proper root and fountain-head of all Pelagian doctrine elsewhere. To know properly the principle on which Pelagianism rests, we must inquire thoroughly into the history of its dogmas as they develop themselves in the 4th and in the early part of the 5th centuries.

This will lead us to inquire into the relation of cosmology, or, rather, of anthropology, to soteriology, or into the question of the transition from creation to salvation, as Cyril of Alexandria has already briefly but distinctly indicated when, in expounding Isa 43:18; 1 Corinthians 5:17; and Rev 21:5, he has advanced the problem whether the salvation in Christ is not to be considered as a new creation of the not altogether unscathed, but yet not altogether destroyed human nature, or as a restoration of man despoiled by the fall of his original perfection. Apollinarism and the Antiochean school, though in other respects very much separated from each other, teach with one voice that the creation of man was imperfect and incomplete, and they define salvation through Christ as a second creation, coming after and completing the first. Salvation, say they, is the finishing of creation, and on that account is necessary. But such an opinion as this is altogether a perversion of Christianity. It stands ill direct opposition to the true Christian conception of God, which admits of no defective creation, but demands one every way perfect and complete. Besides this, if the first man sinned in consequence of the defective nature with which he was created, it could not be properly sin, which is the action of a free will. Pelagianism, on the other hand, maintains the precise opposite doctrine in asserting that man was in his original creation perfect, and did not need emendation. Julian of Eclanum, who sought to carry back the Pelagian doctrines in general, and to rest them on those principles which lay at the foundation of the system, taught in his argument against Augustine that in acknowledging the doctrine of original sin, i.e. of a moral pollution extending to the personal will of the individual through Adam's sin, we are led to the conclusion that as a Savior God comes into contradiction with himself as a Creator, since by salvation he would make better what by creation was made good and perfect; and that now, since human nature remains the same as it was when  originally created by God, viz. good and perfect, there can be no such thing spoken of as a positive deterioration or injury of it.

If we accept this view of Pelagianism, which maintains the creation of man as originally perfect, it stands rightly in opposition to Apollinarism and the Antiochean school. But holding the perfection of human nature in such a sense as to exclude all idea of moral injury, it falls into the opposite error of overestimating it, so that for it salvation has only an accidental importance, and too great an independence is attributed to man. Though the Pelagian builds the chief doctrines of his system on the doctrine of the original perfection of human nature, yet, in a just development of Pelagianism, which stands in antagonism to the whole doctrines of anthropology, we regard the freedom of the will as forming the fundamental conception or principle on which the whole depends. We begin, therefore, our representation of Pelagianism with the doctrine of the freedom of the will, because the doctrine of sin is conditionated upon it, and the doctrine of grace depends upon both.

The doctrine of Augustine, and of all the Reformed confessions, at least those of the Calvinistic type, is, that in the direction of holiness, or of spiritual good, the will of man is in entire bondage; that man has no freedom to do anything really good before God; no natural power, even in the faintest degree, to love and serve God. This they rested on the doctrine of the entire depravity of human nature. For if it is true that man is totally depraved, it must follow as a consequence that the will is in a state of bondage to evil; and also, that efficacious divine grace is necessary to deliver him from this bondage, and to create a will to that which is good. But while denying the freedom of the will to this extent, i.e. to that which is good, they did not mean to affirm that man had ceased to be a responsible agent, or that he had lost the natural power of willing or of choosing; or that when he chose evil. he was acted upon by a power outside or apart from himself which necessitated his willing or choosing in one direction rather than in another; but simply and solely that, in point of fact, man does always choose that which is sinful, and will certainly and invariably continue to choose it till he is made the subject of renewing grace.

His continually willing that which is evil is the result of the depravity which taints his whole nature; but in so choosing evil, he acts spontaneously — he only does that which he chooses to do.  The doctrine of Pelagius stood in antagonism to this view of the state of man's will. His primary position is that moral freedom — the power to choose right or wrong — the “possibilitas utriusque partis,” as he defined it — can never by any means be lost or impaired, that man must always and unchangeably stand in the same relation to good and evil. He argues in his Epistola and Demetriadem, c. 8. that if we would not place both good and evil in the region of physical necessities, but in that of moral freedom, man must possess an equal relation to both, and be able equally to choose, and to act upon his choice in both directions. “Neque vero nos ita defendimus naturae bonum, ut earn dicamus malum non facere posse, quam utique boni et mali capacem etiam profitemur, sed ab hac earn tantummodo injuria vindicamas. ne ejus vitio ad malum videamur impelli, qui nec bonum sine voluntate faciamus, nec malum.” The sin is not man's, he reasons, if it is necessary. Much more, if it is his, it is free: and if it is free, then he can avoid it. Now if the will is free, he continues, ever ready to do one of both, then it follows that it is able to do both, i.e. to sin or to avoid sinning. In his Confession of Faith, sent to Innocent the pope, Pelagio says, “Liberum sic confitemur arbitrium, ut dicamus nos semper Dei indigere auxilio; et tam illos errare qui cum Manicheeis dicunt hominem peccatum vitare non posse, quam illos qui cum Joviniano asserunt hominem non posse peccare; uterque enim tollit libertatem arbitrii. Nos vero dicimus, hominem semper et peccare et non peccare posse, ut semper nos liberi confitemur esse arbitrii.” He places the freedom that appertains to the will in an abstract indifference to good and evil. “Neque enim aliter spontaneum habere poterat bonum, nisi aeque etiam malum habere potuisset.” In like manner Julian also thus defines what he means by the freedom of the will: “Libertas igitur arbitrii possibilitas est vel admittendi vel vitandi peccati, expers cogentis necessitatis, quae in suo utpote jure habet utrum surgentium partem sequatur, i.e. vel ardua asperaque virtutum vel demersa et palustria voluptatum.”

The freedom of the will, he says, is nothing else than the “propulatrix necessitatum;” so that no one is either good or bad in any other way than by his choosing freely to be that which he is. Freedom is, he says, the “possibilitas peccandi et non peccandi;” and as such is the “facultas in quod voluerat latus suopte insistendi arbitratu.” In answering his arguments, Augustine thus states Julian's doctrine: “Libram tuam conaris ex utraque parte per aequalia momenta suspendere, ut voluntas quantum est ad malum, tantum etiam sit ad bonum libera.”  In the conflict to which the publication of such opinions gave rise, Augustine took, as might be expected, the foremost place. He strenuously maintained, and this was his great doctrine — the doctrine which he was peculiarly honored to develop-that there is a distinction between nature and grace; and that grace is always and only, the efficient cause of all that is truly good in men; yea, even in holy angels, beings who have never sinned, all their goodness and holiness they owe to grace alone, sustaining and confirming grace, though not, as in man's case, renewing and sanctifying. He affirmed that it was impossible for any one to occupy that position of absolute indifference to good and evil which Pelagius declared was the essence of freedom; but that, on the contrary, as an intelligent, active moral agent, man must possess a positive character; that is, he must either be determined towards that which is good or towards that which is evil. He affirmed that man must have some moral bent or bias of his mind; that he must be either inclined towards God or away from him, and this before, in actual outer life, there is any manifestation of such a bias.

According to the anthropology of the Western Church, the will of man was always regarded as in a state of determination or decision either towards good or evil. The Eastern anthropology, on the other hand, presented the will of man as intrinsically and essentially in a state of equilibrium, a state of indecision, having a determination neither to good nor to evil. According to the teaching of the former, freedom is self-determination, the acting from motives that are within ourselves — the not being compelled to act by a foreign power without us. All that is needed to the freedom of the will is that it be self-moved; that is, be uncompelled in all the choice it makes. According to the teaching of the latter, the Eastern or Greek anthropology, the freedom of the will consists in its being in a state of indecision, indifference — the possibilitas utriusque partis;” its having the power of choosing either of two contrasts-the power of choosing differently from what it actually does choose.

In speaking of the sinfulness of man there are two questions which must be carefully distinguished: 1. The question of his depravity or sinfulness, or inherent ungodliness of character; and, 2. The question of his guilt (reatus), or liability to punishment. In the Reformed Confession the two doctrines are kept distinct.\* The guilt of Adam's first sin is regarded as an actual part of the guilt which rests upon all his posterity. Adam and his descendants are regarded as being so identified that the guilt which rested upon him rests upon them also. The inherent  depravity of man's nature is to be regarded as the penal consequence of this guilt. But in the time of the Pelagian controversy, as conducted between Augustine and his opponents, the question was, Does man come into the world in a state of innate depravity? and not, Does he come into the world with a sentence of guilt resting upon him? Hence, while the development given by Augustine to the doctrine of grace, in certain directions, has been of permanent and essential service to the Church, there was in it this defect, that he did not fully apprehend the doctrine of man's inherited guilt. He did not deal with that question as apart from the doctrine of inherited corruption; and hence also his views of the doctrine of justification, as being deliverance from this guilt, were defective. He was in this way led, not into the question of the provision that was necessary for securing pardon and acceptance to man, but into the provision necessary for his deliverance from corruption; or into the doctrine of a change of nature in conversion and regeneration.

If the will is only free when it is in a state of equilibrium — a state of indifference to either good or evil having the same power in the one direction as in the other; if no tendency pre-exists in the will, determining it either towards right or wrong, then sin is exclusively an act, and has no existence apart from that act.† The act of sin does not change the nature of man, it only exposes him to punishment for the act itself. Taking up this position, Pelagius and his followers reasoned that man does not bring with him into the world any proneness or tendency to sin — that he has not a sinful and depraved disposition. Sin is only something actual and personal, they affirmed, and cannot be of the character of a taint spreading over the nature and defiling it. This was one of their cardinal principles: “Omne bonum ac malum quo vel laudabiles vel vituperabiles sumus non nobiscum oritur sed agitur a nobis.” Julian, who was the ablest and most systematic defender of Pelagianism, thus defines what sin is, and whence it arises, according to his theory: “Constat esse peccatum. Quaerimus quid sit; utrum corpus aliquod sit quod ex multis compositum vlideatur an singulare quiddam, sicut unum aliquod elementurn vel per cogitationem a reliquorum communione purgatum. Porro nihil horum est. Quid est igitur? Appetitus liberae voluntatis qunem prohibet justitia; vel ut definitione utamur priore: Voluntas faciendi quod justitia vetat, et unde liberim est  abstinere.” Again Julian says, “If it is asked, Whence arises the first sinful will in man? I answer, A motu animi cogente nullo.”

What is the true relation of man to God? Is he in the condition of one who needs redemption, who needs a divine power to act upon him, so as to raise him morally and spiritually from misery and ruin? This is the prominent question in the controversy as conducted between Pelagius and Augustine. The former asserted that human nature has continued in all its spiritual and moral capacities to be the same as it was when it emanated originally from the Creator — that till men individually, by the exercise of free will, chose that which was evil, they continued in the same sinless, innocent condition in which Adam was before he sinned. The Pelagians did not deny that Adam's sill did affect his posterity, but they held that it was only by setting them a bad example. Augustine held that a sinful nature had descended from Adam to all his posterity, and that, as a consequence, they were all under the bondage of evil, from which a divine power was needed to rescue them. Men come, said the Pelagians, into the world in a state of primitive purity. It has no taint of corruption about it, so that men may live on through a long life, may have so lived — in a state of perfect holiness, such as Abel, Isaac, and Jacob, etc. Yet the influence of example they regarded as such that in general man was deteriorated, yea, that that deterioration was going on and continually increasing. Such deterioration they looked upon, however, as only accidental, and as not essentially and necessarily belonging to man. Man they regarded as possessing perfect power to resist this deteriorating influence if he so willed it, and to grow up by the natural development of the faculties in the possession of which he was created into the character of perfect innocence before God. In order to this development there needed no divine power or influence whatever.

On the subject of grace, the Pelagians altogether denied that there was need for, or that God did at all exercise, any power upon man so as to determine the bent of his will. Maintaining the theory of the freedom of the will we have already described, they admitted no divine influence that conflicted with it. They did, indeed, speak of “grace” as bestowed upon man, but by the word they did not mean the “gratia proeveniens” or “preparans,” the divine influences going before and producing by an irresistible power the first motions of the soul towards goodness, but only the outward revelation made by God to man in the Scriptures, and also those moral and spiritual powers bestowed upon him at his creation. The idea of a divine power influencing man's inner nature, and bending his will,  and determining the action of his mind, they altogether rejected. There was in the Pelagian system no place at all for the doctrine of a divine life being imparted to man through the redemption of Christ, and by the power of his Holy Spirit. They did not, indeed, deny to Christ the title of Redemptor, but the idea they attached to that word was simply that of one who, by his teaching and his life, gave a perfect example — “exacta justitiae norma” — which, by our giving heed to it, will enoble and elevate our nature to a position higher than that originally belonging to it by creation. As Adam gave a bad example to his posterity, so Christ gave a good example, and in this consists his excellence as the Redemptor of man. Christ, by his whole life on earth, and by his sufferings and death, and by the communication he made as the Teacher sent from God, supplied valuable motives which ought to induce men to greater efforts to resist temptation, and to imitate his example in a holy life; and beyond this there was in their system no room for anything else for the Redeemer to do.

V. Literature. — Voss, Hist. Controversiarum Pelagianorum (Lugd. Batav. 1618, 4to); Noris, Hist. Pelag. (Lovan, 1702, fol.); Tillemont, Memoires Eccles.; Schrockh, Kirchengeschichte, vol. xiv; Neander, Kirchengeschichte, vol. ii; Schonlemann, Bibl. Patrun Latinorum, vol. ii; Bahr, Geschichte der rom. Literatur, suppl. vol. pt. ii; Versuch einer pragm. Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus nach ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung, by G. F. Wiggers, professor of theology (Rostock, Hamburg, 1833). The first part of this work was first published in 1821. It was translated into English by Prof. Emerson, of Andover, and published in 1840. The second part deals with the semi-Pelagian controversy down to the time of the second Synod of Orange. Worter, Der Pelagianisnus nach seinem Ursprunge und seiner Lehre, (ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Dogmas von der Gnade und Feiheit), (Freiburg, 1866), is properly, the second volume of the author's History of Pelagianism, the first of which was published a few years previously under the title of Geschichte der christlichen Lehre iiber das Verhiltniss von Gnade und Freiheit bis auf Augustinus. See also Theological Essays from the Princeton Rev. first series; Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. 1867; Cunningham, Historical Theology (Edinb. 1864), vol. i; Shedd, Hist. of Christian Doctrine; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines. (W. G. E.)

\*The Dutch Remonstrants, however and as it seems to us justly, objected to the Calvinistic Confessions that they did not keep these  two questions sufficiently distinct. The guilt, and with it the penalty, of Adam's sin was made to rest upon his posterity, and not his depravity simply. The confusion has arisen from not duly observing that depravity is properly predicable only of the moral affections, while guilt is the result of personal volition alone. Hence, although man's moral nature is wholly depraved, his will is nevertheless free, so long as his affections are not held to exercise a necessarily dominant control over his determinations. For it makes but little difference as to his freedom, whether constraint comes ab extra or ab intra, if in either case it is equally absolute Depravity is inherited, guilt is not. — ED.

† The writer here uses “sin”” in an ambiguous sense. Strictly speaking sin is simply an act of transgression (1Jn 3:4); but this implies sinfulness, which is a moral disposition. — ED.

## Pelagius[[@Headword:Pelagius]]

             a very noted ecclesiastical character of the 5th century, whose origin and early history is much obscured, was the exponent of a heretical theory concerning the dogma of original sin (q.v.) and the necessity of divine grace. His contemporaries applied to him the title of Brito, from which it has been concluded that he was a British monk. His real name is said to have been Morgan (Marigena), which was translated into Pelagius; (πελάγιος). About the year 400 he went to Rome, when he began to teach the system of doctrine with which his name is generally associated. The chief events of his history are noticed under the article PELAGIANISM SEE PELAGIANISM (q.v.). The time and circumstances of his death are unknown. He was the author of the following works: Expositionum in Epistolas Pauli libri xic. These commentaries, consisting of brief, simple explanatory notes on all the Epistles of Paul, with the exception of that to the Hebrews, were at first attributed to Gelasius, bishop of Rome; they afterwards found a place among the MSS. of Jerome. They are printed in the Benedictine edition of that father's works, and also in that of Vallarsi. Quotations made from them by Augustine led Marius Mercator and others to the conclusion that they were the work of Pelagius, although they have come down to us in a somewhat mutilated form, as the editors of Jerome's works regarded it as their duty to expunge from them every passage which seemed to them to savor of heresy (see Garnier's ed. of Mercator, App. ad Diss. 6:367): — Epistola ad Demetriadem: a letter addressed to a Roman  lady of distinction. Like the other works of Pelagius, this also was assigned to Jerome, and is found in the best editions of his works. Its real authorship was ascertained from the quotations made by Augustine in his De Gratia Christi. It was published separately by Semler in 1775: — Libellus Fidei ad Innocentium Papam. This also had a place among Jerome's works, and its real authorship was only discovered by quotations in Augustine's De Gratia Christi: — Epistola ad Celantiam Matronens de Ratione die vivendi, found among Jerome's correspondence, numbered 148, in Vallarsi's ed. of his works. Erasmus assigned it to Paulinus of Nola, and Vallarsi to Sulpicius Severus; but Semler has shown from its style and tone that it was the work of Pelagius. The following fragments of works are also found: Εὐλογιῶν Liber, designated by Gennadius as Eulogiarum pro actuali conversatione ex divinis scripturis Liber; by Honorius as Pro actuali vita Liber. It was a collection of Scripture texts, arranged and illustrated after the manner of the Testimonia of Cyprian (see Jerome, Dialog. advers. Pelag. lib. i; Augustine, C. duas Pelagianorulm, op. 4:8; De Gestis Pelagii, comp. Garnier, Ad M. Mercat. Append. ad Diss. vi): — De natura Liber, to which Augustine's De natura et Gratia was a reply: — Liber ad viduam consolatorius atque exhortatorius (see Jerome, Dialog. adv. Pelag. lib. iii; Augustine, De Gestis Pelag. c. 6): — Epistola ad Augustinum (see De Gestis Pelag. c. 26): — Epistola ad Augustinum secunda (see De Gestis Pelag. c. 30). See Augustinus, De Gest. Pelag. ch. 30; Voss, Hist. Controv. Pelag. (Lug. 1618); Tillemont, Memoires Ecclesiast.; Schrockh, Kirchengeschichte, vol. 2; and the literature quoted in the art. PELAGIANISM SEE PELAGIANISM .

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

             ST., an Eastern ecclesiastic, flourished in the second half of the 4th century. He was made bishop of his paternal city, Laodicea, notwithstanding that he was a married man, because he abstained on religious grounds from all sexual connection. He was one of the leaders of the orthodoxy, and in their struggles with the Arians took part at the synods of Antioch (A.D. 361) and Tyana (367). He was banished to Arabia by the emperor Valens in 370, but was permitted to return in a few years, and was present at the Council of Constantinople in 381, and was one of its most honored attendant bishops.

## Pelagius I[[@Headword:Pelagius I]]

             pope of Rome, succeeded Virgilius in the see of Rome (A.D. 555). Like his predecessor, he was involved in dogmatic controversy with most of the Western bishops concerning certain theological tenets condemned by the Council of Constantinople, and known in controversial history by the name of the Three Chapters. Pelagius was supported in his views by the emperor Justinian, who was fond of interfering in theological disputations. He died in 560, and was succeeded by John III (see Norris, De Synodo Quinta). Sixteen of his Epistles are in the Concilia, tom. 5.

## Pelagius II[[@Headword:Pelagius II]]

             succeeded Benedict I as pope of Rome in 579. He was likewise embroiled in disputes concerning the Three Chapters above mentioned. In the mean time a council which assembled at Constantinople bestowed on the patriarch of that city the title of oecumenic, or “universal” bishop, at which Pelagius was greatly offended. He died at Rome in 590, and was succeeded by Gregory I. Ten of his Epistles and six Decrees are extant in the Concilia, tom. 5.

## Pelagius, Alvarus[[@Headword:Pelagius, Alvarus]]

             a noted Spanish Franciscan, flourished in the first half of the 14th century. He was a scholar of Duns Scotus, and first became grand penitentiary of pope John XXII (1316-34), and later bishop of Silves, in Algarve. He is noted especially as the defender of extreme Ultramontanism by his De planctu ecclesiae (Ulm, 1474; Lyons, 1570; Venice, 1560). He regarded the power of the pope as limitless, and not even bound by the laws he might himself have given. Everything is subject to the pontiff, of course all councils included, even the oecumenical. The tribunal of Christ and of the pope on earth are one. Pelagius's work belongs to the classical documents of the curialistic system of the Middle Ages. See Schwab. Johannes Gerson (Wurzburg, 1855).

## Pelaiah[[@Headword:Pelaiah]]

             [some Pelai'ah] (Heb. Pelayah' פְּלָאיָה[and briefly פְּלָיָה, Neh.], distinguished of Jah, i.e. Jehovah; Sept. Φαλαϊvας, Φαλαϊvα, Φελεία, etc.), the name of two Jews.

1. A Levite who aided Ezra in instructing the people (Neh 8:7). B.C. 445. He afterwards joined in the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:10).

2. Son of Elioenai and a descendant of David (1Ch 3:24). B.C. post 400.

## Pelaliah[[@Headword:Pelaliah]]

             (Heb. Pelalyah', פְּלִלְיָה, judged of Jah, i.e. Jehovah; Sept. Φαλαλία), son of Amzi, a priest, and father of Jeroham (Neh 11:12). B.C. ante 445.

## Pelargus, Christoph[[@Headword:Pelargus, Christoph]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Schweidnitz, Silesia, August 3, 1565. He studied at different universities, was in 1586 professor of philosophy at Frankfort, in 1589 doctor, in 1591 professor of theology, and died June 10, 1633. He wrote, Commentarii in Pentateuchum, Matthaeum, Lucam, Johannem et Acta Apostolorum: — De Conciliis: — Epitome Universce Theologice, seu Explicatio Quattuor Librorum Damasceni de Orthodoxa Fide: — De Ascensione Christi in Cclum: — Compendium Theologicum Doctrince Christianae: — Josias Imago Piorum Regum ac Principum. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pelatiah[[@Headword:Pelatiah]]

             (Heb. Pelatyah', פְּלִטְיָה, delivered of Jehovah; also in the prolonged form Pelatyau ‘hu, פְּלִטְיָהוּEze 11:1; Eze 11:13; Sept. Φαλετία, Φαλεττία, Nehemiah Φαλτία, in Ezekiel Φαλτίας), the name of four Jews.

1. Son of Ishi, of the tribe of Simeon, and one of the captains of the five hundred men who made a successful attack on the Amalekites in Mount Seir, in the reign of Hezekiah (1Ch 4:42). B.C. cir. 700.

2. The son of Benaiah, and one of the princes of the people against whom Ezekiel was directed to utter the words of doom recorded in Eze 11:5-12. The prophet in spirit saw him stand at the east gate of the Temple, and, as he spoke, the same vision showed him Pelatiah's sudden death (Eze 11:1; Eze 11:13). B.C. cir. 592.

3. The first named of two (three) sons of Hananiah, among the descendants of David (1Ch 3:21). B.C. post 536.

4. One of the heads of the people who joined in the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:22). B.C. cir. 440.

## Pelayo[[@Headword:Pelayo]]

             a noted mediaeval royal character, and a convert to Christianity, is said to have been the first Christian king in Spain after the conquest of that country by the Arabs. Contemporary historians make no mention of him, but this may be accounted for on the ground of the insignificant size of his kingdom, which comprised only the mountainous district of Asturias. He is  said to have been a scion of the royal Visigothic line, and to have retired before the conquering Arabs to the mountains of Asturias, where he maintained himself against the armies which were sent to attack him, defeating them in various pitched battles, and in numberless minor engagements. One of his most famous exploits was the destruction of a large army sent against him by Tarik, near Cangas-de-Onis. His men were posted on the heights bounding the valley through which the Arabs were to pass, and, waiting till the enemy had become involved in the defile, at a given signal overwhelmed them with enormous masses of rock. This great success caused Pelayo to be recognized as sovereign by the surrounding districts, and the Christians flocked to him from all parts of Spain. He was much engaged in contests with the Arabs, but nevertheless found time to reanimate agriculture, superintend the reconstruction of churches, and the establishment of a civil administration. He died in 737. Such is the account given us by later historians, who trace from him the genealogy of the royal family of Spain.

## Pelbart, Oswald[[@Headword:Pelbart, Oswald]]

             a Hungarian Franciscan monk, noted for his learning and as a pulpit orator, flourished near the opening of the 16th century at Temesvar. We possess the following works of his, which are mostly homiletical, and have passed through numerous editions: Ponzeriumn sermonuo in de tempore (Norimb. 1483, fol. et al.): — Pomoerium sermonum de sanctis (Hagenov. 1475, 1498, 1501, 2 vols. fol.): — Quadragesimale triplex de pcenitentia, de vitiis, de prceceptis Decalogi (ibid. 1475. fol. et al.): — Stellarium coronce qloriosissince Virginis seu Ponzcwriunz sermonun de b. Virgine (Argentin. 1496, fol. et al.): — Expositio compendiosa sensum litteralens et mysticumn complectens libri Psalmorum, scilicet Psalterium, liber Hynnorum, liber soliloquiorum regii Prophete, item Expositio Canticorum V. T., Canticorum N.T., Symboli Athenasii, Hymni universalis creaturce (ibid. 1487, fol. et al.): — Aurei rosarii Theologice ad sententiarum IV libros parformitor quadripartiti libri IV (Hagenov. 1504, et al.). See Wadding, Annal. O. Min. a. 1483 and Script. O. M. p. 274; Czwittinger, Ungar. litt. p. 301; Fabricius. Bibl. med. et inf. Lat. v. 224, s.v. Pelbartus.

## Peleg[[@Headword:Peleg]]

             (Heb. id. פֶּלֶג, division; Sept. Φαλέγ v. r. Φαλέκ, Φαλέχ; Josephus, Φάλεκος, Ant. 1:6, 5), the son of Eber, and father of Reu (Gen 11:16-19). B.C. 24152176. He was the elder brother of Joktan, and the fourth in descent from Shem. This name is said to have been given him “because in his days was the earth divided” (Gen 10:25; 1Ch 1:19). This notice is usually thought to refer, not to the general dispersion of the human family subsequently to the Deluge, but to a division of the family of Eber himself, the younger branch of whom (the Joktanids) migrated into southern Arabia, while the elder remained in Mesopotamia. The name Phaliga occurs for a town at the junction of the Chaboras with the Euphrates; but the late date of the author who mentions the name (Isidorus of Charax) prevents any great stress being laid upon it. The separation of the Joktanids from the stock whence the Hebrews sprang finds a place in the Mosaic table, as marking an epoch in the age immediately succeeding the Deluge. According to others, however, the name indicates a mere earthquake, or at most an actual division of the earth in some geological convulsion, in which islands and continents were separated and formed by volcanic agency, and followed by extensive emigrations (Gen 9:19; Gen 10:32; Deu 32:8-9). Peleg is called Phalec (Φαλέκ) in the New Test. (Luk 3:35). SEE DISPERSION OF NATIONS.

## Pelet[[@Headword:Pelet]]

             (Heb. id. פֶּלֵט, deliverance; Sept. Φαλέτ, Φαλλέτ, v. r. Φαλέκ and Ι᾿ωφαλλέτ), the name of two Jews. SEE BETH-PALET.

1. The fourth named of the six sons of Jahdai, of the family of Caleb the Hezronite (1Ch 2:47). B.C. post 1612.

2. “Son” of Azmaveth (q.v.), and brother of Jeziel, one of David's Benjamite captains at Ziklag (1Ch 12:3). B.C. cir. 1055.

## Peleth[[@Headword:Peleth]]

             (Heb. id. פֶּלֶת, swiftness; Sept. Φαλέθ v. r. θαλέθ), the name of two Jews.

1. The father of On, of the tribe of Reuben, who joined Dathan and Abiram in their rebellion (Num 16:1). B.C. ante 1657. “Josephus (Ant. 4:2, 2), omitting all mention of On, calls Peleth (Φαλαοῦς, apparently identifying him with PHALLU, the son of Reuben. In the Sept. Peleth is  made the son of Reuben, as in the Sam. text and version, and one Heb. MS. supports this rendering.”

2. Son of Jonathan, and a descendant of Jerahmeel through Onam, his son by Atarah, being apparently the fifth in descent from Hezron, grandson of Judah (1Ch 2:33). B.C. cir. 1618.

## Pelethite[[@Headword:Pelethite]]

             [most Pe'lethite] (Heb. Pelethi', פְּלֵתַי; Sept. Φελετύ, Φελεθί; but 1Ch 18:17, Φαλλεθθί), a class of persons mentioned only in the phrase וְהֲפְּלֵתַי הִכְּרֵתַי, rendered in the A.V. “the Cherethites and the Pelethites.” These two collectives designate a force that was evidently David's body-guard. Their names have been supposed either to indicate their duties or to be Gentile nouns. Gesenius renders them “executioners and runners.” comparing the הִכָּרַי וַהָרָצַים, “executioners and runners” of a later time (2Ki 11:4; 2Ki 11:19); and the unused roots כָּרִתand פָּלִת, of both of which we shall speak later, admit this sense. In favor of this view, the supposed parallel phrase, and the duties in which these guards were employed, may be cited. On the other hand, the Sept. and Vulg. retain their names untranslated; and the Syriac and Targ. Jon. translate them differently from the rendering above and from each other. In one place, moreover, the Gittites are mentioned with the Cherethites and Pelethites among David's troops (2Sa 15:18); and elsewhere we read of the Cherethim, who bear the same name in the plural, either as a Philistine tribe or as Philistines themselves (1Sa 30:14; Eze 25:16; Zep 2:5). Gesenius objects that David's bodyguard would scarcely have been chosen from a nation so hateful to the Israelites as the Philistines. But it must be remembered that David in his later years may have distrusted his Israelitish soldiers, and relied on the Philistine troops, some of whom, with Ittai the Gittite, who was evidently a Philistine, and not an Israelite from Gath, SEE ITTAI, were faithful to him at the time of Absalom's rebellion. He also argues that it is improbable that two synonymous appellations should be thus used together; but this is on the assumption that both names signify Philistines, whereas they may designate Philistine tribes. (See Thesaur. p. 719, 1107.)

The Egyptian monuments throw a fresh light upon this subject. From them we find that kings of the 19th and 20th dynasties had in their service mercenaries of a nation called Shayretana, which Rameses III conquered,  under the name “Shayretana of the Sea.” This king fought a naval battle with the Shayretana of the Sea, in alliance with the Tokknari, who were evidently, from their physical characteristics, a kindred people to them, and to the Pelesatu, or Philistines, also conquered by him. The Tokkari and the Pelesatu both wear a peculiar dress. We thus learn that there were two peoples of the Mediterranean kindred to the Philistines, one of which supplied mercenaries to the Egyptian kings of the 19th and 20th dynasties. The name Shayretana, of which the first letter was also pronounced Kh, is almost letter for letter the same as the Hebrew Cherethim; and since the Shayretana were evidently cognate to the Philistines, their identity with the Cherethim cannot be doubted. But if the Cherethim supplied mercenaries to the Egyptian kings in the 12th century B.C., according to our reckoning, it cannot be doubted that the same name in the designation of David's body-guard denotes the same people or tribe. The Egyptian Shap'etana of the Sea are probably the Cretans. The Pelethites, who, as already remarked, are not mentioned except with the Cherethites, have not yet been similarly traced in Egyptian geography, and it is rash to suppose their name to be the same as that of the Philistines, פְּלֵתַי, for פְּלַשְׁתַּי; for, as Gesenius remarks, this contraction is not possible in the Shemitic languages. The similarity, however, of the two names would favor the idea which is suggested by the mention together of the Cherethites and Pelethites, that the latter were of the Philistine stock as well as the former. As to the etymology of the names, both may be connected with the migration of the Philistines. As already noticed, the former has been derived from the root כָּרִת, “he cut, cut off, destroyed;” in Niphal, “he was cut off from his country, driven into exile, or expelled,” so that we might as well read “exiles” as “executioners.” The latter, from פָּלִת, an unused root. the Arab. palata, “he escaped, fled,” both being cognate to פָּלִט, “he was smooth,” thence “he slipped away, escaped, and caused to escape,” where the rendering “the fugitives” is at least as admissible as “the runners.” If we compare these two names so rendered with the Gentile name of the Philistine nation itself, פְּלַשְׁתַּי, “a wanderer, stranger,” from the unused root פָּלִשׁ, he wandered or emigrated,” these previous inferences seem to become irresistible. The appropriateness of the names of these tribes to the duties of David's body-guard would then be accidental, though it does not seem unlikely that they should have given rise to the adoption in later times of other appellations for the royal body-guard, definitely signifying “executioners and runners.” If, however, הִכְּרֵתַי וְהִפְּלֵתַי. meant nothing  but executioners and runners, it is difficult to explain the change to

הִכָּרַי וְהָרָצַים. SEE CHERETHITE.

## Pelham, George, D.C.L[[@Headword:Pelham, George, D.C.L]]

             an English prelate, youngest son of the earl of Chichester, was born October 13, 1766. He studied at Clare Hall, University of Cambridge; was appointed prebend of Chichester Cathedral in 1790, bishop of Bristol in 1803, translated to Exeter in 1807, and to the bishopric of Lincoln in 1820. He was also clerk of the closet to the king and canon residentiary of Chichester. He died in May, 1827. Bishop Pelham published, Charge to the  Clergy of the Diocese of Bristol (1804, 4to): — Sermon at St. Paul's (1805, 4to). See (Lond.) Christian Remembrancer, March, 1827, page 191; (N.Y.) Christian Journal, 1827, page 160; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Pelias[[@Headword:Pelias]]

             (Πεδίας v. r. Παιδείας; Vulg. Pelias), a corrupt form (1Es 9:34) of the name of BEDEIAH (Ezr 10:35).

## Pelican[[@Headword:Pelican]]

             (קָאִת, kaath'y Syriac, kaka; Arabic and Talmuds, kuk and kik; Sept. πελεκάν, Lev 11:18; καταῤῥάκτης, Deu 14:17; στεναγμός, Psalm cii. 6; ὄρνεον, Isa 34:11; χαμαιλέων, Zep 2:14; Vulg. pelican, onoclratulus). Among the unclean birds mention is made of the kadth (Lev 11:18; Deu 14:17). The suppliant Psalmist compares his condition to “a kadth in the wilderness” (Psa 102:6). As a mark of the desolation that was to come upon Edom, it is said that “the kadth and the bittern should possess it” (Isa 34:11). The same words are spoken of Nineveh (Zep 2:14). In these two last places the A.V. has “; cormorant” in the text, and “pelican” in the margin. The expression “pelican of the wilderness” has, with no good reason, been supposed by some to prove that the kadth cannot be denoted by this bird. Shaw (Trav. 2:303, 8vo ed.) says “the pelican must of necessity starve in the desert,” as it is essentially a water bird. In answer to this objection, it will be enough to observe that the term midbar (“wilderness”) is by no means restricted to barren sandy spots destitute of water. “The idea,” says Prof. Stanley, “is that of a wide open space, with or without actual pasture; the country of the nomads, as distinguished from that of the agricultural and settled people” (Sin. and Pal. p. 486). As a matter of fact, however, the pelican, after having filled its pouch with fish and mollusks, often does retire miles inland away from water, to some spot where it consumes the contents of its pouch. Pelicans (Pelecanus onocrotalus) are often seen associated in large flocks; at other times single individuals may be observed sitting in lonely and pensive silence on the ledge of some rock a few feet above the surface of the water (see Kitto, Pict. Bib. on Psalm cii. 6). It is not quite clear what is the particular point in the nature or character of the pelican with which the Psalmist compares his pitiable condition. Some have supposed that it  consists in the loud cry of the bird: compare “the voice of my sighing” (ver. 5). We are inclined to believe that reference is made to its general aspect as it sits in apparent melancholy mood, with its bill resting on its breast. Oedmann's opinion that the Pelicanis graculus, the shag cormorant (Verm. Samml. 3:57), and Bochart's, that the “bittern” is intended, are unsupported by any good evidence. Neither is there sufficient ground to infer from the above passage any peculiar capability in the genus to occupy remote solitudes; for they live on fish, and generally nestle in reedy abodes; and man, in all regions, equally desirous to possess food, water, and verdure, occupies the same localities for the same reasons. Perhaps the Psalmist refers to one isolated by circumstances from the usual haunts of these birds, and casually nestling among rocks, Where water, and consequently food, begins to fail in the dry season, as is commonly the case eastward of the Jordan — such a supposition offering an image of misery and desolation forcibly applicable to the context (see Thomson, Land and Book, 1:403). The best authorities are therefore in favor of the pelican being the bird denoted by kaath. The etymology of the name, from a word meaning “to vomit,” leads also to the same conclusion, for it doubtless has reference to the habit which this bird has of pressing its under mandible against its breast, in order to assist it to disgorge the contents of its capacious pouch for its young. This is, with good reason, supposed to be the origin of the fable about the pelican feeding its young with its own blood, the red nail on the upper mandible serving to complete the delusion.

Pelicans are chiefly tropical birds, equal or superior in bulk to the common swan. They are partially gregarious; and though some always remain in their favorite subsolar regions. most of them migrate in the northern hemisphere with the northern spring, occupy Syria, the lakes and rivers of temperate Asia, and extend westward into Europe, up the Danube into Hungary, and northward to some rivers of Southern Russia. They ,likewise frequent salt-water marshes and the shallows of harbors, but seldom alight on the open sea, though they are said to dart down upon fish from a considerable height. Notwithstanding their perfect development of the natatorial structure, they are good flyers, and the form of their feet does not interfere with their perching on trees, in which habit they are somewhat peculiar among swimming birds. They are all remarkable for voracity. The skin which extends from the throat between the rami of the lower mandible is extensible, and this structure attains its highest point of development in the true pelicans, in which the distended pouch is capable of holding ten  quarts of water. The use of this membrane is that of a reservoir for the temporary retention of the fishes that are captured; enabling the bird to dispose of the superfluous quantity for its own future consumption or for its sitting mate and young. The face of the pelican is naked; the bill, long, broad, and flat, is terminated by a strong, crooked, and crimson-colored nail, which, when fish is pressed out of the pouch, and the bird is at rest, is seen reposing upon the crop, and then may be fancied to represent an ensanguined spot. This, as above observed, may have occasioned the fabulous tale which represents the bird as wounding her own bared breast to revive its young brood; for that part of the bag which is visible then appears like a naked breast, all the feathers of the body being white or slightly tinged with rose color, except the great quills, which are black. The feet have all the toes united by broad membranes, and are of a nearly orange color. Pelecanus onocrotalus, the species here noticed, is the most widely spread of the genus, being supposed to be identical at the Cape of Good Hope and in India, as well as in Western Asia. It is very distinctly represented in ancient Egyptian paintings, where the birds are seen in numbers congregated among reeds, and the natives collecting basketfuls of their eggs. They still frequent the marshes of the Delta of the Nile. and the islands of the river high up the country, and resort to the lakes of Palestine, excepting the Dead Sea. The Pelecanus onocrotalus (common pelican) and the Pelecanus crispus are often observed in Palestine, Egypt, etc. Of the latter Mfr. Tristram noticed an immense flock swimming out to sea within sight of Mount Carmel (Ibis, 1:37).

PELICAN, in Christian symbolism. , A figure of this bird “vulning herself” — that is, feeding her young with her own blood — was common in old churches, the allusion being emblematic of our redemption through the sufferings of Christ. The pelican often surmounts the cross. A brass pelican was employed as a lectern prior to the use of the eagle. SEE EAGLE; SEE LECTERN.

## Pelisson[[@Headword:Pelisson]]

             SEE PELLISSON.

## Pell[[@Headword:Pell]]

             W. E., a clergyman of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near the beginning of the 19th century. He was for many years a member of the North Carolina Conference; but, his health failing, he was obliged to relinquish traveling, whereupon he turned his attention to journalism, and subsequently became one of the editors of the Raleigh Sentinel. He was an advocate of Southern rights. He died at Raleigh, N. C., Nov. 11, 1870. See Appleton, Amer. Cyclop. 10:581.

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

             a learned divine, and mathematician, who settled at Breda as professor of philosophy and mathematics, and was a great correspondent of Cavendish, was born at Southwick, in Sussex, in 1610, and died in 1685. Besides the  works published by him, his MSS. and letters in the British Museum occupy nearly forty folio volumes.

## Pella[[@Headword:Pella]]

             (Gr. Πέλλα), a city of Palestine, and one of the towns of the Decapolis in Peraea, being the most northerly place in the latter district (Pliny, v. 16, 18; Josephus, War, 3:3, 3; comp. Ptolemy, v. 15, 23, and Stephanus, s.v.). It was also called Butis (ἡ Βοῦτις). The place is not named in the Bible, but the district of “Decapolis,” or ten cities, of which Pella was one, is mentioned in Mat 4:25; Mar 5:20; Mar 7:31. That district must have extended round to the south-east as well as to the east and north-east of the Sea of Galilee. Gerasa, Gadara, and Hilpos, three cities of the Decapolis, lay to the south-east of that sea, and Pella is mentioned with these by Josephus (War, 2:18, 1). Pella must therefore have been somewhere in that direction. Eusebius and Jerome say that it was six miles from Jabesh-Gilead, on the road over the mountains from Gerasa to Bethshan, and twenty-one miles north of Amathus, now Amateh, near the junction of the Zerka or Jabbok with the Jordan. The name of Jabesh is still retained in Wady Yabes, or the valley of Jabesh, which comes down from Jebel Ajliin, or the mountains of Northern Gilead, in a south-westerly direction, and enters the Ghor, or the plain of the Jordan, about eight or ten miles below the latitude of Bethshan. JabeshGilead no doubt lay somewhere within or upon that valley. The only ancient site with ruins within that valley, and on the old road from Bethshan to Gerasa, is one called Ed-Deir, on a height, on the south side of Wady Yabes, a little to the south of Kefr-Abil-Arbel of Jerome, and Arbela of Eusebius, in the borders of Pella. This, i.e. Ed-Deir, is supposed to be the site of Jabesh-Gilead (see Robinson, Lat. Bible Res. p. 319; Van de Velde, Palest. 2:352). In early times a convent possibly stood on the site of Jabesh-Gilead, or a convent  may have been the last building that remained; hence probably the name of Ed-Deir, or “the convent,” called perhaps at first “the convent of Jabesh- Gilead,” and afterwards simply “the convent,” meaning the convent of Yabes or Jabesh. About two hours or six miles from Ed-Deir, on the old road to Bethshan, and about twenty-one miles north of Amateh, on an elevated plateau in the side of the mountains of Gilead, immediately above the plain of the Jordan. and about 1000 feet above the level of that plain, almost directly opposite to, or to the east of Bethshan, and immediately above Sukuit, or ancient Succoth, in the plain below, is an ancient site with extensive ruins, called Tubukat Fahel, or Tubukat Felah, as Dr. Thomson's Arab guide called it, who insisted upon this being the true name (Land and Book, 2:176). This no doubt is Pella. The Arabs pronounce it Fella, or Felah, as they have no p in their language. and use for b for p. The place is described by Porter as a low flat tell, in a nook among higher hills, having around it on the north, west, and south a narrow plain, with a ravine on its south side intersecting the plain. The tell and a part of the plain are covered with ruins-veritable remains of an ancient and important city. Columns of the Doric, Ionic, and Corinthian orders were observed by Irby and Mangles in 1818. Portions of the walls are still standing, and the line of streets is here and there traceable. Among the ruins are the remains of an ancient Christian church. The plain stands out like a terrace in the side of the mountains; hence its modern name, “the Terrace of Pella” (Porter, Handbook, p. 318).

The origin of Pella, like that of Gerasa, is not known. But it is said that some Macedonian veterans from the armies of Alexander the Great settled there under the Seleucidae, and named their new home after Pella of Macedon. Fahel, or Felah, however, may be the form of an earlier Arabic or Hebrew name, which the Greeks converted into Pella. The place was taken by Antiochus the Great, in the year B.C. 218 (Polyb. v. 70, 12). It was afterwards destroyed by the Jews under Alexander Jannasus, because the inhabitants refused to conform to the Jewish rites and customs (Josephus, Ant. 13:15, 4). It was built again, however, and afterwards taken by Pompey, who restored it to its former inhabitants (Ant. 14:4, 4); and it finally became the head or capital of a toparchy or district. But what makes Pella specially interesting is the fact that it formed the refuge and home of the Christians of Jerusalem during the siege and destruction of that city by the Romans (see Baier, De Christianorum migratione in Pellam, Jen. 1694). The disciples had been directed by their divine Master  to “flee into the mountains” (Mat 24:16), and to this place in the mountains of Gilead, we are told, they retired (Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 3:5). If the name of the place be of Hebrew origin, its meaning would be, hidden, secret, wonderful, severed, set apart, escape or deliverance, and a very suitable description would it be, as if it had been providentially intended by anticipation, of the hiding-place of the Lord's people, where his hidden ones dwelt in the secret place of the Most High, and were safe until the calamities of those times were passed; where the secret of the Lord was with them that feared him, and his dealings with them so wonderful; where he severed between his servants and the rest of the nation, and set apart the godly for himself; and where they that escaped out of Jacob, the remnant that was to inherit his holy mountains. found deliverance. The view of the surrounding country from the place is very charming, and the waters of Pella are celebrated. In the ravine on the south side of the city or tell is a large and beautiful fountain, which sends forth a fine, clear, and copious stream down the valley called Wady Mafiz, or the valley of the banana or plalntain, now full of tamarisks and oleanders, into the plain of the Jordan. The fountain is of such copiousness as to show it at once to be the famous fountain of Pella spoken of by ancient authors. In the early ages of Christianity, Pella became an episcopal city, but it seems to have been destroyed at or immediately after the conquest of Syria by the Saracens (Reland, Palaest. p. 924 sq.). See Schumacher, Pella (Lond. 1888).

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

             For the latest account of this place, see Merrill, Beyond the Jordan, page 442 sq.

## Pellegrini, Andrea[[@Headword:Pellegrini, Andrea]]

             a Milanese painter, who flourished in the last part of the 16th century, is commended by Lomazzo. Pellegrini executed some works for the churches, particularly the choir of S. Girolamo.

## Pellegrini, Felice[[@Headword:Pellegrini, Felice]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Perugia in 1567. He studied under Federigo Baroccio, under whose able instruction he became a correct and skillful designer. He was invited to Rome by pope Clement VIII to assist ill the works going on in the Vatican. On his return to his native city he excuted some good works for the churches. He died in 1630.

## Pellegrini, Francesco[[@Headword:Pellegrini, Francesco]]

             an Italian painter mentioned by Baretti, flourished about 1740 at Ferrara, and had studied under Giovanni Battista Cozza. Pellegrini executed a number of works for the churches of Ferrara, among which is a picture of the Last Supper, in S. Paolo; and another of St. Bernardo, in the cathedral.

## Pellegrini, Girolamo[[@Headword:Pellegrini, Girolamo]]

             an Italian painter, flourished at Rome, according to Zanetti, in 1674. None of his works are mentioned at Rome, but he was employed at Venice, where he executed several frescos on a large scale for the churches. which Lanzi says indicate a painter sufficiently elevated, though not very select, varied, or spirited in his forms.

## Pelleprat, Pierre[[@Headword:Pelleprat, Pierre]]

             a French missionary, was born in 1606 at Bordeaux. Admitted to the Society of Jesus, he taught philosophy and theology in several colleges of the order. At Paris his talents in the pulpit soon gained him a reputation. In 1639 he embarked for the missions, and, after having visited several houses of the society, went to Mexico, where he sojourned eleven years. He died April 21, 1667, at La Puebla de los Angeles (Mexico). We have of his works, Prolusiones oratoriio (Paris, 1644, 8vo), a collection of discourses: — Relation des Missionas des Jisuites dans les iles et dtns la terre ferme de l'Aqnrique meridionale (ibid. 1655, 8vo): — Introduction a la langue des Galibis, sauvages de l'Amerique mnridicnale (ibid. 1655, 8vo), a rare work. See Sottwell, Bibl. scriptor. Soc. Jesu; Brunet, Manuel du libr.; A. et A. de Backer, Biblioth. descriv. de la Compagnie de Jesus, 3e serie.

## Pellerwoinen[[@Headword:Pellerwoinen]]

             the god of plants among the Finns.

## Pellew, George, D.D.[[@Headword:Pellew, George, D.D.]]

             dean of Norwich and rector of Chart, was born in Cornwall, England, in 1793. He was a son of admiral Sir Edward Pellew, G.C.B. He was educated at Eton and at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; received holy orders in 1817; became in 1823 dean of Norwich; and later, in 1829, rector of Chart. His death took place at Great Chart, Kent, Oct. 13, 1866. He was an accomplished scholar, and published among other works The Life of  Lord Sidmouth, and several volumes of Sermons. See Appleton's Amer. Cyclop. 6:599.

## Pellican, Konrad Kirsner[[@Headword:Pellican, Konrad Kirsner]]

             a noted German divine of the Reformation period, was born at Ruff bach, in the Rhenish province of Alsatia, in 1478. He was kept at school in his native place until he was fifteen years old, when his parents, who were poor, sent him to an uncle at Heidelberg to study there. But in 1493 he was deprived of all help, and he entered the Order of Cordeliers. Some time after he returned to Heidelberg, and thence went to Tubingen, where his success in study commanded great admiration. His proficiency in Hebrew was indeed surprising. He was a great favorite of the learned Franciscan — general Paul(us) Scriptoris, and while traveling found a companion in the converted Jew Pfedersheim, who presented him with a copy of the Hebrew prophets Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the minor ones. Although he had never studied Hebrew, he yet, by the aid of Reuchlin's rules on Hebrew conjugations simply, applied himself to its acquisition with such zeal that by the end of three months he had finished reading it, selected the roots, and arranged them in the form of a concordance. In the last-named work, however, he had the help of a Jew from Spain, Matthaus Adriani. In the year 1501 Pellican was ordained presbyter. In that year he lost his parents, and on the occasion he transcribed the seven penitential psalms in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. to which he subjoined many appropriate prayers. The year following he received the degree of D.D. at Basle, and was made divinity lecturer at the Minorite convent. About this time he assisted in the preparation of Augustine's works for the press. In 1517 he went to Rome on business for his order, and was in that city impressed with the corrupt condition of the papacy, just as Luther had been, whose reformatory steps Pellican could therefore most heartily approve. Returning to Basle, he assumed again, in 1519, the guardianship of his Franciscan cloister there. In 1522 he became acquainted with OEcolampadius, and was soon suspected of reformatory tendencies. Thus in this very year, at a chapter of the order in Leonberg, in Suabia, and at another in Basle, he was constantly inquired about and watched by one Satzger, the provincial of the order. But as the senate of Basle interceded in Pellican's behalf, no measures of censure were put in force against him. Shortly after he was, together with OEcolampadius, made lecturer in divinity, and as he dared to expound the Scriptures and to adopt reformatory measures, he was sorely persecuted and maligned, as were all Reformers.

So long as he had  remained a friar he had been universally esteemed for his learning and integrity; but when it pleased God to convince him of the errors and absurdities of the papal Church, and he began publicly to expose them, he was directly made the object of its hate and persecution. In 1526, having at the request of Zwingli gone to Zurich for the purpose of hearing the lectures of Leo Judat on Hebrew, he there renounced popery, and was soon after married. A little while later he was by Zwingli's interest made a professor of Greek and Hebrew at Zurich, and he evinced his fitness for the position by the publication of an edition of the Hebrew Bible, with the comments of Aben-Ezra and R. Salamon (1527). In his first lectures on the 15th chapter of Exodus, he thanked God who had brought him out of the Egyptian and papistic captivity, helped him to pass the Red Sea, and sing the song of Miriam with joy — “Sing ye to the Lord, for he has triumphed gloriously.” He diligently applied himself also to the study of the Turkish language, that he might be useful to some who had become his neighbors, by efforts for their conversion to the Christian faith. During the thirty years that he was professor at Zurich, he was universally admired for his extensive learning and unwearied labors. He died in 1556, and was succeeded in his position by the illustrious Peter Martyr. His works consist principally of lectures and annotations upon the Scriptures, translations from the Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Chaldee; also an exposition of several books of the Old and New Testaments, together with a translation from Ludovicus Vives, designed to convince the Jews of the truth of Christianity. His most important publications are, Psalterium Davidis ad Hebraicam veritatem interpretatunz cum scholiis brevissimis (Strasburg, 1527, 8vo); the Zurich edition of 1532, in 8vo, is more carefully prepared and more complete: — Commentarii Bibliornum cum vulgata editione, sed ad Hebraicam lectionenn accurate emendata (Zurich, 1531-36, 5 vols. fol.). Richard Simon says of this work: “He keeps to the literal sense, and does not lose sight of the words of his text. Though well read in rabbinical authors, he seeks more to be useful to his readers than to display his rabbinical lore. He considers it safest to borrow nothing from the Jews but grammatical observations.” The characteristics of Pellican were sincerity, candor, uprightness, and humility, rendering him eminent in public life, and in private most amiable. See, besides the chronicle of his life which he has himself written, Fabricius, Oratio hist. de vita Pellicani (1608); Hess, Pellican's Jugendeschichte (1795); Hottinger, Altes u. Neues aus der Gelehrtenwelt; Merle d'Aubigne, Hist. of the Ref. in Switzerland; Adam, Vita theol. German. 1:126 sq.; Hagenbach, Vater u. Begrunder der ref.  Kirche; Ersch u. Gruber, Allgemeine Encyklopadie; Middleton, Evangel. Biogr. 2:60.

## Pellicia, Alexius Aurelius[[@Headword:Pellicia, Alexius Aurelius]]

             an Italian theologian of note, was born at Naples in 1744, and was educated at the high school of his native place. When only twenty-one years old, and shortly after graduation, he translated Tillemont's Life of Christ into Italian, and enriched it with learned notes. Two years later he was teacher of liturgy at the Conference, and at twenty-seven was appointed professor of ethics and archaeology at his alma mater. A year later he wrote a dissertation on the obligation of the Church to the State. This was followed by other learned dissertations; but his chef d'aeuvre is De Christianae ecclesie primae, mediae, et novissinmae tatis politia libri iv (Naples, 1777, 3 vols. 8vo; new ed. by Ritter [Colossians 1829], with add. by Brown, in 1838), which is one of the best archaeological works written by Romanists. He died in 1823.

## Pelling, Edward, D.D.[[@Headword:Pelling, Edward, D.D.]]

             an English divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th centurv. He was a graduate of Cambridge University, and was vicar of St. Helen's, London, in 1674; rector of St. Martin's, Ludgate, in 1678; canon of Westminster in 1683, and subsequently rector of Petworth. He died about the opening of the 18th century. He published A Discourse, philosophical and practical, on the Existence of God (Lond. 1696-1705, 2 pts. 8vo), and many occasional Sermons (1679-1703). some of which were in opposition to the doctrines of the Church of Rome. See Watts, Bibl. Brit. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Pellini, Andrea[[@Headword:Pellini, Andrea]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Cremona probably near the opening of the 16th century. Very little is known of his personal history. He is supposed to have been a scholar of Bernardino Campi. Lanzi says that “Pellini, though unknown in his native city Cremona, is celebrated at Milan for his Descent from the Cross, in the church of S. Eustorgio.” This is a grand composition, correctly designed and well colored, dated 1595.

## Pellini, Marc Antonio[[@Headword:Pellini, Marc Antonio]]

             an Italian painter, was born, according to Orandi, at Pavia in 1664. He first studied under Tommaso Gatti at Pavia, and afterwards visited Bologna and Venice for improvement. He executed a few works for the churches in his native city, but did not rise above mediocrity. He died in 1760.

## Pellisson-Fontanier, Paul[[@Headword:Pellisson-Fontanier, Paul]]

             a noted French character of the reign of king Louis XIV, a renegade from the Huguenots, and the principal government agent for the conversion scheme of the Protestants through bribery, was born at Beziers in 1624. He was deprived of his father at an early age, and was educated by his mother in the principles of the Reformed Church. His family had for a long time been distinguished in the profession of the law, and to that profession he was also destined. He studied successively at Castres, Montauban, and Toulouse, and acquired an intimate knowledge of the best classical writers, and of French, Spanish, and Italian literature. To the study of civil law and jurisprudence he especially devoted himself; the fruits of this shortly afterwards appeared in a paraphrase of the Institutes of Justinian, which was published at Paris in 1645. He commenced his legal career with considerable success at Castres, but it was soon interrupted by a most severe attack of small-pox, which permanently affected his sight, and so disfigured him that he was compelled to abandon the practice of his profession. He retired into the country, and devoted himself to general literature. In 1652 he settled in Paris, where his writings had already made him advantageously known. The French Academy, in acknowledgment of the services he had rendered it by writing its history (the work perhaps by which he is best known), decreed that he should be appointed a member of it on the first vacancy that should occur, and that in the mean time he should be permitted to attend their sittings: to enhance the honor, they further decided that a similar privilege should on no consideration be granted in future to any man of letters. The same year Pellisson purchased the office of secretary to the king; and in 1657 he was appointed first clerk to the minister of finances.

In this employment, where vast sums of money passed through his hands, he maintained his reputation for integrity, while his increased means enabled him to render pecuniary services to the distressed men of letters in the capital. His services were rewarded with the appointment, in 1660, to the office of state counselor. The following year, when the minister was found guilty of defalcation, Pellisson, as the  supposed confidant of the minister. was imprisoned in the Bastile. He remained upwards of four years in captivity. During this imprisonment he composed three memoirs in behalf of Fouquet, which have been reckoned the finest models of that species of writing in the French language. They became however the plea for additional severity towards Pellisson. In order to increase the rigor of his confinement, he was deprived of the use of ink and paper, the want of which compelled him to have recourse to divers ingenious expedients, such as writing on the margin of his books with the lead of the casements. The persevering influence of his friends was at length successful in restoring him to liberty; and he was even received into favor by a king whose characteristic was seldom to forgive any opposition to his despotic will. The sufferings Pellisson had undergone at the Bastile were compensated by a pension and the appointment of historiographer to the king. In 1670 he abjured Protestantism for the Roman Catholic faith.

This change, followed soon after by his entrance into holy orders, enabled Louis XIV to bestow upon him the abbacy of Gimont and the priory of St. Orens, a benefice of considerable value in the diocese of Auch. However, he is favorably distinguished from most proselytes by the lenient and tolerant disposition which he evinced towards those who disagreed with him in opinion, and, when high in royal favor, he publicly disapproved and opposed by his influence and writings the violent measures which were employed by the king's command to bring his Protestant subjects within the pale of the Roman Church. He persuaded his royal master to empower him to use money as he might see fit for the conversion of the Huguenots; and, as the king consented, Pellisson became the advocate of the policy of bribing the Nonconformists into the Church's fold. He communicated with the bishops, and placed in their hands sums of money, with instructions to employ them in indemnifying persons who might abjure heresy for any loss they sustained, or might imagine they sustained, by taking that step. Of course the plan worked well, for there are always many whom gold will tempt. and it is not at all surprising that Madame de Maintenon could write in 1683, “M. Pellisson works wonders... He may not be so learned as M. Bossuet, but he is more persuasive. One could never have ventured to hope that all these conversions would have been obtained so easily” (sic). “I can well believe,” she writes in another place, “that all these conversions are not equally sincere; but God has numberless ways of recalling, heretics to himself.

At all events, their children will be Catholics. If the parents are hypocrites, their outward submission at least brings them so much nearer to the truth; they bear the signs of it in common with the faithful. Pray God  to enlighten them all; the king has nothing nearer to his heart” (Lettres et Memoires de Mme. de Maintenon, 8:90). In 1671, on the occasion of the reception of the archbishop of Paris as member of the Academy, he delivered a panegyric on Louis XIV, which was translated into the Latin, English, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, and even Arabic languages. In 1673, having incurred the displeasure of Madame de Mtontespan, he was deprived of his office of royal historiographer; but, at the special request of Louis, he continued to write the life of the king, and for that purpose accompanied him in several of his campaigns. Nearly every succeeding year of Pellisson's life was marked by some instance of royal favor. His death took place at Versailles in February, 1693. The fact of his not receiving the sacrament in his last moments has been explained by the Roman Catholic writers to be owing to the suddenness of his death; by Protestants to his unwillingness to sanction, by a solemn act of hypocrisy, a conversion which they allege to be insincere. The arguments on both sides will be found impartially stated by Bayle (art. “Pellisson”). It may reasonably be supposed that Pellisson was never truly won over to the Church of Rome, and that he professed conversion for selfish purposes. His efforts to win over Protestants was only to give them advantages of which he saw them deprived, and to avoid persecution. He corresponded with Leibnitz regarding the question of religious toleration, and laid down his views in Reflexions sur les differences en matiere de Religion— (1686). See Weiss, Histoire des Refugies Protestants de France (Paris, 1863, 12mo), p. 65 sq., especially p. 78; Jervis, Hist. of the Church of France, 2:63 sq.; Smiles, Hist. of the Huguenots after the Revocation (see Index).

## Pelloma[[@Headword:Pelloma]]

             an ancient Roman deity, was believed to ward off the attacks of the enemy.

## Pelloutier, Simon[[@Headword:Pelloutier, Simon]]

             a French historian, was born at Leipsic, Germany, Oct. 27,1694. His father, a merchant established at Lyons, had been driven from France by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Aided by an excellent memory and a strong desire to educate himself, he studied at Halle, at Berlin, and Geneva. Admitted to the evangelical ministry, he served the French churches of Buchholtz (1715), of Madgeburg (1719), and of Berlin (1725), where he was the colleague of Lentant. In 1743 he was elected member of the Academy of Sciences at Berlin, and was chosen for its librarian in 1745. He  died at Berlin Oct. 3, 1757. His principal work is, Histoiare des Celtes et particulierement des Gaulois et des Germains depuis les temps fabuleux jusqua la prise de Roze par les Gaulois (La Haye, 1740-1750, 2 vols. 12mo). This edition is full of faults; Chiniac de la Bastide has given a second, revised and enlarged after the MSS. of the author (Paris, 1771, 2 vols. 4to, or 8 vols. 12mo), which was translated into German by Purmann (Frankfort, 1777-1784, 3 vols. 8vo). “This work,” says the Journal des Savants, “is very curious and agreeable in many respects; it is full of an extremely varied erudition. The author, not satisfied with proving what he advances, always accompanies his proofs with judicious reflections, from which he afterwards draws very extended conclusions, calculated to throw light upon the history and antiquities of all the different peoples of Europe.” The editor has added to the Histoire des Celtes several dissertations by Pelloutier; among others the Discours sur les Galates, which gained for him in 1742 a prize from the French Academy of Inscriptions. See Brucker, Pinacotheca, dec. 3, No. 9; Formey, Eloges; Haag, La France Protestante.

## Pelon[[@Headword:Pelon]]

             SEE PELONITE. (below)

## Pelonite[[@Headword:Pelonite]]

             (Heb. with the art. hap-Peloni', הִפְּלוֹנַי, as if from a place or man Pelon. otherwise unknown; Sept. n ὁ Φελωνί v. r. ὁ Φαλλωνί, 1Ch 11:27; ὁ Φελλωνί, 1Ch 11:36; ὁ ἐκ Φαλλοῦς, 1Ch 27:10; Vulg. Phalonites, Phelonites, Phallonites). Two of David's mighty men, Helez and Ahijah, are called Pelonites (1Ch 11:27; 1Ch 11:36). From 1Ch 27:10 it appears that the former was of the tribe of Ephraim, and “Pelonite” would therefore be an appellation derived from his place of birth or residence. But in the Targum of rabbi Joseph it is evidently regarded as a patronymic, and is rendered in the last-mentioned passage “of the seed of Pelan.” In the list of 2 Samuel 23 Helez is called (2Sa 23:26) “the Paltite,” that is, as Bertheau (on 1 Chronicles 11) conjectures, of Beth-Palet, or Beth-Phelet, in the south of Judah. But it seems probable that “Pelonite” is the correct reading. SEE PALTITE. “Ahijah the Pelonite” appears in 2Sa 23:34 as “Eliam the son of Ahithophel the Gilonite,” of which the former is a corruption; “Ahijah” forming the first part of “Ahithophel,” annd  “Pelonite” and “Gilonite” differing only by פand ג- If we follow the Sept. of 1 Chronicles 27, the place from which Helez took his name would be of the form Phallu, but there is no trace of it elsewhere, and the Sept. must have had a differently pointed text. In Heb. פְּלנַי, peloni, as an appellative, corresponds to the Greek ὁ δεῖνα, “such a one:” it still exists in Arabic and in the Spanish Don Fulano, Mr. So-and-so.

## Pelopeia[[@Headword:Pelopeia]]

             a festival observed by the people of Elis in honor of Pelops. It was kept in imitation of Hercules, who sacrificed to Pelops in a trench, as it was usual, when the manes and the infernal gods were the objects of worship.

## Pelops[[@Headword:Pelops]]

             in Greek mythology, the grandson of Zeus and the son of Tantalus, was slain by his father, and served up at an entertainment which he gave to the gods, in order to test their omniscience. They were not deceived, and would not touch the horrible food; but Ceres, being absorbed with grief for the loss of her daughter, ate part of a shoulder without observing. The gods then commanded the members to be thrown into a caldron, out of which Clotho brought the boy again alive, and the want of the shoulder was supplied by an ivory one. According to the legend most general in later times, Pelops was a Phrygian, who, being driven by hos from Sipylos. came with great treasures to the peninsula which derived from him the name of Peloponnesus, married Hippodamia, obtained her father's kingdom by conquering him in a chariot-race, and became the father of Atreus, Thyestes, and other sons. But in what appear to be the oldest traditions. he is represented as a Greek, and not as a foreigner. He was said to have revived the Olympic games, and was particularly honored at Olympia.

## Peloria[[@Headword:Peloria]]

             a festival observed by the Thessalians in commemoration of the news which they received by one Pelorius that the mountains of Tempe had been separated by an earthquake, and that the waters of the lake which lay there stagnated had found a passage into the Alpheus, and left behind a vast, pleasant, and most delightful plain, etc.

## Pelt, Anton Friedrich Ludwig[[@Headword:Pelt, Anton Friedrich Ludwig]]

             a German theologian, was born at Regensburg June 28, 1799, and was educated first at Btickeburg and Altona, and then at the universities in Jena. Kiel, and Berlin. At the last named high school he became “Privatdocent” in 1826, in 1829 was made extraordinary professor at Greifswalde, and in 1835 regular professor at Kiel. After the subjugation of Schleswick-Holstein by the Danes, Pelt was dismissed, and he was made university professor at Greifswalde, and given the living of Kemnitz, near by. He died in 1861. His principal work is Theologische CEncyklopadie als System in Zusammenhanrge mnit der Geschichte der theol. Wissenschaft u. uhrer einzelnen Zweige (Hamb. and Gotha, 1843). Besides, he published, Conmentar zu den Thessalonischen Briefen (1829): — Der Kanmpf Clas dem Glauben (1837), a reply to Strauss; and, with Rheinwald, Homiliarium patristicunt (Berl. 1829, 4 Nos.), which, unfortunately, was never completed. He also founded in Kiel in 1838 the periodical Mitarbeiten.

## Peltanus, Theodor Anton[[@Headword:Peltanus, Theodor Anton]]

             a German Jesuit, born at Pelte, near Liege, was professor of theology at Ingolstadt from 1562 to 1574, and died at Augsburg, May 2, 1584. He wrote, De Peccato Originali: — De Christianorum Sepulturis, Exequiis et Anniversais: — Theologia Naturalis et Mystica: — Paraphrasis ac Scholia in Proverbia Salomonis: — Catena Graecorum Patrum in Proverbia. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:70; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:880, 883. (B.P.)

## Pelte[[@Headword:Pelte]]

             (Lat. Peltanus ), THEODORE ANTOINE DE, a Belgian theologian, was born in 1552 at Pelte, a department of Liege. He assumed the dress of a Jesuit, and taught Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt, then theology at Augsburg. He died in that city May 2, 1584. Besides different treatises of controversy, we have of his works. Paraphrasis et scholia in Proverbia S.lomnonis (Antw. 1606, 4to); and he translated from the Greek into Latin Coticilii Ephesinii prinmi acta (Ingolstadt, 1576, eol.): — Gracorumn xviii Patrsum- homiliae in prcecipua festa (ibid. 1579, 8ro): — the Commentaires of Andre of Caesarea, of Victor of Antioch, etc. See Foppens, Bibl. Belgica; Kobold, Lexicon.

## Pelton, Samuel[[@Headword:Pelton, Samuel]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Montgomery, Orange County, N.Y., March 25, 1776. He received his education in a classical school at Montgomery, studied theology privately, was licensed by Hudson Presbytery, and ordained by the same in 1816 as pastor of the Church at Hempstead, N.Y., and subsequently of the Church in Haverstraw, N.J. He died July 10, 1864. Mr. Pelton was a man of strong mind, a ready preacher, and a good pastor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 160.

## Pelusiotae[[@Headword:Pelusiotae]]

             (from πηλός, mud), a name applied by the Origenists in the 3d century to the orthodox Christians, denoting that they were earthly, sensual, carnally minded men, because they differed from them in their apprehension of spiritual and heavenly bodies.

## Pelvert, Bon-Francois Riviere[[@Headword:Pelvert, Bon-Francois Riviere]]

             (called the abbi), a French theologian, was born Aug. 5, 1714. He was a member of a community of clergymen formed in the parish of Saint- Germain-l'Auxerrois, and was admitted to orders by Bossuet, bishop of Troyes, who procured him, besides several benefices, a theological chair in his seminary. Dismissed by bishop Poncet de la Riviere, he retired to the community of Saint-Josse at Paris, and in 1763 assisted at the Council of Utrecht. His refusal to adhere to the formulary prevented him from performing any ecclesiastical duty. He died in Paris Jan. 18, 1781. His principal writings are, Dissertations sur l'approbation necessaire pour administrer le sacrement de penitence (1755, 12mo): — five Lettres sur la distinction de la religion naturelle et de la religion revelee (1769-70, 2 vols. 12mo): — six Lettres on l'on examine la doctrine de quelques ecrivains modernes celntre les incredules (1776, 2 vols. 12mo); directed against the Jesuits Delamare, Floris, Paulian, and Nonnotte: — Dissertation sur la sacrifice de la messe (1779, 12mo), which drew him into a sharp controversy with Plowden, and were followed by a Defense (1781, 3 vols. 12mo): — Exposition et Conmparaison de la doctrine des anciens e dedes nouveaux philosophes (1787, 2 vols. 12mo), in which the necessity of revelation is established. Abbe Pelvert edited the treatise De Gratia of the abbe Gourlin (1781, 3 vols. 4to), and left a large number of manuscripts. See Frere, Biblioy. Normande, vol. ii; Feller et Weiss, Biog. Univ. s.v.

## Pelvicula Amularum[[@Headword:Pelvicula Amularum]]

             is a term applied to the metal stands for the cruets (q.v.).

## Pemberton, Ebenezer[[@Headword:Pemberton, Ebenezer]]

             (1), a Congregational minister, was born about 1661, and was educated at Harvard University, where, after graduation, he taught for a while. Aug. 28, 1700, he became pastor of the Boston “Old South Church,” and  remained in that place until his death, Feb. 13, 1717. He published a number of Sermons, three prefatory Epistles, etc. (1710-19; published collectively in 1727, 8vo). His Election Sermon of 1710 was highly esteemed. Sec Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:250.

## Pemberton, Ebenezer (2)[[@Headword:Pemberton, Ebenezer (2)]]

             (2), a Congregational minister, son of the preceding, was born in 1704, in Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1721; served for some time as chaplain at Castle William, and in 1727 became pastor of the Presbyterian Church ill New York, where he labored until 1753, when he resigned, and was installed pastor of the Middle Street Church, Boston, March 6, 1754, and there remained until it was closed by the Revolution in 1775. Though one of the most popular preachers of his time, his friendship for governor Hutchinson, one of his flock, caused an imputation of disloyalty, and created difficulties in the Church. He died in Boston Sept. 15,1777. He published, Sermons on several Subjects, preached in the Presbyterian Church in New York (1738): — Dudleian Lecture (1766): — Salvation by Grace through Faith; Eight Sermons preached at Boston (1774); and a few occasional Sermons (1731-71). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:336.

## Pemberton, Israel[[@Headword:Pemberton, Israel]]

             (1), a Quaker preacher of great usefulness, was the son of Phineas Pemberton, one of the early settlers of Pennsylvania, and was born in Bucks County of that state in 1684. He was apprenticed to a merchant in Philadelphia, and subsequently became one of the most considerable merchants of that city. He took an active part in the public affairs of the province, and was for nineteen years a member of the General Assembly. Having been trained religiously, he sustained through life an unblemished character by his justice, integrity, and uprightness. He was endowed with a peculiar sweetness of disposition, which rendered his company agreeable and instructive. He also devoted himself to the ministration of the truth, and approved himself a faithful elder, manifesting by his meekness and humility that, having submitted himself to the discipline of the cross, he was qualified to counsel others in the way of holiness. While attending the funeral of an acquaintance, he was seized with a fit, supposed to be apoplexy, and expired in about an hour, Jan. 19, 1754. See Janney, Hist. of Friends, 3:334.

## Pemberton, Israel (2)[[@Headword:Pemberton, Israel (2)]]

             (2), a Quaker philanthropist, was brother of James and John, and grandson of Phineas, who came over with Penn, and settled near the Falls of Delaware. ISRAEL, his grandson, a man of eloquence and liberality, devoted the latter part of his life to acts of benevolence, especially to the Indians. He died at Philadelphia in 1779, aged 63 years.

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

             a devoted Quaker preacher, a native of Philadelphia, and brother of the preceding, was born Nov. 27, 1727. John was early interested in the Gospel labors of his society, and traveled much both in this country and in Europe in the service of his divine Master. His first visit to Europe was in company with John Churchman, in the year 1750; his second was undertaken in 1782, and occupied him until 1789. His return to his relatives and friends after so long an absence was exceedingly gratifying to them all; but this pleasure was abated by the early discovery that he came home under a burdened mind, from an apprehension that his duty was not fully performed, which occasioned so great distress and conflict as sometimes to affect his bodily health. In his disposition he was modest; yet when his duty led him among the great and distinguished, his manner was plain, solid, and dignified. To the different ranks of sober people he was open and communicative. To the poor he addressed himself with great tenderness and condescension, and might indeed be said to have been the poor man's confiding counselor and friend. Like his Lord and Master, he went about continually doing good. He embarked for Amsterdam in the spring of 1794, and on his arrival in that city engaged in religious labors which occupied him some weeks. He then proceeded towards Pyrmont, in Westphalia, Germany, where there was a monthly meeting of Friends. At Bielefeld he was taken ill with a fever; yet he recovered sufficiently to travel, and reached Pyrmont early in the ninth month. He remained in that vicinity about four months, being in very poor health, yet most of the time occupied in religious labors. He died Jan. 31, 1795. See Janney, History of Friends, 4:80.

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

             a learned Calvinistic English divine, was born in 1591; educated at Magdalene College, Oxford; removed to Magdalene Hall in 1613, and there became a noted divinity reader and tutor. He appears to have been a  good Hebrew scholar, and employed his learning very advantageously in explanations of obscure passages of Scripture, and thorough expositions of the first nine chapters of Zechariah and the book of Ecclesiastes. He was a famous preacher, a good orator, an excellent scholar, and an ornament to society. He died in 1623. His works were published at London in one vol. fol. (1635; 4th ed. Oxford, 1659), and embrace: Vindiciae Fidei, or a Treatise of Justification by Faith; A Treatise of the Providence of God; Salomon's Recantation and Repentance, or the Book of Ecclesiastes explained; The Period of the Persian Mhonarchy, wherein sundry Places!of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Daniel are clenared; A short and sweet Exposition upon the first Nine, Chapters of Zecharie; Sermon on 1Co 15:19-20; Introduction to the worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper; Five godly and profitable Sermons; A Summe of Moral Philosophy. See Wood, Athenae Oxon.; Bickersteth, Christian Student; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Pembroke, Anne[[@Headword:Pembroke, Anne]]

             Countess of, a noted English lady philanthropist. was the daughter and sole heir of George Clifford, earl of Cumberland. She was born at Skipton Castle, in Craven, in 1589. To endowments naturally of a high order she added all those accomplishments which her high rank and extensive wealth brought within her reach. According to bishop Rainbow, “she could discourse with virtuosos, travelers, scholars, merchants, divines, statesmen, and good housewives in any kind.” But she preferred “the study of those noble Berceans, and those honorable women who searched the Scriptures daily; with Mary, she chose the better part of hearing the doctrine of Christ.” She was twice married: her first husband was Richard, earl of Dorset; her second, Philip, earl of Pembroke and Montgomery. She survived the latter forty-five years, during which time she employed herself in a constant series of good works, extensive charities, and generosity to learned men; also in erecting sacred edifices, a noble hospital, and many other stately buildings, both for the honor of her family and for the public good. While she was exemplary in her own religious observances, she was careful also that none of her servants should be remiss or negligent in that respect. In her intercourse with others she was condescending, and ever strove to obliterate from their minds any consciousness of inferiority. She died in 1674.

## Pen[[@Headword:Pen]]

             (עֵט, et, Job 19:24; Psa 45:1; Jer 8:8; Jer 17:1; and חֶרֶט, cheret, Isa 8:1) properly means a style or reed. The instruments with which characters were formed in the writing of the ancients varied with the materials to be written upon. The proper pen was made of reed, calamus, hence a reed pen (Jer 36:4; 3Jn 1:13). This was perhaps the most ancient pen for writing on soft materials; and it is still used by the Turks, Syrians, Persians, Abyssinians, Arabs, and other Orientals, as their languages could not be written without difficulty with pens made like ours from quills. Upon tablets of wax a metallic pen or stylus was employed. In engraving- upon hard substances, such as stone, wood, or metallic plates, “an iron pen,” or graver of iron or copper, was employed (Job 19:24). SEE INK; SEE REED; SEE WRITING. From the size and general appearance of some of the ancient reeds, as preserved in pictures found at Herculaneum, we may perceive how easily the same word (שבט, shebet) might denote the scepter or badge of authority belonging to the chief of a tribe, and also a pen for writing with. For although the two instruments are sufficiently distinct among us, yet, where a long rod of cane, or reed perhaps, was (like a general's truncheon. or baton, in modern days) the ensign of command, and a lesser rod of the same nature was formed into a pen and used as such, they had considerable resemblance. This may account for the phraseology and parallelism in Jdg 5:14 :

“Out of Machir came down governors (legislators); Out of Zebulun they that hold the shebet of writers.”

The ancients also used styles to write on tablets covered with wax. The Psalmist says (Psa 45:1), “My tongue is the pen of a ready writer.” The Hebrew signifies rather a style, which was a kind of bodkin, made of iron, brass, or bone, sharp at one end, the other formed like a little spoon, or spatula. The sharp end was used for writing letters, the other end expunged them. The writer could put out or correct what he disliked, and yet no erasure appear, and he could write anew as often as he pleased on the same place. On this is founded that advice of Horace, of often turning the style, and blotting out, “a Sape stylum vertas iterum, quae digna legi sint scripturus.” Scripture alludes to the same custom (2Ki 21:13), “I will blot out Jerusalem as men blot out writing from their writing tablets.” I will turn the tablets, and draw the style over the wax, till nothing appear-not the least trace. Isaiah (Isa 8:1) received orders from the  Lord to write in a great roll of parchment, with the style of a man, what should be dictated to him. It is asked, What is meant by this style of a man? It could not be one of these styles of metal; they were not used for writing on parchment. It is probable that the style of a man signifies a manner of writing which is easy, simple, natural, and intelligible. For generally the prophets expressed themselves in a parabolical, enigmatical, and obscure style. Here God intended that Isaiah should not speak as the prophets, but as other men used to do. Jeremiah says (Jer 8:8) the style of the doctors of the law is a style of error; it writes nothing but lies. Literally, “The pen of the scribes is in vain.” They have promised you peace, but behold war. He says, “The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron and with the point of a diamond. It is graven upon the table of their heart,” or engraven on their heart, as on writing tablets. The Hebrew says, a graver of shamir.

## Penal Laws[[@Headword:Penal Laws]]

             are statutes enacted for the secular punishment of those who are supposed to be in religious error. Thus the laws against Nonconformists in England were as follows:

“1. An act for well governing and regulating corporations, 13 Car. II, c. 1. By this act all who bore office in any city, corporation, town, or borough were required to take the oaths and subscribe the declaration therein mentioned, and to receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper according to the rites of the Church of England. This turned the dissenters out of the government of all corporations.

2. The Act of Uniformity, 14 Car. II, c. 4. By it all parsons, vicars, and ministers, who enjoyed any preferment in the Church, were obliged to declare their unfeigned assent and consent to everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, etc., or be ipso facto deprived; and all schoolmasters and teachers were prohibited from teaching youth without license from the archbishop or bishop, under pain of three months' imprisonment.

3. An act to prevent and suppress seditious conventicles, 16 Car. II, c. 4, in which it was declared unlawful to be present at any meeting for religious worship, except according to the usage of the Church of England, where five besides the family should be assembled. The first and second offenses were made subject to a certain fine, or three months' imprisonment on  conviction before a justice of the peace on the oath of a single witness; and the third offense, on conviction at the sessions, or before the justices of assize, was punishable by transportation for seven years.

4. An act for restraining Nonnconformists from inhabiting in corporations, 17 Car. II, c. 2. By it all dissenting ministers who would not take an oath therein specified against the lawfulness of taking up arms against the king on any pretense whatsoever, and that they would never attempt my alteration of government in Church and State, were banished five miles from all corporation towns, and subject to a fine of £40 in case they should preach in any conventicle.

5. Another act to prevent and suppress seditious conventicles, 22 Car. II, c. 5. Any persons who taught in such conventicles were subject to a penalty of £'20 for the first, and £40 for every subsequent offense; and any person who permitted such a conventicle to be held in his house was liable to a fine of £20; and justices of peace were empowered to break open doors where they were informed such conventicles were held, an d take the offenders into custody. 6. An act for preventing dangers which might happen from popish recusants, commonly called the Test Act, whereby every person was incapacitated from holding a place of trust under the government, without taking the sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England.”

It may be added that in Scotland, about 1568, it was enacted that every examinable girl or stripling must communicate in the parish church or pay a fine. In 1600 and in 1641 fines were imposed on all non-communicants above fifteen years of age. Dr. Lee prints a portion of a session record, in which occurs the following: “Megget, spous to Thomas Clark, in Rosline, and Helen Denholme, spous to James Clerk, yr, for not communicating at this last communion, confess it, and credit them never to omit the said occasion, and payet 10s. Aug. 22. — Two men in Roslin, for not communicating, were penitent, and payed everie ane of them 4s. 6d.” Severe laws were enacted against papists or trafficking priests, and again, against all who would not conform to prelacy in the days of the Stuarts. Ministers were banished and forbidden to preach, and torture from the thumbkin and boot in many cases was resorted to. Protestant penal laws against papists are as bad in principle as popish penal laws against Protestants. As late as 1700, in Scotland, a statute was sanctioned by king William to the following effect: It re-enacts a great number of the old acts  which make the hearing of mass a capital offense, imposes fines and imprisonment upon every man who should harbor papists, or sell them books, or remove their children out of the country without the authority of the presbytery. It then goes on to state at great length:

1. That every one who shall seize a popish priest in the country shall receive a reward from government: and if the priest shall attempt to conceal his profession, he shall be banished; and if he should return, be put to death.

2. If any person whatever shall be found in a place where there are any of the vestments or images used in popish worship, and refuse to purge himself of popery, he shall be banished, with certificate of death if he should return.

3. That the children of papists shall be taken from them by their Protestant relations.

4. No papist shall purchase land; and should he do so, and the seller come to the knowledge of the fact, he shall retain both the price and the land, and the papist shall have no redress.

5. That no papist, above fifteen years of age, shall inherit any property left to him by another; and when he comes to fifteen years of age, if he does not then become a Protestant, it shall be again taken from him.

6. That it shall not be in the power of any papist to sell and dispone any heritable property whatever.

7. That no money can be left to any Roman Catholic institution.

8. That if any person apostatize from Protestantism to Romanism, he shall forfeit his estate to his next Protestant heir.

9. That no papist can be a curator, a factor, a schoolmaster, a teacher of any kind whatever.

10. That no Protestant shall keep a domestic servant who is a papist.

11. The presbytery of the bounds has power to apply the oath of purgation, which was as solemn and inquisitorial as man could frame it.

When will men learn that the forcible repression of opinion is not the way to change it? When it was proposed to alter some of those last penal laws.  Scotland rose in terrible uproar, and the first attempt had to be abandoned. Those who enjoyed freedom themselves would not allow it to others; those who had smarted under popery made it smart in turn, for they had not learned the lesson of toleration. SEE TOLERATION.

## Penalosa, Juan De[[@Headword:Penalosa, Juan De]]

             a Spanish historical painter, was born at Baeza in 1581. He was one of the ablest scholars of Pablo de Cespedes at Cordova, and assiduously imitated his style. He painted some works for the churches, but more for the convents. His picture of St. Barbe, at the cathedral of Cordova, is said to be a magnificent performance, executed entirely in the style of his master. Penialosa died in 1636.

## Penalties Of The Mosaic Law[[@Headword:Penalties Of The Mosaic Law]]

             In this the controlling principle was the simple and natural, and therefore in early times general, one of recompense or revenge (Wachsmuth, Hellen. Altersth. 2:118), the lex talionis (see Rothmaier, Jus Talionis, Jen. 1700; comp. Polyb. v. 9, 6), which was directed even against beasts (Exo 21:23; Exodus cf., 28; Lev 24:17 sq.; Deu 19:16 sq.; comp. Gen 9:5; 1Ki 21:19), and the kindred notion of compensation for private trespasses (Exo 21:36; Exo 22:1; Exo 22:3; 2Sa 12:6). The design of deterring men from wrong by terror was held in view (Deu 17:13; Deu 19:20; Deu 21:21); but this should not (with Michaelis, Mos. Recht, v. 6 sq.; and Kleinschrod, Peinl. Recht, 2:138) be pressed too far, although it cannot be (with Welker, Letzte Griinde, p. 292) wholly denied. This principle of revenge is found also in the ancient legislation of the Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians (on the last, see esp. Diod. Sic. 1:75). The particular penalties among the Israelites consisted in death, stripes, imprisonment, and in the payment of sums of money, which were either fixed by the law (Deu 22:19; Deu 22:29), or left to the determination of the injured party (Exo 21:22), or took the place of certain personal penalties (Exo 21:29 sq.), for the redemption of which in this way provision had been made. The penalty of banishment does not appear in the Mosaic law; for the phrase “cut off from among his people” cannot be thus understood, SEE EXECUTION; nor is such a punishment at all in the spirit of the theocratic law. The accidental killing of a man led to temporary exile, but within a free city of the Holy Land itself. All these penalties bear an unmistakable air of mildness, in view of the crimes against  which they are denounced and the character of the people, and especially when compared with those inflicted by other ancient nations (e.g. the Egyptians, Diod. Sic. 1:77). Nor did they bring infamy upon the criminal, for punishments involving social and civil degradation were unknown to the Mosaic law.

They were also free from torture; nor was this admitted even in the case of an inquisition until the time of the Herods (Josephus, Ant. 16:8, 4; 10, 3; 17:4, 1). Josephus, indeed (Apion, 2:30), speaks of the Mosaic penalties as more severe than those inflicted among other nations. But this is merely comparative. The freedom of the Mosaic laws from torture will appear the more to its honor if we remember that the most civilized nations have only begun to refrain from it, and to punish the worst criminals with simple death, in very recent time (Abegg, Lehrb. d. Straffrechstwissensch. p. 187). The pardoning power, with which the administration of justice is associated in modern states, accords with this character of punishment; but prescription, in the criminal law (praescriptio criminis), corresponds merely to the ancient right of blood-revenge. Of a gradation of penalties, increasing with each repetition of the offense, the Mosaic law knows nothing (comp. Abegg, Op. cit. p. 230), but it appears in the criminal jurisprudence of the later Jews (Mishna, Sanhedr. 9:5). The expiation by children of the offenses of their parents is nowhere ordered in the law, although it was usual among other ancient nations (Cicero, Ad Brnut. 15). On the contrary, Deu 24:16 directly opposes this practice (comp. 2Ki 14:6; 2Ch 25:4). But in Jos 7:24 some understand that the whole family were sharers in the guilt. (But SEE ACHAN. Keil's remarks on the passage are childish.) It may be seen from 2Ki 9:26 that lawless tvranny sometimes punished children with the father; bunt the children in the case of Naboth were heirs, and Ahab's main design could not be fulfilled while they remained alive (1 Kings 21). ‘The punishment of whole nations at the will of an individual (see Est 3:6) is a work of Oriental despotism, of which examples have been witnessed even in modern times (Arvieux, 1:391 sq.). The only exception was the case of the children of insolvent debtors, who were made bondmen by hard-hearted creditors (2Ki 4:1; Mat 18:25). The threat in Exo 20:5 has nothing to do with civil jurisprudence (see Wegner's Interpretatio of the passage, Viteb. 1790).

There remains for examination the vexed question, which has an important bearing on the determination of the date of the crucifixion, whether the criminal trials and executions of the Jewish authorities could take place on  the Sabbath and high feast-days. There can be no doubt, in the nature of the case, that offenders could be arrested on these days, and that it was done appears from Joh 7:32; Act 12:3. But it cannot be shown from the Mishna (Sanhedr. 88. 1) that sessions of the Sanhedrim were held on such days. SEE PASSOVER.

They certainly were not then usual (Mishna, Join Tob, v. 2); and even on the preceding day they were avoided, if possible, lest in any way they should be held over into the Sabbath. It appears also from Act 12:4 that condemnation, where possible, was postponed until after the festivals. But that executions were held during the feast cannot be doubted (Mishna, Sanhedr. 11:4; comp. Deu 17:12-13). Yet we cannot suppose that the Sabbath, or a feast-day which was regarded as a Sabbath, could be chosen for such a purpose (see esp. Bleek, Beitr. zur Evangelienkritik, p. 140 sq.). SEE PUNISHMENT.

## Penance[[@Headword:Penance]]

             (Lat. pcnitentia) is the outward profession of sorrow, as repentance (q.v.) is the principle and inward feeling of sorrow for sin. The word is used in a negative and a positive sense. In a negative sense penance is manifested in the neglect of ordinary attention to dress, to the care of the person, to the use of food. In a positive sense the word is used to designate the performance of some acts of ecclesiastical discipline, enjoined or authoritatively imposed either as a punishment for offenses by which the party has exposed himself to the censures of that ecclesiastical body called the Church, or as an expression of his penitence. For the sake of affording a historical treatment of the subject, we shall first consider the views and practices of the early Christian Church. (A pretty full account is given by Bingham. Origines Ecclesiae, and a more concise one by Coleman, Ancient Christianity Exemplified, and upon these we shall mainly depend in the first part of this article.)

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

             in the Christian Church, is an initiation of the discipline of the Jewish synagogue, or, rather, it is a continuation of the same institution. Excommunication in the Christian Church is essentially the same as expulsion from the synagogue of the Jews; and the penances of the offender, required for his restoration to his former condition, were not materially different in the Jewish and Christian churches. The principal  point of distinction consisted in this, that the sentence of excommunication affected the civil relations of the offender under the Jewish economy; but in the Christian Church it affected only his relations to that body. Neither the spirit of the primitive institutions of the Church, nor its situation, or constitution in the first three centuries, was at all compatible with the intermingling or confounding of civil and religious privileges or penalties. The act of excommunication was at first an exclusion of the offender from the Lord's Supper and from the agapae. The term itself implies separation from the communion. The practice was derived from the injunction of the apostle (1Co 5:11): “With such a one no not to eat.” From the context, and from 1Co 10:16-18; 1Co 11:20-34, it clearly appears that the apostle refers, not to common meals and the ordinary intercourse of life, but to these religious festivals. Examples of penitence or repentance occur in the Old Testament; neither are there wanting instances, not merely of individuals, but of a whole city or people, performing acts of penitence- fasting, mourning, etc. (Nehemiah 9 and Jonah 3). But these acts of humiliation were essentially different, in their relations to individuals, from Christian penance. We have, however, in the New Testament an instance of the excommunication of an offending member, and of his restoration to the fellowship of the Church by penance, agreeably to the authority of Paul (1Co 5:1-8; 2Co 2:5; 2Co 2:11). This sentence of exclusion from the Church was pronounced by the assembled body, and in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. By this sentence the offender was separated from the people of the Lord, with whom he had been joined by baptism, and was reduced to his former condition as a heathen man, subject to the power of Satan and of evil spirits. This is perhaps, the true import of delivering such a one up to Satan.

A similar act of excommunication is described briefly in 1Co 16:22 : “If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha.” The μαρὰν ἀθά corresponds in sense with the Hebrew חרם, and denotes a thing devoted to utter destruction. It is only the SyroChaldaic מרנא אתה expressed in the Greek character, and means, “The Lord cometh.” The whole sentence implies that the Church leaves the subject of it to the Lord, who cometh to execute judgment upon him. All that the apostle requires of the Corinthians is that they should exclude him from their communion and fellowship, so that he should no longer be regarded as one of their body. He pronounces no further judgment upon the offender, but leaves him to the judgment of God. “What have I to do to judge them that are without?” (1Co 16:12), i.e. those who are not Christians, to which class the excommunicated person  would belong. “Do not ye judge them that are within?” i.e. full members of the Church. But them that are without God judgeth; or, rather, will judge, κρινεῖ, as the reading should be. It appears from 2Co 2:1-11, that the Church had not restored such to the privileges of communion, but was willing to do so, and that the apostle very gladly authorized the measure. It is important to remark that in the primitive Church penance related only to such as had been excluded from the communion of the Church. Its immediate object was, not the forgiveness of the offender'by the Lord God, but his reconciliation with the Church. It could, therefore, relate only to open and scandalous offenses. De occultis non judicat ecclesia — the Church takes no cognizance of secret sins — was an ancient maxim of the Church. The early fathers say expressly that the Church offers pardon only for offenses committed against her.

The forgiveness of all sin she refers to God himself. “Omnia autem,” says Cyprian (Ep. 55), “remissimus Deo omnipotenti, in clujus potestate sunt omnia reservata.” Such are the concurring sentiments of most of the early writers on this subject. It was reserved for a later age to confound these important distinctions, and to arrogate to the Church the prerogative of forgiving sins. The readmission of penitents into the Church was the subject of frequent controversy with the early fathers and ancient religious sects. Some contended that those who had once been excluded from the Church for their crimes ought never again to be received to her fellowship and communion. But the Church generally was disposed to exercise a more charitable and forgiving spirit. During the severe persecutions which the Christians suffered in the early ages of the Gospel, many, through fear of tortures and death, apostatized from the faith. It frequently happened, after the danger was past, that these persons were desirous of returning to communion with the Church; but they were not readmitted to communion until they had made a public confession of their offense. In this manner confession began to be a part of ecclesiastical discipline; and being thus, in the first instance, applied to a crime of a public nature, it was afterwards extended to private sin. SEE CONFESSION. Besides the shame of public confession, the offending party was compelled to submit to public reproof, to acts of penance, to exclusion from the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and to the temporary suspension of all the privileges of a Christian. SEE PENITENTS.

During the 4th and 5th centuries numerous councils were held for regulating the nature and duration of ecclesiastical censures, and for  settling the degree of discretionary power to be vested in bishops for the purpose of relaxing and shortening them, according to the circumstances of the case. As public confession was soon found to be attended with many inconveniences, offenders were permitted to confess their sins privately, either to the bishops themselves or to priests deputed by them to hear such confessions. When the punishment, which was still public, though the sin remained secret, was finished, the penitent was formally received into the Church by prayer and imposition of hands. In the 5th century public penance was submitted to with difficulty and reluctance; and it was thought expedient to allow penance, in certain cases, to be performed in monasteries, or in some private place, before a small select number of persons. This private penance was gradually extended to more and more cases; and before the end of the 7th century the practice of public penance for private sins was entirely abolished. Strenuous opposition was made to this at first, but the laxer custom prevailed. About the end of the 8th century penance began to be commuted: in the room of the ancient severities, prayers, masses, and alms were substituted; and in process of time the clergy of the Romish Church gained such an ascendency over the minds of the people as to persuade them that it was their duty to confess all their sins, however private or heinous, to the priests, who had power to prescribe the conditions of absolution (q.v.).

The nature and origin of private penance is a subject of controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants; the former contending that it had existed from the first, and that it held the same place even in the ages of public penance for secret sins which the public penance did for public offenses. At all events, from the date of the cessation of the public discipline, it has existed universally in the Roman Church. (See below.) According to Protestants, penance has no countenance whatever from Scripture, and is contrary to some of the most essential principles of the Christian religion; particularly to the doctrine of justification by faith in Jesus Christ alone, on the ground of his complete or “finished” work; penance being, in fact, founded on a doctrine of at least supplementary atonement by the works or sufferings of man — the sinner himself. The outward expressions of humiliation, sorrow, and repentance common under the Jewish dispensation, are regarded as very consistent with the character of that dispensation, in which so many symbols were employed. It is also held that the self-inflicted austerities, as fasting, sackcloth and ashes, etc., of Jewish and earliest Christian times, had for their sole  purpose the mortification of unholy lusts and sinful passions, in the people of God; or the expression of sorrow for sin, so that others beholding might be warned of its evil and restrained from it; all which is perfectly consistent with the principles of Christianity, if kept within the bounds of moderation and discretion. But penance in any other view, as a personal exercise, is utterly rejected. Arguments founded on the meaning of the two Greek words μετανοέω and μεταμέλομαι, both translated in our English version repent, are much urged by many Roman Catholic controversialists, the former being represented as equivalent to the English do penance; but this is condemned by Protestants as inconsistent with the very use of the words in the New Testament itself. That penance began, as a practice, very early in the Christian Church, is not only admitted by Protestants, but is alleged in proof of the very early growth of those corruptions which finally developed themselves in the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, and of which Protestants also hold that there are plain intimations in the New Testament, not only prophetical, but showing the development of their germs to have already begun during the age of the apostles.

In the Romish Church penance is affirmed to be “truly and properly a sacrament, instituted by Christ our Lord, for the benefit of the faithful, to reconcile them to God as often as they shall fall into sin after baptism” (Council of Trent, sess. 14, can. i). To receive this sacrament three things are necessary: first, sorrow for sins committed, along with a purpose to commit them no more; secondly, an entire confession of all the sins committed; thirdly, the performance of the penance enjoined by the confessor. By penance, as ordinarily employed, at least in Protestant literature, is meant not the entire sacrament, but the satisfaction or the doing of the penance imposed by the priest after confession. According to Roman theology, by the atonement of Christ and the absolution of the confessor only the eternal punishment of sin is remitted. Where the penitent has intense contrition the temporal punishment is also remitted. But ordinarily the temporal penalties remain to be suffered either in this life or in purgatory. “Whoever,” says the Council of Trent, “shall affirm that the entire punishment is always remitted by God, together with the fault, and therefore that penitents need no other satisfaction than faith, whereby they apprehend Christ who has made satisfaction for them, let him be accursed.” Penance, accordingly, is imposed upon the sinner, not only to atone for the punishment due, but also to cure the bad effects left by sin. If penance be not performed in this life, the penalties remain to be suffered in purgatory  (q.v.), unless they are remitted by indulgence (q.v.). Besides fasting, alms, abstinence, which are the general conditions of penance in the Romish Church, there are others of a more particular kind, such as the repeating of a certain number of Ave Marias, paternosters, and credos, the wearing of hair shirts, self-flagellation, etc. The acts of the penitent are stated to be the matter, as it were (quasi materia), of this sacrament, the form of which resides in the words of absolution (Ibid. sess. 14, cap. 3). The following is the manner in which public penance is inflicted in the Romish Church, according to Gratian (Decret. pars i, Dist. 1, c. 64, p. 290, Paris, 1612):

“On the first day of Lent the penitents present themselves before the bishop, clad in sackcloth, with naked feet, and eyes cast down on the ground. This was to be done in the presence of the principal clergy of the diocese, by whom the penitents were introduced into the church, where the bishop, weeping, and the rest of the clergy repeated the seven penitential psalms. Then, rising from prayers, they threw ashes upon the penitents, and covered their heads with sackcloth, declaring to them, with mournful sighs, that as Adam was ejected from Paradise, so must they be turned out of the Church. The bishop then commanded the officers to turn them out of the church doors; and all the clergy followed after, repeating the curse pronounced upon Adam: ‘In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread' (Gen 3:19). A similar penance was inflicted upon them the next time the sacrament was administered, which was the Sunday following. All this was done to the end that the penitents, observing in how great a disorder the Church was by reason of their crimes, should not lightly esteem of penance.”

In the Roman Catholic so-called Douai version of the Scriptures the term penance is generally substituted for repentance. Thus, e.g. “Except ye repent,” etc., is rendered “Except ye do penance;” and in Mat 2:2 we have not n” Repent,” but “Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;” and again in Mar 1:4 : “John was in the desert baptizing and preaching the baptism of penance for the remission of sins.” SEE REPENTANCE.

Dens, in his System of Divinity, divides penances into three classes: vindictive, medicinal or curative, and preservative. All satisfactory works he regards as included under the three kinds-prayer, fasting, and alms. “The following,” says this Romish divine, “can be enjoined under the head of prayer once, or oftener, either for many days or weeks, namely:

1. To say five paternosters and five Ave Marias, in memory of the five wounds of Christ, either with bended knees or outstretched arms, or before a crucifix.

2. To recite the rosary, or Litanies of the blessed Virgin Mary, or of the saints. etc.

3. To read the psalm Miserere, or the seven penitential psalms.

4. To hear mass, or praises. or preaching.

5. To read a chapter in Thomas a Kempis.

6. To visit churches, to pray before the tabernacle.

7. At stated hours, in the morning, evening, during the day, or as often as they hear the sound of the clock, to renew orally or in the heart ejaculatory prayers, acts of contrition or charity, such as ‘I love thee, O Lord, above all things;' I detest all my sins: I am resolved to sin no more;' ‘O Jesus, crucified for me, have mercy on me,' etc

8. At an appointed day to confess again, or, at any rate, to return to the confessor. To fasting may be referred whatever pertains to the mortification of the body, so that a perfect or partial fast can be enjoined.

(1) Let him fast (feria sexta) on the sixth holy day, or oftener.

(2) Let him fast only to the middle of the day.

(3) Let him not drink before noon, or in the afternoon, unless at dinner or supper, though he may be thirsty; let him abstain from wine and from cerevisia forti.

(4) Let him eat less, and take in the evening only half the quantity.

(5) Let him rise earlier from bed; let him kneel frequently and for a long period; let him suffer cold, observe silence for a certain time, and abstain from sports and recreations, etc.

To alms is referred whatever may be expended for the benefit of our neighbor. (1) To give money, clothes, food, etc. (2) To furnish personal assistance, to wait on the sick, to pray for the conversion of  sinners, etc., and other works of mercy, whether corporeal or spiritual.”

As we have just seen, the Church of Rome affirms “penance” to be a “sacrament,” instituted by Christ himself, and secret “confession” to be one of its constituent parts, instituted by the divine law; and she anathematizes those who contradict her: the Church of England denies “penance” to be a sacrament of the Gospel, affirms it to have “grown of the corrupt following of the apostles,” and “not to have” the proper “nature of a sacrament,” as “not having any visible sign or ceremony ordained by God,” and of course denies the ‘ sacramental character of “confession.” The Church of Rome pronounces that, by the divine law, “all persons” must confess their sins to the priest: the Church of England limits her provisions for confession to “sick persons.” The Church of Rome pronounces that all persons are “bound” to confess; the Church of England directs that the sick “be moved” to make confession. The Church of Rome insists upon a confession of “all sins whatsoever;” the Church of England recommends “a special confession of sins.” if the sick person “feel his conscience troubled with any weighty matter.” The Church of Rome represents penance as instituted for reconciling penitents to God “as often as they fall into sin after baptism,” and imposes confession “once a year;” the Church of England advises it on a peculiar occasion.

The purpose of the Church of England in so advising it evidently is the special relief of a troubled conscience; whereas the Church of Rome pronounces it to be “necessary to forgiveness of sin and to salvation;” and denounces with an anathema “any one who shall say that confession is only useful for the instruction and consolation of the penitent.” Penance, then, according to the ecclesiastical law of England, is a punishment affecting the body of the delinquent, by which he is obliged to give a public satisfaction to the Church for the scandal he has given by his example. Instead of the ancient discipline practiced against offenders, the United Church of England and Ireland at present contents herself with an office “called a commination or denouncing of God's anger and judgments against sinners,” which is annually read on Ash-Wednesday after the morning service. In case of incest or of incontinency, the offending party is usually enjoined to do a public penance in the cathedral or parish church, or in the public market, barelegged and bareheaded, in a white sheet, and to make an open confession of his crime in a prescribed form of words. This penance is augmented or moderated according to the quality of the fault and the  discretion of the judge. In smaller faults and scandals a public satisfaction or penance, as the judge of the ecclesiastical court shall decree, is to be made before the minister, churchwardens, or some of the parishioners, respect being had to the quality and circumstances of the offense; as in the case of defamation or laying violent hands on a minister, or the like. As these censures may be modified by the judge's discretion, so also they may be totally altered by the commutation of penance, by the oblation of a sum of money for pious uses, which shall be accepted as a satisfaction of public penance. Anciently such commutation money was to be applied to the use of the Church, in the same manner as fines, in cases of civil punishment, are converted to the use of the public (Burn, Eccles. Law, 3:77, 80. See also Collier, Eccles. Hist. bk. iv).

In the discipline of all the other Protestant churches penance is now unknown. The nearest approach to the Roman Catholic polity on the subject was that in use among the English Puritans of the 17th century, and more particularly in the Church of Scotland during that and the succeeding century, when it was common “to make satisfaction publicly on the Stool of Repentance” (q.v.). As far back even as 1576 we find in the records of the General Assembly this enactment:

“The kirk ordaynes sic persones as are convict of incest or adulterie, and hes not stubbornly contemnit the admonitions of the kirk, nor sufferit the sentence of excommunication for their offenses, shall make publict repentance in sackcloath, at their own kirks, bareheaded and barefooted, three severall dayes of preaching, and after the said third day to be receavit in the societie of the kirk in their owne cloathes. The uthers that hes been excommunicat for their offenses shall present themselves, bareheaded and barefooted, sax preaching dayes, and the last, after sermone, to be receavit in their ownne cloathes, as said is. Give they be excommunicat for their offenses, they shall stand bareheaded at the kirk doore, every preaching day, betwixt the assemblies, secluded from prayers before and after sermnone, and then enter in the kirk, and sit in the publick place bareheaded all the tyme of the sermons, and depart before the latter prayer. The uthers that are not excommunicat shall be placeit in the publick place where they may be knawne from the rest of the people, bareheaded, the tyme of the sermones, the minister remembering them in his prayer in the tyme after preaching; all the saids persons to bring their ministers' testimonialls to the next assembly of their behavior in the meantyme, according to the act made thereupon be the kirk in the 2d sessione, halden  July 7, 1569.” “No superintendent nor commissioner, with advyce of any particular kirk of their jurisdictione, may dispense with the extreamitie of sackcloath prescryvit be the acts of generall discipline for any pecuniall soume ad pios usus.”

These laws were impartially executed: peers and peeresses, as the earl and countess of Argyle, earl and countess of Arran — Arran being at the time prime minister — were laid under public censure. Felons were subjected to such discipline, and then executed.

It does not seem to have occurred to the Reformers or their more immediate successors in the Protestant churches that their system of discipline, with its public rebukes and enforced humiliations of various kinds — as the wearing of a sackcloth robe, and sitting on a particular seat in church — was liable to be interpreted in a sense very different from that of a mere expression of sorrow for sin; but. the belief is now very general among the most zealous adherents of their doctrinal opinions that in all this they adopted practices incongruous with their creed, and in harmony rather with that of the Church of Rome. Nor do they seem to have perceived that Church discipline (q.v.), in its proper sense, as relating to ecclesiastical rights and privileges, is wholly distinct from the imposition of penalties by churches or Church courts. Penitential humiliations, imposed by ecclesiastical authority, are now no more in favor where Church discipline is most strict than where the utmost laxity prevails. The commutation of penalties deemed shameful, for a fine to the poor of the parish, was an abuse once prevalent in Scotland, but never sanctioned by the higher ecclesiastical authorities.

See, besides Bingham and Coleman, Riddle, Christian Antiquities; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism; Killen, Ancient Church, p. 491 sq.; Siegel, Christl. Alterthumer, 1:192 and 286; Calvin, Institutes; Marshall. Penitential Discipline, p. 101 sq. (in Anglo-Catholic Library); Jahrb.f. deutsch. Theol. 8:91 (1868); 2:355 sq.; Cramp, Text-Book of Popery; Willet, Synop. Panpism; Haag, Histoire des Dogmes Chretiennes; Hagenbach, fist. of Doctrines; Barnum, Romanism; Theol. Rev. v. 427; (London) Quarterly Review, Jan. 1868 (Amer. edition), p. 55; and especially Die Bussordnungen der abenzdlandischen Kirche, by Dr. F. W. H. Wasserschleben (Halle, 1851, 8vo, 726 pp.). After a historical introduction, showing a most thorough survey of the whole subject in its original sources, all the penitentials and canons relating to penance in the  British, Irish, Anglo-Saxon, Frankish, and Spanish churches are given at length. It is a repertory, in fact, of penitential law-not in abstracts, but in a reprint of the original documents themselves.

Penates were certain inferior deities among the Romans, who presided over houses and the domestic affairs of families, and were called Penates because they were generally placed in the innermost and most secret parts of the house, “in penitissima cedium parte, quod,” as Cicero says, “penitus insident.” The place where they stood was afterwards called penetralia, and they themselves received the name of Penetrales. It was in the option of every master of a family to choose his Penates, and therefore Jupiter, and some of the superior gods, are often invoked as patrons of domestic affairs. According to some, the Penates were divided into four classes; the first comprehended all the celestial, the second the sea gods, the third the gods of hell, and the last all such heroes as had received divine honors after death. The Penates were originally the manes of the dead, but when superstition had taught mankind to pay uncommon reverence to the statues and images of their deceased friends, their attention was soon exchanged for regular worship, and they were admitted by their votaries to share immortality and power over the world, with Jupiter or Minerva. The statues of the Penates were generally made of wax, ivory, silver, or earth, according to the affluence of the worshipper, and the only offerings they received were wine, incense, fruits, and sometimes the sacrifice of lambs, sheep, goats, etc. In the early ages of Rome human sacrifices were offered to them; but Brutus, who expelled the Tarquins, abolished this unnatural custom. When offerings were made to them, their statues were crowned with garlands, poppies, or garlic; and, besides the monthly day that was set apart for their worship, their festivals were celebrated during the Saturnalia. Some have confounded the Lares and the Penates, but they were different.

## Pendant[[@Headword:Pendant]]

             (Lat. pendens, hanging) is a term common in architecture to designate

(1) a hanging ornament which was much used in the Gothic style, particularly in late perpendicular work, on ceilings, roofs, etc. On stone vaulting they are frequently made very large, and are generally enriched with moldings and carvings. Good specimens are to be seen in Henry VII's  Chapel, Westminster; the Divinity School, Oxford; St. Lawrence, Evesham, etc. In open timber roofs pendants are frequently placed under the ends of the hammer-beams, and in other parts where the construction will allow of them. About the period of the expiration of Gothic architecture, and for some time afterwards, pendants were often used on plaster ceilings, occasionally of considerable size, though usually small.

(2) This name was also formerly used for the spandrels very frequently found in Gothic roofs under the ends of the tie-beams, which are sustained at the bottom by corbels or other supports projecting from the walls. In this position it is usually called a Pendannt-post.

## Pendentive[[@Headword:Pendentive]]

             is an architectural term used to designate the portion of a groined ceiling supported by one pillar or impost, and bounded by the apex of the longitudinal and transverse vaults; in Gothic ceilings of this kind the ribs of the vaults descend from the apex to the impost of each pendentive, where they become united. It also denotes the portion of a domical vault which descends into the corner of an angular building when a ceiling of this description is placed over a straight-sided area; pendentives of this kind are common in Byzantine architecture, but not in Gothic.

## Pendlebury, Henry[[@Headword:Pendlebury, Henry]]

             a Nonconformist divine, was born near ,the beginning of the 17th century. He was a minister at Holcomb, Lancashire, in 1651, and was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He died in 1695. His works are, Transubstantiation: — Barren Figtree: — The Books Opened, on Rev 20:12 : — Invisible Realities, etc., containing an account of his life: — Sacrificium Missaticum, Mysterium Iniquitatis, on the mass, with the author's life (Lond. 1768, 8vo). See Allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors, 2:1549.

## Pendleton, William N., D.D[[@Headword:Pendleton, William N., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in Hanover County, Virginia, December 26, 1809. He graduated from West Point Military Academy in  1830, was ordained in 1837; was successively professor in Newark College, Delaware, principal of a highschool in Virginia, rector of All- Saints', Frederick, Maryland, and from 1855 of Grace Church, Lexington, Virginia, until his death, January 15, 1883.

## Peneius[[@Headword:Peneius]]

             a river-god among the ancient Thessalians, said to be the son of Oceanus and Tethys.

## Penensus, F[[@Headword:Penensus, F]]

             an engraver, probably an Italian, by whom there are some spirited etchings of devout subjects after Italian masters and from his own designs, marked with his name, among which are the Holy Family, with St. Catharine and an angel in the air, after Parmiggiano, and the Marriage of St. Catharine, from his own design. There is a fine expression in his heads, but he was negligent and incorrect in designing the extremities.

## Penetralis[[@Headword:Penetralis]]

             a surname applied to the different Roman divinities who occupied the penetralia or inner parts of a house. These deities were Jupiter, Vesta, and the Penates.

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

             an American Christian philanthropist, was born at Savannah. Georgia. He died in 1834. His benefactions laid the foundation of the Mercer Institute, Green County, Georgia. Another monument of his charity is the Penfield Mariner's church, in Savannah, erected at a cost of eight thousand dollars. He also left a large property to other Christian charities, such as education, foreign and domestic missions, etc.

## Peniel[[@Headword:Peniel]]

             (Heb. Penil', פְּנַיאֵל, face of God; Samar. פנו אל; Sept. ειδος θεοῦ; Vulg. Phanuel, and so also the Peshito), the name which Jacob gave to the: place in which he had wrestled with God: “He called the name of the place ‘Face of El,' for I have seen Elohim face to face” (Gen 32:30). With that singular correspondence between the two parts of this narrative which has already been noticed under MAHANAIM, there is apparently an allusion to the bestowal of the name in 33:10, where Jacob says to Esau, “I have seen thy face as one sees the face of Elohim.” In 32:31, and the other passages in which the name occurs, its form is changed to PENUEL (פְנוּאֵל, Penuel', apparently of the same signification). On this change the lexicographers throw no light. It is perhaps not impossible that Penuel was the original form of the name, and that the slight change to Peniel was made by Jacob or by the historian to suit his allusion to the circumstance under which the patriarch first saw it. The Samaritan Pentateuch has Penuel in all. The promontory of the Ras-el-Shukah. on the coast of Syria  above Beirfit, was formerly called Theouprosopon, probably a translation of Peniel, or, its Phoenician equivalent. The scene of Jacob's vision was evidently some spot on the north bank of the Jabbok, between that torrent and Succoth (comp. 32:22 with 33:17). This is in exact agreement with the terms of its next occurrence.

It does not appear that there was any town or village upon the spot at the time of this wondrous event; but it was probably then marked by some rude cairn or stone to serve as a record of the divine presence. We hear no more of it for five hundred years. After the defeat of the Midianites in the valley of Jezreel, Gideon pursued them to their home in the eastern district. On reaching the fords of the Jordan at Succoth, he asked the people of that city to supply food to his fainting followers; they refused, “and he went up thence to Penuel, and spake unto them likewise” (Jdg 8:8). He probably ascended from the valley of the Jordan through the glen of the Jabbok, which falls into the Jordan a few miles below Succoth. This would bring him direct to the site of Peniel, on which a city appears to have been built in the interval. It was natural, and in accordance with Eastern custom, that a holy place such as Penuel should become the nucleus of a town. In the time of Gideon there was a tower (מגדל) at Peniel, which Gideon destroyed on his return from the conquest of the Midianites. It would seem too that the city was then completely depopulated (Jdg 8:17). It may have remained a ruin till the days of Jeroboam, of whom we read that after taking up his abode in Shechem, he “went out from thence, and built Penuel” (1Ki 12:25). This was done, no doubt, on account of its commanding the fords of Succoth and the road from the east of Jordan to his capital city of Shechem, and also, perhaps, as being an ancient sanctuary. We hear no more of Peniel in Scripture. Josephus merely repeats the Scripture notices (Ant. 1:20, 2; 8:8, 4), as do Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Fanuel). They do not appear to have known the exact site; and, indeed, Jerome represents the Penuel of Jacob, Gideon, and Jeroboam as distinct places.

## Penington, Isaac[[@Headword:Penington, Isaac]]

             a distinguished and zealous preacher of the Society of Friends, was born in 1617. He was the son of Sir Isaac Penington, lord mayor of London; was married in 1648 to Mary Springett, widow of Sir William Springett, and mother of the wife of William Penn. Except when traveling in the discharge of his religious engagements, he resided on his estate, the Grange, at Chalfont, Buckinghamshire. From 1661 to 1670 he suffered imprisonment  for conscience' sake no less than six times. As this victim of persecution was a man of a remarkably meek and quiet spirit, though courageous in matters of religious principle, it is not unlikely that his republican parentage had some share in stimulating the unsleeping vigilance of the civil authorities. It is an interesting series of facts that Thomas Ellwood was domestic Latin tutor to Isaac Penington's children; that it was through the good offices of Penington and Dr. Paget that the amiable tutor obtained the honorable post of reader to John Milton; and that it was to Ellwood's suggestion that the world owes the inception of Paradise Regained. Penington died in 1679; at Goodnestone Court, Kent, and was buried at Jordans, in the county of Bucks, where his remains repose by those of William Penn. Of his numerous writings, which amount to more than eighty (principally expositions of his theological dogmas), a collection was published: The Works of the Long Mournful and Sorely Distressed Isaac Penington, etc. (1681, fol.). Among his productions are, Light or Darokness, Displaying or Hiding Itself (Lond. 1650, 4to): — A Word for the Common Weal (1650, 4to): — The Fundamental Right, Safety, and Liberty of the People, briefly Asserted (1651, 4to): — Divine Essays (1654, 4to): — The Root of Popery Struck at (1660, 4to): — The Holy Truth and People Defended (1672, 4to): — His Testimony Concerning Church Government and Liberty of Conscience (1681,4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1549; Thomas, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Webb, The Penns and Peningtons of the 17th Century (Lond. 1867).

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

             eldest son of Isaac Penington, was born in Bucks County, England, in 1655. He died at Goodnestone Court, Kent; in 1710. He deserves consideration here as the defender of his father's theological views, in whose behalf he published two tracts, Complaint (1681 ): Exceptions against W. Rogers's Strictures on Isaac Penington's Writings (1695 ): — Certificates on Behalf of S. Jennings (1695), and five tracts (1695-97) in defense of the Quakers, in answer to the publications of George Keith (q.v.).

## Penini, Jedaja, Ben-Abraham Bedrashi[[@Headword:Penini, Jedaja, Ben-Abraham Bedrashi]]

             a Hebrew poet of much celebrity, and a writer of great originality and research, was born at Barcelona, in Spain, in 1280, and died about 1340. He is the author of a few poetical compositions, which are more esteemed  for the ingenuity and studied labor of which they bear the marks than for any intrinsic poetical merit. For instance, in one of these poems every word begins with the letter M. He has a better right to the title of “Orator” given him by his brethren, while Christian writers have compared him to Seneca, Lactantius, and Cicero. He owes this honor to his celebrated work entitled בְּחַינִת עוֹלָם(Bechinath Olam), “Examination of the World,” a discourse or letter concerning the vanity of all earthly things, and the seeking of the kingdom of God. The learned Philip Aquinas, an Israelite converted to Christianity in the 17th century, wrote a French translation of itn, L'Examen du Monde (Paris, 1629). Great praise has been bestowed on the work itself, and the way in which it is treated by its French translator, as well as by Buxtorf, who speaks of it as of “liber insignis tam quoad res, quam quoad verba, ut eloquentissimus habeatur, quisquis stylum ejus imitatur.”

It was also translated into German by different translators, and into English in 1806, and lately in the Hebrew Review, edited by M. I. Raphall (Lond. 1835), 1:135 sq. Being a great advocate of philosophical studies, Penini vehemently opposed the sentence of excommunication pronounced by Ibn-Adereth, which forbade the study of philosophical works (excepting medicine) before the age of twenty-five years, and addressed a letter to him כְּתָב הִהַתְנִצְּלוּת, “Defence of the Study of Philosophy.” He also wrote, לְשׁוֹן הִזָּהָב, “the Wedge of Gold,” annotations on the Talmudic exposition of the Psalms (Midrash Tehillim): — An elucidation of Ibn-Ezra's “Exposition on the Pentateuch” — The above-mentioned poem, a prayer in verse, every line commencing with the letter מ, entitled בִקָשִׁת הִמֵּמַין, translated into Latin by H. Prache (Leips. 1662), and into German by D. Ottenrosser (q.v.), Furth (1808), and B. W. Prerau (Vienna, 1803): — A commentary on the Psalms: — Compendium of the canons of Avicenna: — Annotations on the Talmudic treatises Midrash Rabboth, Tanchum, and Siphre: — Treatise on the intellect and imagination: — “The Selection of Pearls,” a collection of didactic sayings from the Greek and Arabic sages, since translated from the Arabic by rabbi Judah Ibn-Tibbon (q.v.). He is also said to have composed a work of some extent on the game of chess, under the title of מִעֲדִנֵּי מֶלֶךְ, “the Royal Delight.” See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 3:71 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei (Ger. transl. by Hamburger), p. 257 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Tiebr. 3:291; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden (Leips. 1873), 7:260 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 3:29; Zunz, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur (Berlin, 1845), p. 467 sq.; id. Literaturgeschichte der synaagogalen Poesie  (ibid. 1865), p. 498; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal p. 112 sq.; Finn, Sephardim, p. 302 sq.; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 302 sq.; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 266; Ginsburg, Commentary on Ecclesiastes, p. 61, where a few pieces of the Bechinath Olam are translated (Lond. 1861); Delitzsch, Zur Gesch. de jiidischen Poesie (Leips. 1836), p. 348; Cassel, Leitfaden fur jud. Geschichte und Literatur (Berlin, 1872), p. 70. (B. P.)

## Peninim[[@Headword:Peninim]]

             SEE RUBY.

## Peninnah[[@Headword:Peninnah]]

             (Heb. Peninnah', פְּנַנָּה, coral; Sept. Φεννάνα), one of the two wives of Elkanab, the father of Samuel, of whom we only know that she bore children to her husband, and was not very generous in her bearing towards the other wife, Hannah (1Sa 1:2). B.C. cir. 1125.

## Penitence[[@Headword:Penitence]]

             (Gr. μετανοία; Lat. penitentia) is the older word for repentance (q.v.) used by the Vulgate, but replaced by resipiscentia, μεταμελεία, when the penitential scheme of the Latin Church was developed; for poenitentia then became restricted to the act of repentance, i.e. the performance of the penances of the confessional. SEE PENANCE. Penitence is an enduring and penal condition; for there is an evident etymological connection between peana and punio, both having their common origin ποινή, a “fine,” or “weregeld,” for blood. The old form, in fact, of punio was pyenio, and is so written by Cicero, “Cum multi inimicos mortuos poeniantur” (Tusc. 1:44, and MSS. in Mil. 31; also, Aul. Gell. VII, 3:54). Thus moerus, whence pomrriunm, for murus, from μοῖρα (quasi “allotment boundary”), maenio for munio; paniceus and puniceus, paenicus and punicus. “Poenitere” is explained as “pnoenam tenere” by the ancient author of the treatise De vera et falsa Penitentia, in the works of Augustine, with direct reference to punio. “Poenitere enim est poenam tenere, ut semper puniat in se ulciscendo quod commisit peccando. Poena enim proprie dicitur laesio quae punit et vindicat quod quisque commisit” (c. xix). Isidore of Seville gives the same definition, “A punitione poenitentia nomen accepit, quasi punitentia, cum ipse homo punit poenitendo quod male admisit;” which is followed by the schools:”  Pcenitentia quasi punitentia” (Hugo a S. Vict. De Myst. Eccl.c. iii.). Scotus slightly varies the definition, “quasi poenae tenentia.” Hence the idea of penitence involves a lasting remorse for sin — “yea, what revenge,” as St. Paul expresses it; and in this it is distinguished from the initiative repentance that leads to conversion and baptism. Thus penitence may be said to be a correlative term of repentance, as renovation is of regeneration.

Penitence is also used for a discipline or punishment attending repentance, more usually called penance. It also gives title to several religious orders, consisting either of converted debauchees and reformed prostitutes, or of persons who devote themselves to the office of reclaiming them. SEE PENITENTS.

## Penitential[[@Headword:Penitential]]

             (Codex Pmenitentialis) is an ecclesiastical book in the Romish Church which contains everything relating to the imposition of penance (q.v.) and the reconciliation of penitents (q.v.). It appoints the time and manner of penance to be regularly imposed for every sin, and forms of prayer that are to be used for the receiving of those who entered upon penance, and reconciling penitents by solemn absolution; a method chiefly introduced in the time of the degeneracy of the Church. There are various penitentials, as the Roman Penitential, and the Penitentials of Bede, and of Theodore of Tarsus, archbishop of Canterbury, etc.

## Penitential Priests[[@Headword:Penitential Priests]]

             officers appointed in many ancient churches, when private confession was introduced, for the purpose of hearing confessions and imposing penances. The office originated in the time of the Decian persecution, and was abolished by Nectarins, bishop of Constantinople. The example of Nectarius was followed by all the bishops of the East, but the office was continued in the Western churches, chiefly at Rome. The Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, ordered all bishops to have a penitentiary; and such a dignitary is still connected with most Romish cathedrals, whose duties, however, are quite different from those of the original penitentiary.

## Penitential Psalms[[@Headword:Penitential Psalms]]

             These are usually reckoned seven. They are so called because they are regarded as specially expressive of sorrow for sin, and accepted by  Christian devotion as forms of prayer suitable for the repentant sinner. They are Psalms 6, 32, 39, 51, 102, 130, , 143 according to the A.V., which correspond with 6, 31, 37, 50, 101, 129, and 142 of the Vulgate. These Psalms have been set apart from a very early period, and are referred to as such by Origen (Hom. ii in Leviticum). Pope Innocent III ordered that they should be recited in Lent. They have a special place in the Roman Breviary, and more than one of the popes attached an indulgence to the recital of them. The most deeply penitential, and the most frequent in use, both public and private, is the 51st Psalm, or the Miserere (50th in the Vulgate.)

## Penitentiary[[@Headword:Penitentiary]]

             is a word which has been variously applied.

(I.) In the early Christian Church it designated certain presbyters or priests, appointed in every church to receive the private confessions of the people; not in prejudice to the public discipline, nor with the power of granting absolution before any penance was performed, but in order to facilitate public discipline, by acquainting the people what sins were to be expiated by public penance, and to appoint private penance for such private crimes as were not proper to be publicly censured (Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 18, ch. 3). The office of general confessor, or penitentiary priest, in a diocese, mentioned by Sozomen and Socrates, was abrogated in the East by Nectarius of Constantinople in the reign of the emperor Theodosius. It subsists, however, to this day in the Romish Church, where the penitentiaries are of various rank and dignity. Thus there are,

1. The cardinal grand penitentiary, who presides over the tribunal of the penitentiaries at Rome; and

2. Penitentiary priests, established for the hearing of confessions in the three patriarchal churches at Rome, viz. those of the Vatican, the Lateran. and of Santa Maria Maggiore.

3. Penitentiary priests, established in the cathedral churches for the purpose of absolving cases reserved to the bishops of the several dioceses. The Council of Trent (sess. 24, c. 8) decreed that every bishop should establish in his cathedral church a penitentiary, who must be either a master, a doctor, or a licentiate in theology or in the canon law, and of the age of forty years.

(II.) The term is applied among Protestants to such houses as have been established for the reception and reformation of females who have been seduced from the path of virtue. Of penitentiaries, in this sense, there are 63 in Great Britain and Ireland, capable of receiving 2657 inmates, besides numerous small private “Homes.” The single condition of admission to most of the institutions is “penitence,” a desire and endeavor to return to a virtuous life. The inmates remain in the strictest seclusion for periods varying from a few months to two years, the average time being about a year; they then return to their friends, or to situations provided for them. It is an invariable rule not to dismiss any one without seeing that she is provided with the means of honest subsistence. During their seclusion they are employed in needlework, washing, and housework. The ages at which they are received vary from fourteen to forty. In the metropolis there are 19 institutions, accommodating 1155 women; in other towns of England, 34 institutions, accommodating 1116; and in the chief towns of Scotland and Ireland, 10 institutions, with accommodation for 386. One third of the provincial and one half of the metropolitan establishments have been created in the last ten years. The oldest institution in existence is the London Magdalen Hospital, opened in 1758; the next, that of Dublin, 1767; Edinburgh follows in 1797; and none of the others date earlier than the present century. The results of these penitentiaries, as far as they can be ascertained, are excellent. During the last one hundred years, 8983 women have passed through the London Magdalen. This most important and useful institution is supported by voluntary contributions, patronized by royalty, and conducted on truly Christian principles, by means of which numbers of miserable outcasts have not only been recovered to the proprieties of moral conduct, but have given satisfactory evidence of genuine conversion to God.

(III.) In the United States the name, having been adopted by the Quakers of Pennsylvania in 1786, when they caused the legislature of that state to abolish the punishments of death, mutilation, and the whip, and to substitute solitary confinement as a reformatory process, is applied to all those prisons which are constructed on reformatory principles, whether the convicts be men or women. The happiest results have flowed from the efforts of the Prison Discipline Society directed to this point. SEE PRISON REFORM.

## Penitents[[@Headword:Penitents]]

             (I) is a name for those members of the Church who, having offended the laws of God or the ecclesiastical canons, seek reconciliation. Penance (q.v.), in the primitive Church, as Coleman, from Augusti, remarks, was wholly a voluntary act on the part of those who were subject to it. The. Church not only would not enforce it, but refused even to urge or invite any to submit to the penitential discipline. It was to be sought as a favor, not inflicted as a penalty. The offending party had, however, no authority or permission to prescribe his own duties as a penitent. When once he had resolved to seek the forgiveness and reconciliation of the Church, it was exclusively the prerogative of that body to prescribe the conditions on which this was to be effected. No one could even be received as a candidate for penance without permission first obtained of the bishop or presiding elder. The period of penitential probation differed in different times and places, but in general was graduated according to the enormity of the sin, some going so far in their rigor, SEE NOVATIAN, as, contrary to the clearly expressed sense of the Church, to carry it even beyond the grave. In the earlier ages much depended upon the spirit of each particular Church or country; but about the 4th century the public penitential discipline assumed a settled form, which, especially as established in the Greek Church, is so curious that it deserves to be briefly described. Sinners of the classes already referred to had their names enrolled, and were (in some churches, after having made a preliminary confession to a priest appointed for the purpose) admitted, with a blessing and other ceremonial, by the bishop to the rank of penitents. This enrollment appears to have commonly taken place on the first day of Lent.

The penitents so enrolled were divided into four distinct classes, called by the Greeks προσκλαίοντες, ἀκροώμενοι, ὑποπίπτοντες, and συνιστάμενοι; and by the Latins flentes, audientes, substrati, and consistentes — that is, the mourners or weepers, hearers, kneelers, and co- standers. The duties required of penitents consisted essentially in the following particulars:

1. Penitents of the first three classes were required to kneel in worship, while the faithful were permitted to stand.

2. All were required to make known their penitential sorrow by an open and public confession of their sin. This confession was to be made, not  before the bishop or the priesthood, but in the presence of the whole Church, with sighs and tears and lamentations. These expressions of grief they were to renew and continue so long as they remained in the first or lowest class of penitents, entreating at the same time in their behalf the prayers and intercessions of the faithful. Some idea of the nature of these demonstrations of penitence may be formed from a record of them contained in the works of Cyprian. Almost all the canons lay much stress upon the sighs and tears accompanying these effusions.

3. Throughout the whole term of penance all expressions of joy were to be restrained, and all ornaments of dress to be laid aside. The penitents were required, literally, to wear sackcloth, and to cover their heads with ashes. Nor were these acts of humiliation restricted to Ash-Wednesday merely, when especially they were required.

4. The men were obliged to cut short their hair, and to shave their beards, in token of sorrow. The women were to appear with disheveled hair, and wearing a peculiar kind of veil.

5. During the whole term of penance, bathing, feasting, and sensual gratifications, allowable at other times, were prohibited.

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

             (II). There are in the Roman Catholic Church several orders or fraternities (as they are called) of penitents, of both sexes. These are secular societies, who have their rules, statutes, and churches, and make public processions under their particular crosses or banners. Of these is is said there more than a hundred, the most considerable of which are as follows:

1. The White Penitents, of whom there several different bodies at Rome, the most ancient having been constituted in 1264 by Gonfalon, in the church of San major, in imitation of which four others were established in the church of Ara-Coeli. The habit of these penitents is a kind of white sackcloth, and on the shoulder is circle, in the middle of which is a red and white cross.

2. Black Penitents, the most considerable of which are the Brethren of Mercy, were instituted in 1488 by some Florentines, in order to attend criminals during their imprisonment and at the time of their death. On the  day of execution they walk in procession before them, singing the seven penitential psalms and the litanies; and after they are dead they take them down from the gibbet and bury them. These penitents wear black sackcloth, and hence they are sometimes called Friars of the Sack. There are others whose business it is to bury such persons as are found dead in the streets: these wear a death's head on one side of their habit.

3. There are also blue, gray, red, green, and violet penitents, all whom are remarkable for little else besides the different colors of their habits.

4. Penitents or converts of the name of Jesus are a congregation of religious at Seville, in Spain, consisting of women who have led a licentious life. This monastery, founded in 1550, is divided into three quarters: one for professed religious, another for novices, and a third for those who are under correction. When these last give signs of a real repentance, they are removed into the quarter of the novices, where, if they do not behave themselves well, they are remanded to their correction. They observe the rule of St. Augustine.

5. Penitents of Orvieto are an order of nuns instituted by Antonio Simoncelli, a gentleman of Orvieto, in Italy. The monastery he built was at first designed for the reception of poor girls abandoned by their parents, and in danger of losing their virtue. In 1662 it was changed into a monastery, for the reception of such as, having abandoned themselves to impurity, were willing to reform and consecrate themselves to God by solemn vows. Their rule is that of the Carmelites.

6. The Order of Penitents of St. Magdalen was established about the year 1272, by one Bernard, a citizen of Marseilles, who devoted himself to the work of converting the courtesans of that city. Bernard was seconded by several others, who, forming a kind of society, were at length erected into a religious order by pope Nicholas III, under the rule of St. Augustine. Gesney says they also made a religious order of the penitents, or women whom they converted, giving them the same rules and observances which they themselves kept.

7. The Congregation of Penitents of St. Magdalen of Paris. By virtue of a brief of, pope Alexander, Simon, bishop of Paris, in 1497, drew them up a body of statutes, and gave them the rule of St. Augustine.  See Hist. du Clerge seculier et regulier, 1:361 sq.; 2:386; iii; 135, 249. SEE MAGDALEN, RELIGIOUS ORDER OF.

## Penknife[[@Headword:Penknife]]

             (תִּעִר הִסֹּפֶר, tdar has-sopher, Jer 36:23). The translation of this phrase by “penknife,” is substantially correct, but a more literal rendering, “the scrivener's knife,” would have been preferable; this was used to sharpen the point of the writing-reed. SEE KNIFE; SEE WRITING.

## Penn, Abram[[@Headword:Penn, Abram]]

             M.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the county of Patrick, Va., in the year 1803. In early life he studied medicine, but while he was absent at Philadelphia, attending lectures, his wife died, which was the cause of his awakening. He at once began to seek Christ, gave up the study of medicine, and returned home. Two years after he offered himself to the Virginia Conference, and was received on trial in 1825. He rose rapidly as a minister, and from his reception until broken down by disease he exhibited constancy, zeal, and a uniformity and depth of piety seldom manifested. He was eminently successful as a preacher, and enjoyed a popularity almost unbounded. His talents were not of the highest order, yet he possessed a clear, vigorous, and comprehensive mind, well stored with valuable information. With a graceful diction, rich imagination, and great zeal and earnestness of manner, he took a high position among the ministers of the Church. He was a devoted son of Methodism, an unflinching advocate of her doctrines and rights, of her polity and discipline. The leading feature of his character was a dauntless, straightforward honesty that needed no disguise for itself, and was impatient of dissimulation and disguise in other men. Yet there was in Dr. Penn a fountain of geniality that made his society peculiarly agreeable, and secured him the ardent attachment of many warm and admiring friends. He suffered much in the later years of his life with a most distressing affection of the heart. Many times it brought him to the very gates of death, but he would rally again, and go on in the path of duty and toil. At length disease gained the mastery, and peacefully, joyfully, he resigned his soul into the hands of his Creator. A life pious, devoted, and useful was crowned by a death calm, peaceful, triumphant. See Bennett, Methodism in Virginia (Richmond, 1871, 12mo), p. 731 sq.

## Penn, Granville[[@Headword:Penn, Granville]]

             youngest son of the Hon. Thomas Penn (son of the founder of Pennsylvania) by lady Juliana Fermor, fourth daughter of Thomas, first earl of Pomfret, was born in 1761. He was for some time an assistant chief clerk in the War Department, for which he received a pension of £550, and succeeded to the family estates upon the death of his brother, John Penn, LL.D. Granville Penn has conferred an inestimable service on the Church by his learned and valuable contributions (extending over a period of about thirty years) to theological literature. He died in 1844. We quote of his works: Critical Remarks on Isa 7:18 (Lond. 1799, 4to): — Remarks on the Eastern Origination of Mankind, and of the Arts of Cultivated Life (1799, 4to): — Three Copies of his Greek Version of the inscription on the Stoner fom Egypt [Rosetta, etc.] (1802, 8vo): — Observations in Illustration of Virgil's Fourth Eclogue (1810, 8vo): — A Christian's Survey of all the Principal Events and Periods of the World (2d ed. 1812, 8vo): — The Bioscope, or the Dial of Life Explained (1814, sm. 8vo): — The Prophecy of Ezekiel concerning Gog, etc. (1814. 8vo): — Original Lines and Translations (1815, 8vo): — Institutes of Christian Perfection of Macarius, translated from the Greek (1816, sm. 8vo; 2d ed. 1828, 12mo): — An Examination of the Primary Argument of the Iliad (1821, 8vo): — A Comparative Estimate of the Mineral and Mosaical Geologies (1822, 8vo; suppl. 1823, 8vo; 2d ed. [of the whole] revised and enlarged with relation to the latest publications on Geology, 1825, 2 vols. 8vo; again, 1844,.2 vols. in one, 8vo): — Memorials of the Professional Life and Times of Sir William Penn, knight, etc., 1644-1670 (1833, 2 vols. 8vo): — The Book of the New Covenant of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; being a Critical Revision of the Text and Translation of the English Version of the New Testament, with the aid of most ancient Manuscripts unknown to the Age in whiich that Version was put forth by Authority (1836, 8vo): — Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant, etc. (1837, 8vo): — Supplemental Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant, with a Brief Exposure of the Strictures of the Theological Reviewer for July (1837, 1838, 8vo). See Lond. Lit. Gaz. Jan. 28, 1837; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1550.

## Penn, James[[@Headword:Penn, James]]

             was a theologian who flourished in the 18th century, first as under grammar-master of Christ Church Hospital, and afterwards as vicar of  Clavering-cum-Langley, Essex. He published several works on theology, but there is not much valuable interpretation of the Scriptures, and far too large a portion of controversial spirit. We quote of his works: Various Tracts (Lond. 1756, 8vo), theological: — Various Tracts (1762, 8vo), theological: — Three Sermons (1769, 8vo): — Sermons and Tracts (1777, 8vo), He also published a number of occasional sermons, etc. See Orme, Bibl. Bib.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1551.

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

             an English divine, was born in 1743. He flourished as vicar of Roughton, Norfolk, and subsequently of Beccles, where he died in 1814. He published Sermons on Various Subjects (1792, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. 2:1551.

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

             conspicuous as a leader of a Christian sect, philanthropist, founder and legislator of a colony which has expanded into the second state of the American Union, was born in London, England, Oct. 14, 1644. He was the son of Sir William Penn, a gentleman of Welsh descent, who, first as a captain, then as an admiral in the British navy, by several victories at sea and the capture of Jamaica, greatly contributed towards the English maritime ascendency over the Dutch, and stood in high favor with court and country. His mother, Margaret, was the daughter of John Jasper, a Rotterdam merchant, an amiable, sensible woman. Young William was started to a careful education befitting his rank at the school of Chigwell, Essex, and, duly prepared, in his fifteenth year entered the college of Christ's Church, Oxford. He is described as from his earliest youth remarkable for an amiable disposition, docility, and uncommon aptitude, beauty in person, and altogether a harmonious development of faculties- physical, intellectual, and moral. He advanced rapidly in his studies, and cultivated the acquaintance of those classmates who were most distinguished for learning and good conduct; among their number was John Locke (q.v.). Enjoying excellent health and strength, he engaged also and delighted in athletic exercises — sports of the leisure hours — such as fencing, shooting, boating.

On the whole, he bade fair to make a career to distinction such as his ambitious father had in view, and most auspicious circumstances made easy to realize. This prospect, however, was suddenly changed in an unexpected manner, and the youth thrown into a train of  thoughts much at variance with the usual pursuit of honor and glory. With other students, he attended a meeting of the society then lately formed by the agitation of George Fox (q.v.). The speaker on this occasion was Thomas Lee, who had formerly belonged to the university. His discourse made a deep impression on Penn, reviving certain religious ideas which, as he confessed, had seriously occupied his mind when he was only twelve years old. Some of his classmates were equally affected. In consequence they ceased to attend the worship of the Established (Episcopal) Church, as running into ritualism and formality, and held conventicles of their own, where they exhorted and prayed and discussed theological topics. Reprimanded and fined for “nonconformity,” they nevertheless persisted in their proceedings; they went even farther. When the students were enjoined to wear again the surplice, which had been abolished since the Reformation, they (the conventiclers) not only refused compliance with the royal order, but fell upon those who appeared in the hateful popish garment. Hence the severest punishment which the college authorities could inflict was pronounced against the refractory pupils. Among those thus expelled from the college was Penn. The feelings of the admiral can easily be imagined.

William's reception at home was not the most cordial. Highly incensed at the views and actions of his son, on whom he otherwise doted, he first tried remonstrances, then threats, at last even bodily chastisement, to induce a change of sentiment and conduct; but in vain. He concluded by sternly interdicting the paternal roof. Young William, although strongly attached to his father, who was hotheaded and hasty, but kindly at heart, bore it gently, yet remained firm in his purpose and faith. After a while, by the intercession of lady Penn, the admiral relented so far as to allow William to return home, and finally sent the youth traveling (1662) into France and Italy, in the hope that acquaintance with the world might divert and alter his mind. During this tour, furnished with letters of introduction and his own prepossessing exterior, he was well received in the brilliant circles of Paris and at the court of Louis XIV. In Saumur he enjoyed the intercourse of a prominent Protestant divine, Moses Amyrault, and devoted a couple of months to becoming familiar with theological matters. He spent about two years on the Continent, as it seemed to good advantage and the satisfaction of his father, who recalled him, when he had gone as far as Turin, to take charge of his affairs while he was absent at sea. To prevent any relapse into his former oddities, it was deemed proper to keep him busy, and, as the best preparation both for family and state affairs, he was entered at Lincoln's Inn to study law. This curriculum was  soon interrupted by the plague which broke out in the metropolis. To remove him out of danger, he was dispatched to Ireland, where in the county of Cork the admiral owned large estates. With letters to the viceroy. the duke of Ormond, who was an intimate friend of the admiral, William was a welcome guest at the gay vice-regal court. During this visit he had a special opportunity of ingratiating himself, and still more rising in estimation. When at Carrick-Fergus a mutiny broke out among the troops. Young Penn volunteered his services, under the command of the viceroy's son, to assist in reducing them to obedience, and by his coolness and courage displayed in the affair earned general praise. Elated by this success, he resolved to choose the profession of arms as his way to fame and fortune; and so enraptured was he with that idea that he had his picture painted in military dress, said to be the only one for which he ever sat. Unexpectedly and strangely, the admiral, even disregarding the duke's (Ormond's) congratulation about his son's bravery, etc., disapproved of this step, and ordered him to superintend the management of his Irish possessions. Reluctantly but promptly he obeyed. While so engaged business called him to the city of Cork. There he met again the Quaker preacher who had made so strong an impression on him in Oxford. His old convictions revived. He attended Lee's meetings, and finally professed publicly adherence to his doctrines.

Ere long (1667) he had to share also their lot of persecution. He was, with eighteen others of the sect convened for nonconformity worship, arrested and imprisoned. A letter which he immediately addressed to the earl of Orrery, lord president of Munster, showing the injustice of the proceeding, and advocating general religious toleration, soon effected his own release. This was probably the first time he touched the keynote of his life, which subsequently resounded frequently and in many variations in his words and actions. Great was the chagrin of the parent when the news of this new conversion reached him — a reverse of all his fond hopes and aspirations. William was immediately called home. Could it be true? A fine young gentleman of twenty-three, polished and courtly in address, distinguished for sprightly wit and profound erudition, admired for martial courage, with honors and wealth ready to fall to him almost at the asking, consorting with the despised people nicknamed Quakers — self-styled Friends — followers of a ranting, enthusiastic cobbler! It was even so. Young Penn, looking more to the merits of the underlying truth than to external appearances, modestly avowed his principles; and while expressing his sincere desire to obey his father in everything that did not conflict with his duty to God, he declared  he could not abandon his religion. his duty to his heavenly Father being paramount to all other considerations. The admiral, so used to command, descended to resort with his beloved son to expostulation, argument, persuasion, entreaty; yea, he even proposed a compromise-to overlook the rest of his opinions provided he would agree to uncover his head before his majesty the king, the duke of York, and himself, acknowledging them as his superiors.

Yet even this trifling request William refused to entertain, after having implored by prayer God's help and illumination. A second banishment from home ensued, throwing him on the hospitality of friends and the clandestine supplies of money from a tender-hearted mother, since he, with all his accomplishments, had no certain profession to fall back upon for support. But in spite of all the adverse surrounding circumstances, and the sad feelings of a sensitive heart, he continued with his whole soul to work in the holy cause he had embraced by deed, word, and writing. We may here observe it was principally Penn, ill connection with Robert Barclay, George Keith, and Samuel Fisher, who tempered the rude and irregular utterances of George Fox, and reduced them to a system of doctrine and discipline, the main features of which are still preserved as the rules of the Society of the Friends. The first essay published by Penn, under the title Truth Exalted, was addressed to lay and clericals, to the king and the people, exhorting all to examine into the foundation of their faith, etc. On account of a succeeding publication, The Sandy Foundation Shaken, he had to undergo an imprisonment in the Tower (1668-69). It was declared heretical, as, among other things, it attempted to refute “that the Godhead existed in three separate persons.” During this incarceration, when it was reported to him that the bishop of London had threatened, “Penn must either recant or die in it,” he said, “Then the prison shall be my grave before I will budge a jot: my conscience I owe to no mortal man:” and in this expected martyrdom he wrote one of his most popular treatises, No Cross, no Crown; followed shortly after by another, Innocency with her Open Face, in which he acknowledged Christ's divinity. This latter pamphlet gave somewhat better satisfaction to the clergy, and the intercession of the duke of York with the king effected, after nearly nine months' confinement, his liberation. But in August, 1669, he was again arrested for preaching in the open street before the Friends' meeting-house, which was shut, and kept closed against them by a guard of soldiers.

On the occasion of this trial before mayor (of London), recorder, and aldermen, he made a most manly defense, not only of his own case, but of the liberties of the English people so greatly involved in this case, and won  from the jury an honest verdict of acquittal. The magistrate turned now in anger against the jury, and fined the members, and imprisoned them until the fine should be paid. An appeal, however, pronounced this absurd sentence, which would render the jurors only tools of the judge, illegal. Penn and Mead were fined for contempt of court, because they had kept their heads covered. The admiral settled this matter, although his son protested. About this time a reconciliation took place between father and son. The admiral's health had been of late fast declining, and he learned to see earthly things, however splendid, in a more sober light. William, too, had gained greatly in his esteem by the firm and able stand he had made in the last trial. Without being a Simeon, he could easily foresee the thorny paths, the persecutions and dangers, which such a character would have to encounter, and with paternal solicitude he made to the king and to the duke of York the dying request that they might extend to his son their protection. The promise was graciously given, and in after-years truly complied with on their side, and duly and gratefully appreciated by him on whom it was conferred. He remained at his father's bedside. watching him with tender assiduity until he breathed his last, and had even the gratification to hear from the lips of the dying man, “Let nothing in the world tempt you to wrong your conscience,” etc.. a confirmation of what William had contended for. Admiral Penn died Sept. 16, 1670, and left William property yielding all annual revenue of £1500 ($7500), and a claim of £16,000 ($80,000) on the government, due for services and money advanced to the crown. Shortly after this event he was again committed by the lieutenant of the Tower rather arbitrarily to the loathsome prison of Newgate for addlressing. a meeting on the street on religious subjects, and refusing to take the oath of the Oxford Act, which, according to his view, applied only to persons in orders addressing unlawful assemblies.

He employed during this term of six months his pen busily in support of his principles and in defense of his society. Among the treatises issued from this dungeon stands pre-eminent for ability, learning, and charity, The Great Cause of Liberty of Conscience once more briefly Debated and Defended by the Authority of Reason, Scripture, and Antiquity. After the expiration of his imprisonment he visited the Continent on a religious mission, and traveled through Holland and some parts of Germany. After his return to England (1672) he married the daughter of Sir William Springett, of Darling, Sussex, and then connected with the Quakers by her mother, who had become thewife of Isaac Penington (q.v.). His domestic relations and the attention required for the management of his extensive  private affairs did not abate his zeal in behalf of what he deemed true religion. He engaged either in controversies or in exposing the hardships to which his society was subjected by oppressive and unequal laws. He also wrote during this period a treatise On Oaths, and another on the Necessity of Religious Toleration, in which he ventured to maintain that the civil affairs of all governments may be peaceably transacted under the different liveries or trims of religion. “So far from a government being weakened or endangered by a variety of religious sentiments,” he writes, “it is, on the contrary, strengthened by them, provided that all are equally tolerated; for it prevents combinations against the government.”

In 1677 he undertook with Fox and Barclay another journey to Holland and Germany, to make converts no less than to smooth the way of the persecuted. In the former country he preached with great acceptance; but in the latter empire, although the countess-palatine Elizabeth, granddaughter of James I, favored his intentions, he found less appreciation, perhaps because less understood or less needed, the Peace of Westphalia, ending the Thirty-years' War, having at least partially settled the principle of religious tolerance. On his return he was called upon to defend his cause before a committee of the Commons, Parliament inclining to severer measures against people who differed so much in their habits. and demanded liberty of faith and conscience for all, even Roman Catholics. For the last ten years continually harassed, he now conceived a plan by which he might escape further trials and troubles, and realize his ideal of Christianity, viz., by founding a commonwealth after his own model in the transatlantic territories of Great Britain. By his transcendent abilities, his efforts, not to mention the sacrifices and personal sufferings in behalf of the sect, his honesty, his wealth and rank, overshadowing influence, and his beneficence, he had become, without seeking the position, their head and leader, and was consulted also in other not strictly religious matters. Thus it came to pass that he was appealed to in difficulties and disputes that had arisen between two Friends, Edward Byllinge and John Fenwick, so-called proprietors of lands in New Jersey.

William Penn as referee carefully examined the matter, and made his award. Fenwick refused to comply. Finally, however, by Penn's good offices the dispute was adjusted. Byllinge, who afterwards became embarrassed, wished to transfer his interest in the territory to his creditors, but in order to make the property more available entreated Penn to act as assignee. Penn became thereby (1675) instrumental in the settlement of  New Jersey, with a constitution of equitable rights. In this way engaged in colonizing West New Jersey, and subsequently as a purchaser also of the eastern part of that province, he acquired a knowledge of the adjoining region. This promised to be a place of refuge and security, where the distressed Friends and others might enjoy civil and religious liberty. He applied to king Charles II, the friend and patron of his father, and, “after many waitings, watchings, solicitings, and disputes in council,” obtained the grant of a tract of land in payment of the governmental debt above mentioned. The patent bears the date of March 4, 1681, and comprised lands on the Delaware River, including also settlements previously made by Sweden and Holland with 2000 inhabitants, to whom a royal proclamation was issued April 2, 1681. The new province, against his own wish, for he wanted it called New Wales or Sylvania, was named by the king, as he pleased to pretend; in memory of admiral Penn, Pennsylvania. Penn himself says of this grant:” It is a clear and just thing; and my God, that has given it me through many difficulties, will, I believe, bless and make it the seed of a nation. I shall have a tender care to the government that it will be well laid at first.” He forthwith (July 11, 1681) published an account of his acquisition, and invited purchasers at the rate of forty shillings a hundred acres, subject to a quit-rent of one shilling per annum forever. The next object of colonization was to establish an asylum for the Quakers, who were still persecuted, to form a people whose morals would correspond with the purity of the faith they professed, and to demonstrate that the use of arms was unnecessary for the protection of society.

The propagation of his religious views, however, was a secondary consideration; his form of government he was anxious to submit to the test of reality and experience in general. Soon after preliminary arrangements had been made, three ships, with numerous emigrants of his own persuasion from England and Wales, were dispatched the Amity and John and Sarah to sail from London, the Factor from Bristol. The expedition was under the control of colonel William Markham, Penn's relative, as his deputy, joined with others as commissioners authorized to confer with the aborigines on the purchase of land (for he considered the royal patent invalid as to them), and to conclude a treaty of amity. He instructed his agents to bear themselves with candor, justice, and humanity, and addressed to the Indians a letter of the same sentiments, sent presents to the chiefs, and merchandise to pay for the land bargained for. In the following year (1682) Penn himself, leaving his wife and children in England, crossed the ocean, to settle the affairs of the new colony. On Dec. 14, 1682, he held a grand  council with the sachems and their people, assembled in great numbers, trusting himself, with his European train, unarmed among the wild sons of the forest. The savages, at a sign from their head sachem, throwing bows and arrows to the ground, seated themselves in a semicircle around their chiefs. The locality chosen was then called Shackamaxon; it bears now the name of Kensington, a suburb of the present Philadelphia; a gigantic elm, with its widespreading branches, formed the main spot of their gathering (the tree was blown over in 1810, when it was, by its annual growth-rings, ascertained to have been two hundred and eighty-three years old, consequently one hundred and fifty-five at the time). The place is now marked by a marble monument. We have no space here to detail the tenets of the principal party interested, SEE FOX; SEE FRIENDS; SEE QUAKERS, but we cannot withhold an account of this transaction as a memorable manifestation of their Christianlike policy and practice, which, if followed consistently, would have saved millions of lives and treasure, and crowned Christian colonists with the renown of true missionaries of the Gospel of Peace. Penn addressed them by interpreter substantially as follows: The Great Spirit who rules the heavens and the earth, the Father of all men, bore witness to the sincerity of his wishes to dwell with them in peace and friendship, and to serve them with all his power.

Himself and followers had met them unarmed, because their religion forbade the use of hostile weapons against their fellowcreatures. They came not to injure others-that was offensive to the Great Spirit; but to do good, in which he delighted. Having met in the broad way of truth and benevolence, they ought to disdain deception, and to regulate their conduct by candor, fraternity, and love.” Unrolling the parchment, he explained the articles of the treaty and the terms of purchase. “By these,” he continued, “they were protected in their lawful pursuits even in the lands they had sold. Their right to improve their plantations, and means to secure subsistence, would be in all respects similar to those of the English. Should unfortunately disputes arise between the two peoples, they should be adjusted by arbitrators composed of equal numbers of Indians and Englishmen.” From the merchandise before him he then paid for the land to their satisfaction, and made them besides many presents. The sums which he spent for the purchase of all land on this and other occasions is computed at £6000 ($30,000). Laying the roll of parchment upon the ground, he bade them observe it as a sign “that the land should be thenceforth common to both peoples.” “He would not,” he added, “like the people of Maryland, call them his children or his brethren; for some parents chastised their children  too severely, and brethren could disagree. Nor would he compare their friendship to a chain, which the rain might rust. But tlhey would consider them as of one flesh and blood with the Christians, and the same as if one body was divided in two parts.” Taking up the parchment, he presented it to the chief sachem, and desired that it might be carefully preserved for three generations, that their children might know what had passed, as if he remained to repeat it.” The Indians in return made long and stately speeches, the gist and end of which was that they pledged themselves to live in love with William Penn and his children as long as the sun and moon would endure. This transaction is one of the brightest pages in American history, and has been honorably noticed even by the sarcastic Voltaire in these words: “This was the only treaty between these people (the natives) and the Christians which was not ratified by an oath, and which was never broken.” For the space of more than seventy years, as long as the Quakers retained supremacy in the government of Pennsylvania, the peace and amity then solemnly promised never was violated, nor was the blood of a single Quaker shed by the Indians. It is significant that the place thus sanctified, near the junction of the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, and selected for the capital of his province, has become the largest inland city of the continent, the cradle of the American republic, and the center of the late Centennial celebration. A few months after Penn bought the site from the Swedes, who had already erected a church there, and designed a map, according to which it was regularly laid out.

In the political construction of the new country, as proprietor empowered to enact laws with the assent of the freemen, he availed himself of this right in a manner which ranks him with Moses, Lycurgus, and Solon, without incurring their faults. His laws, although not exempt from error, are surely in advance of all similar works of his age, even Locke's plan of government adopted by lord Baltimore not excepted. His code is dated April 25, 1682, and was drawn up before he embarked. His friend, Algernon Sidney, was consulted in framing it. Of the twenty-four chapters of this document we will mention only a few of the more striking features:

1. “Almighty God being only Lord of conscience, Father of lights, and the author as well as the object of all divine knowledge, faith, and worship, who can only enlighten the mind and convince the understanding of people in reference to his sovereignty over the soul of mankind, therefore be it enacted, that no person now or hereafter living in the province, who shall confess one Almighty to be the creator and upholder and ruler of the  world, and who professes himself or herself obliged in conscience to live peaceably and justly under civil government, shall in any wise be molested or prejudiced for his or her conscientious persuasion or practice; nor shall he or she at any time be compelled to frequent or maintain any religions worship, place, or ministry contrary to his or her mind, but shall freely and fully enjoy his or her liberty in that respect without any interruption or reflection; and if any person shall abuse or deride any other for his or her different persuasion or practice in religion, such shall be looked upon as a disturber of the peace, and be punished accordingly.”

2. Yet only professed Christians were admitted to office, and of them such only as paid taxes; the purity of election was guarded by penalties against bribery, other corruption and frauds nowadays so frequently resorted to probably being then unknown and not thought of. Besides these he made very wise enactments.

3. The law of primogeniture, still to this day in force in England, was abolished; all members of a family should enjoy an equal share of inheritance.

4. Every one, rich or poor, was to learn a useful trade or occupation, the poor to live on it, the rich to have a resort, if they should become poor.

5. Even to malefactors his clemency extended; all penalties to have a tendency rather to improve than to punish the criminal. He substituted for about two hundred offenses which were at that time capitally punished in England some milder penalty. Only murder and treason were punishable by death.

In March, 1683, he held in the infant settlement the second assembly, and, waiving some more of his proprietary privileges, amended “the frame of government,” so that almost in all but the name Pennsylvania was rendered a representative democracy; and to his dying day he declared that if the people needed anything more to make them happy he would readily grant it. Says a modern writer: “In the early constitutions of Pennsylvania is to be found the distinct annunciation of every great principle, the germ, if not the development, of every valuable improvement in government or legislation which has been introduced into the political systems of more modern epochs.”

After having settled the provincial administration (five commissioners, with Lloyd as president during his absence), he returned in August, 1684, to England on account of his domestic affairs, and the  prospect that, by his influence on king Charles II, he could give better protection to the increasing sect of the Quakers. In 1685 Charles II was succeeded on the throne by his brother, the duke of York, as James II. In accordance with the pledge given to the admiral on his death-bed, the new king bestowed on the son the same friendship he had on the deceased. Penn, therefore, failed not to attend the royal court, and tried to use as heretofore his influence for good. But these frequent visits at Whitehall were misconstrued, and the most invidious and rididiculous slanders were put in circulation. He was accused of being a Catholic, a disguised Jesuit, corresponding with the pope and trafficking with pardons to convicted criminals. All the actions which in the eyes of zealots might give color to these criminations may be easily explained by the radical principles of equal rights and tolerance to all denominations openly avowed by Penn, and by the promptings of broad humanity to redress or alleviate grievances of any kind so natural to his character. The facts are that, mainly through his influence on the monarch, in 1686 a proclamation was issued which, with a number of other Dissenters, set fourteen hundred imprisoned Quakers at liberty; and in 1687 another declaration for liberty of conscience to all, unrestricted by any test and penalties. When, under a liberal construction of this Nonconformity Act, the king filled offices with Catholics, and committed himself to other reactionary measures, the Whig party prevailed in Parliament (1688), and declared James, who left England, to have forfeited the crown, and installed William of Orange and Mary as rulers of the realm. Now a still graver offense, that of high-treason, was laid on Penn: the charge that, out of attachment to the fallen royalty, he was accomplice to a plot calculated to overthrow the newly chosen regime and restore the self-exiled James to the throne. The indictment rests mainly on the statement of the head conspirator Preston, who, convicted of the crime and condemned to death, naming among others also Penn as implicated, tried to postpone or avert his own execution.

Fuller, the principal witness against him, was by Parliament afterwards branded as an impostor. The impeachment is too outrageous. That Penn, the man of common-sense, the apostle of peace and good-will, who had forbidden the use of carnal weapons, an exemplar of frankness, enjoying under the Reform more toleration than ever, should invite a hostile (French) invasion and civil war for the uncertain caprice of a bigoted and licentious king! (For a detailed refutation we refer the reader to Dixon.) In answer to these calumnies, to which, with other still more serious charges, even Macaulay gives credence in his History of England, Penn published (1688) a letter of which the  following is an extract: “It is fit that I contradict them as particularly as they accuse me. I say then, solemnly, I am so far from having been bred at St. Omer's, and received orders at Rome, that I never was at either place; nor do I know anybody there; nor had I ever any correspondence with anybody in these places. And as for officiating in the king's chapel, or any other, it is so ridiculous, as well as untrue, that, besides that nobody can do it but a priest, I have been married to a woman of some condition above sixteen years, which no priest can be by any dispensation whatever. I have not so much as looked into any chapel of the Roman religion, and consequently not the king's, though a common curiosity warrants it daily to people of all persuasions. And, once for all, I do say I am a Protestant Dissenter, and to that degree such that I challenge the most celebrated Protestant of the English Church, or any other on that head, be he layman or clergyman, in public or private. For I would have such people know it is not impossible for a true Protestant Dissenter to be dutiful, thankful, and serviceable to the king, though he (the king) be of the Roman Catholic communion. We hold not our property or protection from him by our persuasion, and therefore his persuasion should not be the measure of our allegiance.” Another attempt to fasten a disreputable transaction on Penn is the charge that he was an agent of the queen in extorting or collecting a penalty from the parents of certain girls who, under the lead of their schoolmistress, tendered colors to the rebellious Monmouth when passing Taunton; and who were for this act imprisoned on the charge of high- treason. The imputation against Penn rests on a letter dated Feb. 13, 1685- 6, by secretary Sunderland, addressed to “Mr. Penn,” who, in company with Walden, should manage the affair. The penalty demanded was £7000, which her gracious majesty donated to her maids of honor.

In reply: 1. It nowhere appears that William Penn was meant — to one George Penn the business would have been more congenial; 2. It is not proved that either William or George or any Penn accepted the commission; 3. It is a fact, substantiated by the contemporary Oldmixon, that one Brent, a popish lawyer, and Crane as his deputy, were engaged, and executed the collection, much to their own benefit, so that the maids of honor received only one third part of the imposed fine. Equally groundless is the insinuation that he interfered in the affair of Magdalen College to the injury of the Protestant faculty. He tried to mediate and save it, if possible, even by a compromise, which was construed by his enemies as trying to induce the president (Hough) to commit simony. His only fault was that he could not prevail over the king, who, bent on his purpose, by a royal order  transferred the institution to the Jesuits despite all remonstrances. But as credence to these calumnies, fostered probably by High Churchmen, was accorded by the government, an order for his arrest was finally issued (1690). Penn, absent to attend the funeral of his master, George Fox, when learning of it, to escape the blind fury of his powerful enemies, first concealed himself in London, and then by the way of Shoreham passed over into France, and once only had a secret interview with Algernon Sidney, in which he with more than his usual earnestness protested his innocence. In December, 1693, after the passion had subsided, he appeared again in England, and stood trial before the royal privy council, and was honorably acquitted. Meanwhile he had suffered greatly, not only in person, but also in property. Just before his intended arrest (1690) he had prepared a new expedition of five hundred colonists, and was on the eve of sailing. All the expenses of the outfit were lost, and in 1692 he was deprived of his supreme rights in Pennsylvania, and the province administered by royal governors until 1694, when he was reinstated as proprietor. In 1696 he married a second time, taking for his wife Hannah Callowhill. In 1699 he embarked with his family for his territories, with the intent of permanently residing there. He stayed only two years. The English ministry had presented to the House of Lords a bill to subject all the proprietary governments to the perfect control and authority of the crown.

Penn's friends succeeded in postponing its discussion. His return and presence prevented it from being passed. The remaining period of his life he spent in England, employing tongue and pen in the service of civil and religious liberty; maintaining an active correspondence with his representatives and agents in his American province, for which he had an anxious care. The succession of queen Anne, the Protestant daughter of the Catholicizing James 11, procured for him a certain favor and patronage at court, but he rarely availed himself of this advantage. The losses and great expenses incurred during the last years caused him financial embarrassments- a heavy burden and a source of chagrin, as the provincial assembly, to which he applied for relief, ungratefully refused to come to his aid. He was obliged to contract a mortgage of £66,000 on his transatlantic territories. In 1712 he himself proposed to the English government to sell his right and title to them; but before the business was closed, overcome by labors and cares, he had three consecutive attacks of apoplexy, the last of which deprived him almost entirely of memory; but his cheerful and benevolent disposition and the amenity of his conversation were apparent to the last. He died at his country-seat of Rushcombe, Buckinghamshire,  July 30, 1718. -His remains were buried near the Friends' meeting house at Jordans. The plain recital of his doings is his best eulogy.

Besides the treatises already named, Penn wrote and published the following, which are all controversial: A seasonable Caveat against Popery (1670): — Truth rescued from Imposture (1671): — The Spirit of Truth Vindicated (1672): — Quakerism a New Nickname for Old Christianity (1673): — England's Present Interest Considered (1674). His collected writings, with a biography, were published in 1726 at London, and in 1782 in 4 vols. See Marsillac, Vie de GuillaumePenn (Paris, 1791); Clarkson, Miemoirs of the Private and Public Life of William Penn (Lond. 1813, 2 vols.; new ed. 1849, with a preface by W. E. Forster, which deserves particular attention as containing a refutation of some of the calumnies started against him by Macaulay); Hepworth Dixon, Williamn - Penn, a Historic Biography from New Sources (2d ed. Lond. 1853); Paget, Inquiry into the Evidence of the Charges brought by Lord Macaulay against William Penn (Edinb. 1858); Janney, Life of Penn (Philad. 1852). See also Ranke, Englische Geschichte, vol. v; Weingarten. Revolutions- Kirchen Englands (Leips. 1868), p. 405-421; Janney, Hist. of the Friends, vol. iii; Skeats, Hist. ofthe Free Churches of England, p. 81, 82, 153,315; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England, vol. i and ii; Marsden, Hist. of the Churches and Sects of Christendon. For a full account of Penn's writings, and of those relating to him, see especially Joseph Smith's Catalogue of Friends' Books, 2:282-326; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, 2:1551-1553. See also the excellent article in Thomas, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Quarterly Review of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, April, 1863, art. ii; Christian Review, 17:555; Westminster Review, October, 1850; Littell's Living Age, March 28,1846, art. vii.

## Penna, Francois-Horace della[[@Headword:Penna, Francois-Horace della]]

             an Italian missionary, was born in 1680 at Macerata, States of the Church. Having entered the Order of the Capuchins while young, he was in 1719 appointed chief of a mission destined to evangelize Thibet, and went to Lassa with twelve of his brethren. After several years of apostolic labors, Della Penna, seeing his mission reduced to only three monks, returned to Rome in 1735 to ask for new reinforcements, and upon his recital the Congregation of the Propaganda associated with him nine other Capuchins, with whom he departed in 1738, loaded with presents, and bearing two pontifical briefs for the king of Thibet and the grand lama. They arrived in  Thibet in 1741, and commenced their preaching; and it was upon the instruction- furnished by Della Penna that the Congregation of the Propaganda published in Italian Relation of the Commencement of the Present State of the Kingdom of Thibet and its Neighbors (Rome, 1742, 4to). It is not necessary to take literally the recital of the conversions that Della Penna pretends to have made; what he relates in this respect must be accepted only as an inventory. He died July 20, 1747, in Patan, Nepaul. We owe to this missionary, who had studied Thibetan under a doctor at Lassa, several manuscript fragments, by which father Giorgi has profited in the publication of his Alphabetum Tibetanurn (1742, 4to). It is also from the designs of Della Penna that the Thibetan characters of the Propaganda have been engraved. See Lettres edif. et cur. ecrites des Missions etrangesres; Remusat, Recherches Tartares, 1:344.

## Penna, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Penna, Lorenzo]]

             an Italian organist, was born at Bologna in 1613. He entered the Order of Carmelites at Mantua, taught theology, and became chapelmaster of the church of his order at Parma. His reputation as an organist and didactic writer appears to have been great. He died Oct. 20, 1693. Besides his Messes and his Psaumes concertos, which have had several editions, we have of his works, Li primi labori musicali (Bologna, 1656-79, 3 pts. 4to), a treatise reprinted five times, and containing some good things; and Direttorio del canto fermno (Modena, 1689, 4to). See Orlandi, Scrittori Bolognesi; Fetis, Biog. univ. des Musiciens.

## Pennacchi, Pietro Maria[[@Headword:Pennacchi, Pietro Maria]]

             a painter of Trevigi, who, according to Zanetti, flourished at Venice about 1520. He painted some works for the churches at Venice and Murano, which Lanzi says are more excellent in color than design.

## Pennafiel, Council Of[[@Headword:Pennafiel, Council Of]]

             (Concilium Penafelense), was held, April 1, 1302, by Gonsalvo of Toledo and his suffragans. Fifteen articles were published, tending to repress those abuses which are noticed in the councils of this age, viz. incontinence among the clergy, usury, etc. Among other things, it was enacted, by canon 12, that in every church the “Salve Regina” should be sung after compline. By canon 8, that the priests should make with their own hands the bread to be consecrated at the Eucharist, or cause it to be made by other  ecclesiastics in their own presence. By canon 7, that tithe should be paid of all lawful property, thereby to recognize the universal sovereignty of God. See Labbe, Concilia, 11:2444.

## Pennaforte, Raymond Of[[@Headword:Pennaforte, Raymond Of]]

             a celebrated ecclesiastical character of the 13th century, was born at Barcelona, and was educated at the university of his native place from 1204 to 1219. He then went to Bologna, and there taught for some time. Ere he had left home he had been vicar-general of his native place. On his return he entered the Dominican Order, then but recently founded. By request of his superiors he wrote Summa casuum poenitentiae. In 1230 pope Gregory IX called him to Rome, and made him his chaplain and confessor. His holiness also entrusted him with a collection of the papal decisions not given by Gratian, and they were published under the title Decretalium Gregorii IX compilatio. In 1235 he was elevated to the archbishopric of Tarragona, but he refused the honor, and retired to his convent. In 1238 he was, however, obliged to accept the honor of a general of his order. But though he accepted the office, he finally resigned it, and devoted himself to the conversion of Moors and Jews, and to his studies. He died Jan. 6,1275. Pope Clement VIII enrolled him among the saints, and he is commemorated Jan. 20. See Butler, Lives of the Saints, Jan. 20, vol. i.

## Pennell, George Caspar, D.D[[@Headword:Pennell, George Caspar, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in New York city, July 11, 1832. He graduated from Columbia College in 1852, and from the General Theological Seminary in 1855; was successively assistant rector of St. Paul's, Troy; rector of Grace Church, and afterwards of St. James', Buffalo; of St. Mary's, Mott Haven; of Christ Church, Rouse's Point; of St. John's, Newark, N.J.; and finally of St. John's Mission, Deadwood, Nebraska, where he died, May 20, 1882.

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

             D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Ireland in 1790. He graduated at the university in Dublin, emigrated to the United States, and in April, 1822, was settled as pastor over the First Presbyterian Church, Rochester, N.Y.; in 1832 he removed to Northampton, Mass., and subsequently became president of Hamilton College, N.Y. But he soon again exchanged the rostrum for the pulpit, and became pastor of the Church at Nyack, N.Y. In 1839 he removed to Grand Rapids, Mich., and afterwards preached at Pontiac, Mich. He died March 20, 1860. Dr. Penney's life was laborious and useful; he was greatly beloved wherever he was located. He was the author of a work on Education, and published a number of fugitive theological articles in periodicals. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 105; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, v, vol. i, . v. (J. L. S.)

## Penney, Nicholas[[@Headword:Penney, Nicholas]]

             a French engraver of the last century, has left some plates treating of devout subjects from his own designs, executed with the graver in a very neat style, but without much effect, among which is one of the Virgin appearing to St. Bartholomew. They are marked “N. Penney fecit.”

## Penni, Giovanni Francesco[[@Headword:Penni, Giovanni Francesco]]

             an eminent Italian painter, was born at Florence in 1488, and received the name of Il Farttorne, or the Steward, from his having been entrusted with the management of the domestic affairs of Raffaelle. He was, however, also one of his principal assistants, and probably bore the surname 11 Fattore because he was also Raffaelle's apprentice. He was first employed in the decoration of the Loggie of the Vatican, where he executed the histories of Abraham and Isaac in such an admirable manner that Raffaelle made him one of his heirs. Dr. Waagen is of opinion that Penni executed many parts of the cartoons at Hampton Court, especially those of the Death of Ananias, St. Paul and Barnabas art Lystra, and St. Paul Preaching at Athens. Of Penni's own works no frescos and very few oil-paintings remain. His characteristics are said to have been facility of invention, graceful execution, and singular felicity in landscape. After the death of Raffaelle, Penni went to Naples, where he died in 1528. Kugler and Passavant attribute to Penni the celebrated Madonna del Passeggio in the Bridgewater collection, usually believed to be Raffaelle's.

## Penni, Luca[[@Headword:Penni, Luca]]

             another Italian artist and brother of the preceding, was born at Florence about the year 1500. Orlando says that Luca also studied in the school of Raffaelle. According to Vasari, Luca united himself to Plierino del Vaga, and worked with him in the churches at Lucca, Genoa, and other cities; he afterwards accompanied Rosso into France, and ultimately passed into England, where he was employed for some time by Henry VIII. On his return to Italy he is said to have quitted painting for engraving. There are quite a number of prints attributed to him, mostly after the works of Rosso and Primaticcio. Among them are the following: Susannna and the Elders; Abraham sacrificing Isaac, after Primaticcio; The Marriage of St. Catharine, ditto.

## Pennington, J. W. C[[@Headword:Pennington, J. W. C]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian minister (colored), was born in 1800. He was born a slave but escaped from his condition of servitude at the age of twenty-one years, and found his way to New York, where he was assisted in his studies for the ministry by the Presbyterian Church, under the care of Dr. Cox. He was subsequently settled at Hartford, and later over the Shiloh Presbyterian Church, New York. He received the degree of D.D. from the University of Heidelberg, Germany. For two or three years previous to his death he labored with great zeal and success among the freedmen in Florida. He died at Jacksonville Oct. 22, 1870.

## Pennington, Montagu[[@Headword:Pennington, Montagu]]

             an English divine of some celebrity, was born about 1763, and was educated at Trinity College, Oxford, where he took his M.A. in 1784. He was vicar of Northbourne and Shoulden, and perpetual curate of St. George's Chapel, Deal. He was also a magistrate for Kent and the Cinque Ports. HQ died April 15, 1849. He published Redemption, or a View of the Rise and Progress of Christianity (1811); and, besides several minor literary labors, prepared a memoir of his aunt, Mrs. Elizabeth Carter, the poetess, and published it with a collection of her poems, essays, etc. (Lond. 1807, 4to; 1808, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

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

             a brother of the preceding, also an English clergyman, was born about 1770, and was educated under his very learned aunt. After taking holy orders, bishop Porteus. who was the friend of Mrs. Carter, presented Thomas Pennington with the rectory of Thorley, Herts. He became also chaplain to Lord Ellenborough. He died about 1850. His publications are of little interest now.

## Pennone, Rocco[[@Headword:Pennone, Rocco]]

             a distinguished Lombard architect, flourished at Genoa in the 16th century. Milizia does not mention his instructor, but he warmly commends Pennone's abilities, as evinced in the enlargement of the government palace at Genoa, particularly in the arrangement of a grand portico, flanked by two courts, which, although differing in size, satisfy the eye by their perfect  symmetry. These courts are surrounded by two orders of galleries, the first supported by Doric and the second by Ionic columns. Among the other works of Pennone is a part of the church of St. Sacramento, which he completed after the designs of Galeazzo Alessi.

## Penny[[@Headword:Penny]]

             In the A.V., in several passages of the New Test., “penny,” either alone or in the compound “pennyworth,” occurs as the rendering of the Greek δηνάριον, a transfer of the name of the Roman denarius (Mat 18:28; Mat 20:2; Mat 20:9; Mat 20:13; Mat 22:19; Mar 6:37; Mar 12:15; Mar 14:5; Luk 7:41; Luk 10:35; Luk 20:24; Joh 6:7; Joh 12:5; Rev 6:6). It took its name from its being first equal to ten “n asses,” a number afterwards increased to sixteen. The earliest specimens are of about the commencement of the 2d century B.C. From this time it was the principal silver coin of the commonwealth. It continued to hold the same position under the empire until long after the close of the New-Testament canon. In the time of Augustus eighty-four denarii were struck from the pound of silver, which would make the standard weight about 60 grains. This Nero reduced by striking ninety-six from the pound, which would give a standard weight of about 52 grains, results confirmed by the coins of the periods, which are, however, not exactly true to the standard. The drachm of the Attic talent, which from the reign of Alexander until the Roman domination was the most important Greek standard, had, by gradual reduction, become equal: to the denarius of Augnstus, so that the two coins came to be regarded as identical. Under. the same emperor the Roman coin superseded the Greek, and many of the few cities which yet struck silver money took for it the form and general character of the denarius, and of its half, the quinarius. In Palestine in the New-Test. period, we learn from numismatic evidence, that denarii must have mainly formed the silver currency. It is therefore probable that in the New Test, by (δραχμή and ἀργύριον, both rendered in the A.V. “piece of silver,” we are to understand the denarius. SEE DRACHMA.

The δίδραχμον of the tribute (Mat 17:24) was probably in the time of our Savior not a current coin, like the στατήρ mentioned in the same passage (Mat 17:27). SEE MONEY.

From the parable of the laborers in the vineyard it would seem that a denarius was then the ordinary pay for a day's labor (Mat 20:2; Mat 20:4; Mat 20:7; Mat 20:9-10; Mat 20:13). The term denarius aureus (Pliny 34:17; 37:3) is probably a corrupt designation for the aureus  (nunzmus); in the New Test. the denarius proper is always intended. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Denarius. The earlier silver denarii were struck by the authority of distinguished families, and bear portraits and designs illustrative of Roman history; these are called consular denarii. After the time of Julius Caesar they present us with a series almost unbroken of the emperors, together with many of their wives, sons, daughters, and occasionally of their fathers, sisters, and brothers also. The consular denarius bore on one side a head of Rome, and X or a star, to denote the value in asses, and a chariot with either two or four horses; but afterwards the reverse bore the figures of Castor and Pollux, and sometimes a Victory in a chariot of two or four horses. At a later date the busts of different deities were given on the obverse; and these were finally superseded by the heads of the Caesars. The reverses varied, and some of them are very curious. The name continued to be applied to a silver piece as late as the time of the earlier Bvzantines. The states that arose from the ruins of the Roman empire imitated the coinage of the imperial mints, and in general called their principal silver coin the denarius, whence the French name denier and the Italian denaro. The chief Anglo-Saxon coin, and for a long period the only one corresponded to the denarius of the Continent. It continued to be current under the Normans, Plantagenets, and Tudors, though latterly little used. It is called penny, denarius, or denier, which explains the employment of the first word in the A.V. See Arnold. De denario Petri (Alt. 1769); Dorschaeus, Denarius Vespertinus (Rost. 1657). SEE DENARIUS.

## Penny Weddings[[@Headword:Penny Weddings]]

             (or PENNY BRIDALS) is the name of a peculiar festive marriage ceremonial which was common in Scotland until the middle of the 17th century. At these penny weddings the invited guests made contributions in money (seldom more than one shilling each), to pay the general expenses, and leave over a small sum, which would assist the newly married pair in furnishing their dwelling. This practice, now disused, as leading to “profane minstreling and promiscuous dancing,” was denounced by an Act of the General Assembly of the Kirk in 1645, as well as by numerous acts of presbyteries and kirk-sessions about the same period. The act reads as follows:

“The assembly, considering that many persons do invite to these penny weddings excessive numbers, arono, whom there frequently  falls out drunkenness and uncleanness, for preventing whereof, by their act Feb. 13, 1645, they ordain presbyteries to take special care for restraining the abuses ordinarily committed at these occasions, as they shall think fit, and to take a strict account of the obedience of every session to their orders thereanent, and that at their visitation of parishes within their bouilds; which act is ratified March 8, 1701. By the 12th session assembly, 1706, presbyteries are to apply to magistrates for executing the laws relating to penny bridals, and the commission, upon application from them, are to apply to the government for obliging the judges who refuse to execute their office in that matter. By the 14th act Parl. 3 Car. II, it is ordained that at marriages, besides the married persons, their parents, brothers, and sisters, and the family wherein they live, there shall not be present above four friends on either side. If there shall be any greater number of persons at penny weddings within a town, or two miles thereof, that the master of the house shall be fined in the sum of 500 merks.”

## Penny, Joseph, D.D[[@Headword:Penny, Joseph, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and at the University of Glasgow. Two years after he came to America he taught in the academy at Flushing, L.I. In 1821 he took charge of the First Church, Rochester, N.Y.; in 1832 of that at Northampton, Massachusetts, and in 1835 became president of Hamilton College. After leaving that institution, in 1839, he removed to Grand Rapids, Michigan, and from there to Pontiac, where his health failed, and he returned to Rochester. He died there, March 20, 1860. Dr. Penny was a man of superior abilities and fine education. In 1829 he visited his native land and organized temperance societies there. See Mears, Presbyterianism in Central New York,. pages 319, 630.

## Penry (Or Penri Or Ap Henry), John[[@Headword:Penry (Or Penri Or Ap Henry), John]]

             a Puritan divine, better known under the names of Martin MarPrelate and Martin Priest, was a native of Wales, and was born in 1559. He was educated at Peter House, Cambridge, whence he removed to Oxford, where he took his degree of master, and then entered into holy orders. In the controversy between the Puritans and the hierarchy he waged a fierce war against the Establishment, and was accused and condemned for holding seditious opinions and libelling the queen (Elizabeth). He was executed like a felon in 1593, leaving a widow with four young children to bemoan their loss. He was charged with the authorship of the Mar-Prelate Tracts, but he disapproved of the project, and their spirit and their style are so unlike his that his apologists deny his having had anything to do with them. During his trial he advocated the principles which he believed necessary for adoption by the English Church, viz. (1) that the Church as an institution of Christianity should be governed only by the laws of its divine founder; (2) that the offices derived from the Romish hierarchy were unscriptural and antichristian. There is little doubt that Penry's conscientious hostility to prelacy and Church authority made him obnoxious to the ruling party, and brought him to a premature and violent death. He seems to have had less of that spirit of rancor and insubordination than the majority of his co-thinkers. Especially in his last  moments did the spirit of the man rise to the solemn circumstances of his fate, and he died, if not precisely for the cause, yet with much of the devoted spirit of a martyr. See Waddington, John Penry, the Pilgrim Martyr (Lond. 1854, 8vo); Stoughton, Spiritual Heroes, p. 52 sq.; Coleman, The English Confessors after the Ref. p. 117 sq., 297 sq.; Price, Hist. of Nonconformity, vol. i; Soames, Elizabethan Religious Iistory, p. 427 sq.; Collier, Eccles. Hist.; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans; (Lond.) Gentleman's Magazine, 1854, 1:511; Bacon, Genesis of the New England Churches; and the article as well as the references in Allibone, Dict, of Brit. and Amer. Auth. ii, s.v.

## Pensaben, Fra Marco, And Fra Marco Maraveia[[@Headword:Pensaben, Fra Marco, And Fra Marco Maraveia]]

             his assistant, two old painters of the Order of the Dominicans at Venice, flourished in the first half of the 16th century. Pensaben was born at Venice in 1486, Of his parents and boyhood nothing is known. The earliest account takes his back to 1510, when he was a priest at the Dominican convent of Sts. Paul and John in Venice, having only a short time previous to this taken the Dominican habit. In the capitular acts of 1514 he is called sub-prior, and in those of 1524 head sacristan. Lanzi says Pensaben was an artist of singular merit, wholly unknown in the history of art till Frederici discovered some documents relating to him in the convent of the Dominicans at Trevigi, whither he had been invited from Venice. “‘In this style, partaking of the ancient and modern taste, is a large picture of St. Nicholas in a church of the Dominicans at Trevigi, in which the cupola, the columns, and the perspective, with a throne, on which is seated the Virgin with the infant Jesus, surrounded by saints standing, the steps ornamented by a harping seraph, all discover the composition of Bellini. It was painted by P. Marco Pensaben, assisted by P. Marco Maraveia, both Dominican priests engaged for this purpose from Venice.” Nothing further is- known of their works. Pensaben died in 1530.

## Pensieri, Batista[[@Headword:Pensieri, Batista]]

             an Italian engraver who flourished in the latter part of the 16th century, was a native of Parma, and is usually called Baptista Parmensis, from his signature. Zani calls his name Battista Pensieri da Parmna, and says that he was a designer, engraver, and a seller of books and prints, and gives four inscriptions from his prints (see Spooner). Pensieri resided chiefly at Rome, where he engraved several plates for various masters, and others from his own designs, executed in a style resembling that of Cornelius Cort. Among these are the following: The Virgin and Infant appearing to St. John (after Baroccio, Baptista Parmensis fec. 1588): — The Baptism of Christ (Baptista Parmensis): — The Chastity of St. Joseph (1593): — The Crucifixions (in two sheets, Baptista Parmensis fornis. 1584).

## Pensio[[@Headword:Pensio]]

             i.e. the enjoyment or use of a part of the fruits of a benefice without service, was formerly a very common occurrence in the Church of Rome, and is even now occasionally enjoyed in the Church of England. SEE SINECURE. At present in the Romish Church the pensio is accorded only to priests de emeritu.

Titulis pensionis is the name of the secured income to a priest without regard as to its source.

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

             also called DE LA VEGA, a Jewish merchant of Spain, is noted for his literary labors as poet, moral philosopher, and orator. He was born about 1650 at Espejo, in Cordova; and lived afterwards at Livorno, Amsterdam, and Antwerp, at which last place he probably died. He belongs to the last Spanish Jews who cultivated Spanish poetry in a foreign land. He wrote, אִסַירֵי הִתַּקַוָה, “the Prisoners of Hope,” an allegorical drama (Amsterd. 1673): — פֵּרְדֵּס שׁוֹשִׁנַּים, “Orchard of Lilies.” In both these dramas Penso shows the assiduity of Satan in deluding man from the worship of God, and the many snares he lays in his way to entrap him; but Providence frustrates all Satan's diabolic devices, and righteousness obtains at last the sway over him: — La Rosa, Panegyrica sacra, a panegyric poem in praise of the Mosaic law (ibid. 1683): — The Life of Adam, in Spanish (ibid. 1683): — Sermon funebre, a funeral oration in Spanish on the death of his mother, printed together with a funeral oration  on the death of his father (ibid. 1683): — Discurso Academico moral y sanyrado, etc. (ibid. 1683): — Discursos academicos, morales, rhetoricos, y sangrados que recito en lafiorida Acadamia de los Floridos, etc. (ibid. 1685). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:75; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:198; 13; Kavserling, Sephardim, p. 316 sq.; Bibliothekjiudischer Kanzelredner, vol. i, Beilage, p. 17; Margoliouth, Modern Judaism investigated, p. 246; Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der jidischen Poesie, p. 77, 160, 174; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 326 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 389; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:555; 3:417; 4:851. (B. P.)

## Pentacle of Solomon[[@Headword:Pentacle of Solomon]]

             a five-angled figure, composed of two triangles interlaced; the legendary seal or sigil of Solomon, carved on an emerald, by which he ruled the gins or daemons, representing the five fingers of the hand of Omnipotence. David's shield had six angles.

## Pentateuch[[@Headword:Pentateuch]]

             the collective title commonly given to the first five books of the O.T. In the present article we treat this important section of Scripture as a whole, in the light of modern criticism and discussion, reserving its component books for their separate heads. See Moses.

I. The Name. — The above is the Greek name given to the books commonly called the Five Books of Moses (ἡ πεντάτευχος sc. βιβλος; Pentateuchus sc. liber; the fivefold book; from τοῦχος, which, meaning originally “vessel, instrument,” etc., came in Alexandrine Greek to mean “book”). In the time of Ezra and Nehemiah it was called “the Law of Moses” (Ezr 7:6); or “the book of the Law of Moses” (Neh 8:1); or simply “the book of Moses” (Ezr 6:18; Neh 13:1; 2Ch 25:4; 2Ch 35:12). This was beyond all reasonable doubt our existing Pentateuch. The book which was discovered in the Temple in the reign of Josiah, and which is entitled (2Ch 34:14) the book of the Law of Jehovah by the hand of Moses,” was substantially, it would seem, the same volume. In 2Ch 34:30 it is styled “the book of the Covenant,” and so also in 2Ki 23:2; 2Ki 23:21, while in 2Ki 22:8 Hilkiah says, I have found “the book of the Law.” Still earlier, in the reign of Jehoshaphat, we find a “book of the Law of Jehovah” in use (2Ch 17:9). This was probably the earliest designation, for a “book of  the Law” is mentioned in Deuteronomy (Deu 31:26), though it is questionable whether the name as there used refers to the whole Pentateuch or only to Deuteronomy. The modern Jews usually call the whole by the name of Torah (תּוֹרָה), i.e. “the Law,” or Torath Mosheh (תּוֹרִת משֶׁה), “the Law of Moses.” The rabbinical title is חֲמַשָּׁה חוּמְשֵׁי הִתּוֹרָהthe five fifths of the Law.” In the preface to the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, it is called “the Law,” which is also a usual name for it in the New Testament (Mat 12:5; Mat 22:36; Mat 22:40; Luk 10:26; Joh 8:5; Joh 8:17). Sometimes the name of Moses stands briefly for the whole work ascribed to him (Luk 24:27). Finally, the whole Old Testament is sometimes called a potiori parte, “the Law” (Mat 5:18; Luk 16:17; Joh 7:49; Joh 10:34; Joh 12:34). In Joh 15:25; Rom 3:19, words from the Psalms, and in 1Co 14:21, from Isaiah, are quoted as words of the Law. SEE LAW.

II. Present Form. — The division of the whole work into five parts has by some writers been supposed to be original. Others (as Leusden, Havernick, and Lengerke), with more probability, think that the division was made by the Greek translators. For the titles of the several books are not of Hebrew, but of Greek origin. The Hebrew names are merely taken from the first words of each book, and in the first instance only designated particular sections and not whole books. The MSS. of the Pentateuch form a single roll or volume, and are divided not into books, but into the larger and smaller sections called Parshiyoth and Sedarim. Besides this, the Jews distribute all the laws in the Pentateuch under the two heads of affirmative and negative precepts. Of the former they reckon 248; because, according to the anatomy of the rabbins, so many are the parts of the human body; of the latter they make 365, which is the number of days in the year, and also the number of veins in the human body. Accordingly the Jews are bound to the observance of 613 precepts; and in order that these precepts may be perpetually kept in mind, they are wont to carry a piece of cloth foursquare, at the four corners of which they have fringes consisting of eight threads apiece, fastened in five knots. These fringes are called צַיצְית, a word which in numbers denotes 600: add to this the eight threads and the five knots, and we get the 613 precepts.

The five knots denote the five books of Moses. (See Bab. Talmud. Maccoth, sect. 3; Maimon. Pref. to Jad Hachazakah; Leusden, Philol. p. 33.) Both Philo (de Abraham. ad init.) and Josephus (c. Apion. 1:8) recognize the division now current. Vaihinger supposes that the symbolical meaning of the number five led to  its adoption; for ten is the symbol of completion or perfection, as we see in the ten commandments (and so in Genesis we have ten “n generations”), and therefore five is a number which, as it were, confesses imperfection and prophesies completion. The Law is not perfect without the Prophets, for the Prophets are in a special sense the bearers of the Promise; and it is the Promise which completes the Law. This is questionable. There can be no doubt, however, that this division of the Pentateuch influenced the arrangement of the Psalter in five books. The same may be said of the five Megilloth of the Hagiographa (Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther), which in many Hebrew Bibles are placed immediately after the Pentateuch. In some Jewish writers, however, there are found statements indicating that the Pentateuch was formerly divided into seven portions (comp. Jarchi, ad Proverb. 9: 1; ibique Breithaupt). In the Jewish canon the Pentateuch is kept somewhat distinct from the other sacred books of the Old Testament, because, considered with reference to its contents, it is the book of books of the ancient covenant. It is the basis of the religion of the Old Testament, and of the whole theocratical life. SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

For the several names and contents of the five books we refer to the articles on each book, where questions affecting their integrity and genuineness separately are also discussed.

III. Unity of the Pentateuch. —

1. This is evinced in its general scope and contents. With a view to this point, we need only briefly observe here that this work, beginning with the record of creation and the history of the primitive world, passes on to deal more especially with the early history of the Jewish family. It gives at length the personal history of the three great fathers of the family; it then describes how the family grew into a nation in Egypt, tells us of its oppression and deliverance, of its forty years' wandering in the wilderness, of the giving of the law, with all its enactments both civil and religious, of the construction of the tabernacle, of the numbering of the people, of the rights and duties of the priesthood, as well as of many important events which befell them before their entrance into the Land of Canaan, and finally concludes with Moses's last discourses and his death. The unity of the work in its existing form is now generally recognised. It is not a mere collection of loose fragments carelessly put together at different times, but bears evident traces of design and purpose in its composition. Even those  who discover different authors in the earlier books, and who deny that Deuteronomy was written by Moses, are still of opinion that the work in its present form is a connected whole, and was at least reduced to its present shape by a single reviser or editor (see Ewald, Geschichte, 1:170; Stfahelin, Kritische Unters. p. 1).

The question has also been raised whether the book of Joshua does not, properly speaking, constitute an integral portion of this work. To this question Ewald (Geschichte, 1:175), Knobel (Genesis, Vorbem. § 1, 2), Lengerke (Kenaan, 83), and Stahelin (Kritische Unlters. p. 91) give a reply in the affirmative. They seem to have been led to do so, partly because they imagine that the two documents, the Elohistic and the Jehovistic, which characterize the earlier books of the Pentateuch, may still be traced, like two streams, the waters of which never wholly mingle though they flow in the same channel, running on through the book of Joshua; and partly because the same work which contains the promise of the land (Genesis 15) must contain also — so they argue — the fulfillment of the promise. But such grounds are far too arbitrary and uncertain to support the hypothesis which rests upon them. All that seems probable is that the book of Joshua received a final revision at the hands of Ezra, or some earlier prophet, at the same time with the books of the law. The fact that the Samaritans, who it is well known did not possess the other books of Scripture, have besides the Pentateuch a book of Joshua (see Chronicon Samaritanum, etc., ed. Juynboll, Lugd. Bat. 1848), indicates no doubt an early association of the one with the other, but is no proof that they originally constituted one work, but rather the contrary. Otherwise the Samaritans would naturally have adopted the canonical recension of Joshua. We may therefore regard the five books of Moses as one separate and complete work.

2. More particularly, the order which pervades the book manifests its unity, although this is not, indeed, tediously formal or monotonous.

(1.) Chiefly its chronological order, the simplest of all, and such as might be expected to be predominant in a book which is in a large measure historical. This characteristic is obvious in respect to the position of the two books of Genesis and Deuteronomy at the beginning and the end; the former serving as an introduction, and the latter as a recapitulation. In like manner the story of the family of Abraham expands, when we come to Exodus, into that of the people of Israel: first, enslaved Israel attains to  redemption, and next redeemed Israel is consecrated to the service of its Lord, who meets his people, delivers his law of life to them, and instructs them to set up his tabernacle in the midst of them. The book of Leviticus contains scarcely any history, and is occupied with the rules for the service of God in this tabernacle: it is the code for the spiritual life of Israel as the congregation of the Lord code published almost at once, and in a form substantially complete. The fourth book, that of Numbers, resumes the thread of the history, and conducts the redeemed and consecrated and organized host from Mount Sinai through the wilderness to the Land of Promise; including further legislation, of which they stood in need if they were to take a suitable place among the kingdoms of the world.

(2.) Yet obviously this book is not a dry series of annals, in which the chronological order is alone observable; still less is it the mere leaves of a journal in which the narrative of the three middle books was written down at the dates of the several occurrences, and left unchanged in all time coming. Whatever may have been written down in the form of a journal at the first (of which we have possibly an instance in Numbers 33), would be revised, extended, abbreviated, and rearranged by the author, ere it came from his hands a finished history. Therefore we find a systematic order, according to the internal or logical connection of the parts, even in the purely narrative portions. Thus Genesis 38 furnishes the account of transactions in the family of Judah which cannot but have stretched over a long course of time, of years apparently, including the greater part of the time that Joseph was alone in Egypt, and which very probably extended back to a date considerably earlier than that at which his captivity began: the entire series of events, however, being recorded in this one chapter, with a twofold advantage — that of being itself more distinctly set before us, and that of not interrupting the thread of Joseph's history in Egypt. Sometimes indeed we may be unable to determine whether the order in which events are narrated is the order of time or that of logical sequence; an uncertainty which meets us in other portions of sacred history, as well as outside of the Bible. But it is not surprising that this logical order predominates in the legislation; though even here the chronological order is by no means uncommon, because the laws sprang, to a considerable extent, out of the circumstances in which the people were placed from time to time. This peculiarity has given rise to repetitions, enlargements, rearrangements, and even in a limited degree to modifications, of earlier enactments, of which we have an instructive example in the varied order in  which the parts of the tabernacle and its furniture are mentioned, first in the directions given to Moses in the mount, and, secondly, in the narrative of its actual construction.

(3.) A third principle of arrangement is the rhetorical, of which the instances are fewer. Indeed it is very much confined to Deuteronomy, in which Moses appears as the great prophet of Israel. It was a corollary from the plan of these discourses that Moses should present the topics in the form likeliest to tell upon the audience to whom he was giving a parting address; that he should group incidents and laws according to certain affinities or contrasts for the purpose of effect; that he should pass over some subjects in entire silence, should touch upon others lightly, and on another class still should enlarge at some length; and that he should often present them under peculiar aspects, in forms somewhat different from those in which we should have seen them if we had known them only from the earlier books. Yet such variety, subordinate in its amount, and existing for a special purpose, is in reality an additional proof of the unity of the Pentateuch, and of the comprehensiveness of the plan on which it has been written.

IV. Authority and Date of Composition. — This is preeminently the subject which calls for discussion here, as it has been largely disputed. The reply we give is the old and common one, namely, by Moses, during the wandering in the wilderness. We shall endeavor to state plainly and fairly the views and reasons both for and against it.

1. History of the Controversy. —

(1.) Adverse Writers. — At different times suspicions have been entertained that the Pentateuch as we now have it is not the Pentateuch of the earliest age, and that the work must have undergone various modifications and additions before it assumed its present shape.

So early as the 2d century we find the author of the Clementine Homilies calling in question the authenticity of the Mosaic writings. According to him the Law was only given orally by Moses to the seventy elders, and not consigned to writing till after his death; it subsequently underwent many changes, was corrupted more and more by means of the false prophets, and was especially filled with erroneous anthropomorphic conceptions of God, and unworthy representations of the characters of the patriarchs (Hom. 2:38, 43; 3:4, 47; Neander. Gnost. Systeme, p. 380). A statement of this  kind, unsupported, and coming from a heretical, and therefore suspicious source, may seem of little moment; it is however remarkable, so far as it indicates an early tendency to cast off the received traditions respecting the books of Scripture; while at the same time it is evident that this was done cautiously, because such an opinion respecting the Pentateuch was said to be for the advanced Christian only, and not for the simple and unlearned.

Jerome, there can be little doubt, had seen some difficulty in supposing the Pentateuch to be altogether, in its present form, the work of Moses; for he observes (contra Helvid.): “Sive Mosen dicere volueris auctorem Pentateuchi sive Esram ejusdem instauratorem operis,” with reference apparently to the Jewish tradition on the subject. Aben-Ezra († 1167), in his Comment. on Deu 1:1, threw out some doubts as to the Mosaic authorship of certain passages, such as Gen 12:6; Deu 3:10-11; Deu 31:9, which he either explained as later interpolations, or left as mysteries which it was beyond his power to unravel. But for centuries the Pentateuch was generally received in the Church without question as written by Moses. In the year 1651, however, we find Hobbes writing: “Videtur Pentateuchus potius de Mose quam a Mose scriptus” (Leviathan, c. 33). Spinoza (Tract. Theol.-Polit. c. 8, 9, published in 1679) set himself boldly to controvert the received authorship of the Pentateuch. He alleged against it (1) later names of places, as Gen 14:14 comp. with Jdg 18:29; (2) the continuation of the history beyond the days of Moses, Exo 16:35 comp. with Jos 5:12; (3) the statement in Gen 36:31, “before there reigned any king over the children of Israel.” Spinoza maintained that Moses issued his commands to the elders, that by them they were written down and communicated to the people, and that later they were collected and assigned to suitable passages in Moses's life. He considered that the Pentateuch was indebted to Ezra for the form in which it now appears. Other writers began to think that the book of Genesis was composed of written documents earlier than the time of Moses. So Vitringa (Observ. Sacr. 1:3), Le Clerc (De Script. Pentateuchi, § 11), and R. Simon (Hist. critique du V. T. lib. i, c. 7, Rotterdam, 1685).

According to the last of these writers, Genesis was composed of earlier documents, the laws of the Pentateuch were the work of Moses, and the greater portion of the history was written by the public scribe who is mentioned in the book. Le Clerc supposed that the priest who, according to 2Ki 17:27, was sent to instruct the Samaritan colonists, was the author of the Pentateuch.  It was not till the middle of the last century, however, that the question as to the authorship of the Pentateuch was handled with anything like a bold criticism. The first attempt was made by a layman, whose studies we might have supposed would scarcely have led him to such an investigation. In the year 1753 there appeared at Brussels a work entitled Conjectures sur les memoires originaux, dont ii paroit que Moyse s'est servi pour composer le livre de Genese. It was written in his 69th year by Astruc, doctor and professor of medicine in the Royal College at Paris, and court physician to Louis XIV. His critical eye had observed that throughout the book of Genesis, and as far as the 6th chapter of Exodus, traces were to be found of two original documents, each characterized by a distinct use of the names of God; the one by the name Elohim, and the other by the name Jehovah. Besides these two principal documents, he supposed Moses to have made use of ten others in the composition of the earlier part of his work. Astruc was followed by several German writers on the path which he had traced; by Jerusalem, in his Letters on the Mosaic Writings and Philosophy; by Schultens, in his Dissertatio qua disquiritur, unde Moses res in libro Geneseos descriptas didicerit; and with considerable learning and critical acumen by Ilgen ( Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs, 1er Theil, Halle, 1798) and Eichhorn (Einleitulng in d. A. T.).

But this “documentary hypothesis,” as it is called, was too conservative and too rational for some critics. Vater, in his Commentar uber den Pentateuch (1815), and A. T. Hartmann. in his Linguist. Einl. in d. Stud. der Buicher des A. Test. (1818), maintained that the Pentateuch consisted merely of a number of fragments loosely strung together without order or design. The former supposed a collection of laws, made in the times of David and Solomon, to have been the foundation of the whole: that this was the book discovered in the reign of Josiah, and that its fragments were afterwards incorporated in Deuteronomy. All the rest, consisting of fragments of history and of laws written at different periods up to this time, were, according to him, collected and shaped into their present form between the times of Josiah and the Babylonian exile. Hartmann also brings down the date of the existing Pentateuch as late as the exile. This has been called the “fragmentary hypothesis.” Both of these have now been superseded by the “supplementary hypothesis,” which has been adopted with various modifications by De Wette, Bleek, Stahelin, Tuch, Lengerke, Hupfeld, Knobel, Bunsen, Kurtz, Delitzsch, Schultz, Vaihinger, and others.  They all alike recognize two documents in the Pentateuch. They suppose the narrative of the Elohlst, the more ancient writer, to have been the foundation of the work, and that the Jehovist, or later writer, making use of this document, added to and commented upon it, sometimes transcribing portions of it intact, and sometimes incorporating the substance of it into his own work.

Yet though thus agreeing in the main, they differ widely in the application of the theory. Thus, for instance, De Wette distinguishes between the Elohist and the Jehovist in the first four books, and attributes Deuteronomy to a different writer altogether (Einl. ins A. T. § 150 sq.). So also Lengerke, though with some differences of detail in the portions he assigns to the two editors. The last places the Elohist in the time of Solomon, and the Jehovistic editor in that of Hezekiah; whereas Tuch puts the first under Saul, and the second under Solomon. Stahelin, on the other hand, declares for the identity of the Deuteronomist and the Jehovist, and supposes the last to have written in the reign of Saul, and the Elohist in the time of the Judges. Hupfeld (Die Quellen der Genesis) finds, in Genesis at least, traces of three authors, an earlier and a later Elohist, as well as the Jehovist. He is peculiar in regarding the Jehovistic portion as an altogether original document, written in entire independence, and without the knowledge even of the Elohistic record. A later editor or compiler, he thinks, found the two books, and threw them into one. Vaihinger (in Herzog's Encyklopadie) is also of opinion that portions of three original documents are to be found in the first four books, to which he adds some fragments of the 32d and 34th chanters of Deuteronomy. The fifth book, according to him, is by a different and much later writer. The pre-Elohist he supposes to have flourished about 1200 B.C., the Elohist some 200 years later, the Jehovist in the first half of the 8th century B.C., and the Deuteronomist in the reign of Hezekiah.

Delitzsch agrees with the writers above mentioned in recognising two distinct documents as the basis of the Pentateuch, especially in its earlier portions; but he entirely severs himself from them in maintaining that Deuteronomy is the work of Moses. His theory is this: the kernel or first foundation of the Pentateuch is to be found in the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19-24), which was written by Moses himself, and afterwards incorporated into the body of the Pentateuch, where it at present stands. The rest of the laws given in the wilderness, till the people reached the plains of Ioab, were communicated orally by Moses and taken down by the  priests, whose business it was thus to provide for their preservation (Deu 17:11, comp. 24:8; 33:10; Lev 10:11, comp. 15:31). Inasmuch as Deuteronomy does not pre-suppose the existence in writing of the entire earlier legislation, but on the contrary recapitulates it with the greatest freedom, we are not obliged to assume that the proper codification of the law took place during the forty years' wandering in the desert. This was done, however, shortly after the occupation of the land of Canaan. On that sacred soil was the first definite portion of the history of Israel written; and the writing of the history itself necessitated a full and complete account of the Mosaic legislation. A man, such as Eleazar the son of Aaron, the priest (see Num 26:1; Num 31:21), wrote the great work beginning with the first words of Genesis, including in it the Book of the Covenant, and perhaps gave only a short notice of the last discourses of Moses, because Moses had written them down with his own hand. A second — who may have been Joshua (see especially Deu 32:44; Jos 24:26; and comp. on the other hand 1Sa 10:25), who was a prophet, and spake as a prophet, or one of the elders on whom Moses's spirit rested (Num 11:25), and many of whom survived Joshua (Jos 24:31) — completed the work, taking Deuteronomy, which Moses had written, for his model, and incorporating it into his own book. Somewhat in this manner arose the Torah (or Pentateuch), each narrator further availing himself when he thought proper of other written documents.

Such is the theory of Delitzsch, which is in many respects worthy of consideration, and which has been adopted in the main by Kurtz (Gesch. d. A. B. i, § 20, and ii, § 99, 6), who formerly was opposed to the theory of different documents, and sided rather with Hengstenberg and the critics of the extreme conservative school. There is this difference, however, that Kurtz objects to the view that Deuteronomy existed before the other books, and believes that the rest of the Pentateuch was committed to writing before, not after, the occupation of the Holy Land. Finally, Schultz, in his recent work on Deuteronomy, recognises two original documents in the Pentateuch, the Elohistic being the base and groundwork of the whole, but contends that the Jehovistic portions of the first four books, as well as Deuteronomy, except the concluding portion, were written by Moses. Thus he agrees with Delitzsch and Kurtz in admitting two documents and the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy, and with Stahelin in identifying the Deuteronomist with the Jehovist.  One other theory has, however, to be stated before we pass on. The author of it stands quite alone, and it is not likely that he will ever find any disciple bold enough to adopt his theory: even his great admirer Bunsen forsakes him here. But it is due to Ewald's great and deserved reputation as a scholar, and to his uncommon critical sagacity, briefly to state what that theory is. He distinguishes, then, seven different authors in the great Book of Origins or Primitive History (comprising the Pentateuch and Joshua). The oldest historical work, of which but a very few fragments remain, is the Book of the Wars of Jehovah. Then follows a biography of Moses, of which also but small portions have been preserved. The third and fourth documents are much more perfect: these consist of the Book of the Covenant, which was written in the time of Samson, and the Book of Origins, which was written by a priest in the time of Solomon. Then comes, in the fifth place, the third historian of the primitive times, or the first prophetic narrator, a subject of the northern kingdom in the days of Elijah or Joel. The sixth document is the work of the fourth historian of primitive times, or the second prophetic narrator, who lived between 800 and 750. Lastly comes the fifth historian, or third prophetic narrator, who flourished not long after Joel, and who collected and reduced into one corpus the various works of his predecessors. The real purposes of the history, both in its prophetical and its legal aspects, began now to be discerned. Some steps were taken in this direction by an unknown writer at the beginning of the 7th century B.C.; and then in a far more comprehensive manner by the Deuteronomist, who flourished in the time of Manasseh, and lived in Egypt. In the time of Jeremiah appeared the poet who wrote the Blessing of Moses, as it is given in Deuteronomy. A somewhat later editor incorporated the originally independent work of the Deuteronomist, and the lesser additions of his two colleagues, with the history as left by the fifth narrator, and thus the whole was finally completed. “Such,” says Ewald (and his words, seriously meant, read like delicate irony), “were the strange fortunes which this great work underwent before it reached its present form.”

(2.) Writers in favor of the Mosaic Authorship of the Pentateuch. — On the other side, however, stands an array of names certainly not less distinguished for learning, who maintain not only that there is a unity of design in the Pentateuch — which is granted by many of those before mentioned-but who contend that this unity of design can only be explained on the supposition of a single author, and that this author could have been  none other than Moses. This is the ground taken by Hengstenberg, Havernick, Drechsler, Ranke, Welte, and Keil. The first mentioned of these writers has no doubt done admirable service in reconciling and removing very many of the alleged discrepancies and contradictions in the Pentateuch: but his zeal carries him in some instances to attempt a defense, the very ingenuity of which betrays how unsatisfactory it is; and his effort to explain the use of the divine names, by showing that the writer had a special design in the use of the one or the other, is often in the last degree arbitrary. Drechsler, in his work on the Unity and Genuineness of Genesis (1838), fares no better, though his remarks are the more valuable because in many cases they coincide, quite independently, with those of Hengstenberg. Later, however, Drechsler modified his view, and supposed that the several uses of the divine names were owing to a didactic purpose on the part of the writer, according as his object was to show a particular relation of God to the world, whether as Elohim or as Jehovah. Hence he argued that, while different streams flowed through the Pentateuch, they were not from two different fountain-heads, but varied according to the motive which influenced the writer, and according to the fundamental thought in particular sections; and on this ground, too, he explained the characteristic phraseology which distinguishes such sections. Ranke's work (Untersuchungen uber den Pentateuch) is a valuable contribution to the exegesis of the Pentateuch. He is especially successful in establishing the inward unity of the work, and in showing how inseparably the several portions, legal, genealogical, and historical, are interwoven together. Kurtz (in his Einheit der Genesis [1846], and in the first edition of his first volume of the Geschichte des Alten Bundes) followed on the same side; but he has since abandoned the attempt to explain the use of the divine names. on the principle of the different meanings which they bear, and has espoused the theory of two distinct documents. Keil, also, though he does not despair of the solution of the problem, confesses (Luther. Zeitschr. [1851-2] p. 235) that “all attempts as yet made, notwithstanding the acumen which has been brought to bear to explain the interchange of the divine names in Genesis on the ground of the different meanings which they possess, must be pronounced a failure.” Ebrard (Das Alter des Jehova-Namens) and Tiele (Stud. und Krit. 1852-1) make nearly the same admission. It is not fair, however, to require the advocates of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch to explain positively the reasons which impelled him to the peculiar use of these names. The causes of such a selection are often inscrutable, even to the writer himself. A sufficient  reason is perhaps given in the supposition that Moses made use of documents written by different persons which contained those peculiarities. The want of uniformity observable in the same section in this respect shows that it is due to a twofold influence. It must be borne in mind that this peculiar distinction in the use of the sacred names is mostly confined to the book of Genesis (q.v.).

2. Direct Testimony of the Book to its own A uthorship and Date of Composition. —

(1.) Of this character is Exo 17:14, “And the Lord said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua; for I will utterly put out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven:” a statement which becomes the more pointed if we read, as we have little hesitation in doing, not “in a book,” but “in the book” (בִּסֵּפֶר). This passage shows that the account to be inserted was intended to form a portion of a more extensive work, with which the reader is supposed to be acquainted. It also proves that Moses, at an early period of his public career, was filled with the idea of leaving to his people a written memorial of the divine guidance, and that he fully understood the close and necessary connection of an authoritative law with a written code, or זכרון. At any rate, the direct testimony to the fact that particular passages were written by Moses is of vast importance as a presumption that other passages were written by him also, although the contrary assertion has often been put forward: nay, many passages may be inferred a fortiori to have come from his pen. Or, where the inference might be unsafe, as in the instance now given, it is because of the extraordinary emphasis of the testimony in such a passage; not merely that the doom of Amalek was written by Moses in the book of the Lord for Israel, but also its being so expressly recorded that it was written. See also Exo 24:4-7; Num 33:1-2; Deu 17:18-19 (a remarkable passage); 28-30, which repeatedly mention the written blessings and curses; Deu 27:1-13, a command to “write all the words of this law” on plastered stones, preparatory to the solemn reading of the blessings and the curses beside the altar which was to be erected when the people took possession of the center of the Promised Land (comp. the account of the fulfillment, Jos 8:30-35). The most remarkable passage, however, is at Deu 31:9 : “And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it to the priests the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord,  and unto all the elders of Israel,” and charged these ecclesiastical and civil heads of the community to read it to the assembled congregation of Israel during the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles, on the occasion when it was most largely attended in the seventh year, the year of rest. Further (Deu 31:24-27): “And it came to pass when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it in [or rather at] the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God; that it may be there for a witness against thee. For I know thy rebellion and thy stiff neck: behold, while I am yet alive with you this day, ye have been rebellious against the Lord; and how much more after my death?” It has often been said that no assertion could be more explicit, or made in more solemn circumstances, or with additions more calculated for discovering and demonstrating its falsehood unless the truth had been notorious. With this mass of evidence we must connect the warnings against adding to what Moses commanded, or taking from it (Deu 4:2; Deu 12:32); the circumstantial statement as to the discourses being addressed by Moses to the people (Deu 1:1-5); and along with these opening words of Deuteronomy, the closing words of Numbers (Num 36:13), as also the last words of Leviticus (Lev 27:34; also 25:1; 26:46). If all these statements are not to be set aside as an idle dream or a tissue of deliberate falsehoods, the very least which can be inferred from them is that the Pentateuch (at all events the part of it from the time when the people came to covenant with God at Mount Sinai) is from one writer; that the divine legislation was in the first place given from that mount, the substance or essence of which was concluded in the book of Leviticus; that there were appendices to this, recorded in the book of Numbers, on to the time when Israel stood upon the eastern bank of the Jordan, ready to cross over upon Jericho; and that there was a very solemn renewal of the covenant on the part of the generation which had grown up in the wilderness, to whom, in the book of Deuteronomy, Moses repeated much of the legislation and addressed his parting counsels. It may be made a question whether the hand of a later writer, who finished the Pentateuch, is perceptible from Deu 31:24 (comp. Deu 33:1, and ch. 34), or whether the words in Deu 31:24-30 are still the words of Moses.

In the former case we have two witnesses, viz. Moses himself, and the continuator of the Pentateuch; in the latter case, which seems to us the more likely, we have the testimony of Moses alone.  It is true that the above passages do not define the limits of the book, nor prove its absolute identity with the existing copies of the Pentateuch. But other evidences will be found to supply this proof. We have already the fact that a book was written by Moses under the immediate authority of God, and that this book was intended to be of perpetual obligation. Now, supposing that the scriptural testimony of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch had ended here, although we shall see this is not the case, yet, even so, no moral doubt could exist that this design was carried into effect, and that the books thus preserved were substantially identical with those which have come down to us. For at this period the Jewish people suddenly take their place amid the settled nations of the world, and enter upon that grand and mysterious national life which has continued till our own day. It will not be denied by any that this race was distinguished from all others by many peculiar characteristics. Some of their national habits exhibited affinity in various points of detail with the surrounding polytheism amid which they dwelt; but their whole system was sharply separated, alike by the grandeur of its religious monotheism and by its complex social and civil organization, from that of all other nations. Their code of laws was penetrating enough to affix its indelible peculiarities on the race who lived under them, and to endow it with a force and elevation, a perpetuity of national life, and a world-wide influence, to which no parallel can be found in history, Such an effect would itself prove the existence of a cause as permanent as itself, for the precise ritual and ceremonial enactments of the system could never have been maintained without an authorized code of directions. When we inquire into the nature of that peculiar polity to which it is to be attributed, we find it in the books of Moses. The Pentateuch contains a system which explains the national life of the Jewish race, and which, in its turn, is equally explained by it. As we know, on the one side, that the Pentateuch was reduced by Moses to a written form, and, on the other side, that the phenomena of national Jewish life can only be explained by the influence of a positive written code, it is impossible not to put the two facts together, and identify the Mosaic books of the law with the code of subsequent times. In other words, the permanence of the effect proves the permanence of the cause. The subsequent history of the Jewish race would have sufficed to prove that the Mosaic code must have existed in a permanent form from that period till the present, even if no positive external proofs of the fact had existed.  From the passages adduced above it is apparent, indeed, that the most numerous and direct testimonies occur in Deuteronomy; and the opinion has had learned advocates that these testimonies are to be restricted to this one book, which is therefore admitted to be from the pen of Moses, whereas it is alleged that there is no clear evidence as to the authorship of the other four. But he who takes up this position in good faith is likely soon to discover that Deuteronomy presupposes the existence of the others, and the general knowledge of their contents, by its incidental reference to subjects which are intelligible only when we turn to the fuller accounts given in these books: for example, the dispersion and settlement of the nations by the hand of God; the call of Abraham, that in his seed the families of the earth might be blessed; the patriarchal history generally, and the result of it, the sojourn of the children of Israel in Egypt; the destruction of Sodom and the neighboring cities; the relationship of the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites to Israel; the laws in reference to leprosy; the entire rules for the sacrificial services; the consecration of Aaron's family, and of the whole tribe of Levi in a wider sense, to these services; and the method of their support; and the laws on the subject of murder and manslaughter. Besides, the age of generalizations, such as we find in Deuteronomy, must be preceded by the age of particular enactments. Hence there are scarcely any who have intelligently believed that Deuteronomy is the work of Moses, who have not come to feel the necessity of acknowledging him to be (substantially at least) the author of the entire Pentateuch.

(2.) Pressed by these arguments, some of the sceptical critics have resorted to the opposite conclusion that the book of Deuteronomy itself, in which these striking testimonies are so largely found, is likewise not the production of Moses. It is of importance therefore to consider this question separately.

All allow that the Book of the Covenant in Exodus, perhaps a great part of Leviticus, and some part of Numbers were written by Israel's greatest leader and prophet. But Deuteronomy, it is alleged, is in style and purpose so utterly unlike the genuine writings of Moses that it is quite impossible to believe that he is the author. But how, then, set aside the express testimony of the book itself? How explain the fact that Moses is there said to have written all the words of this law, to have consigned it to the custody of the priests, and to have charged the Levites sedulously to preserve it by the side of the ark? Only by the bold assertion that the fiction was invented by  a later writer, who chose to personate the great Lawgiver in order to give the more color of consistency to his work! The author first feigns the name of Moses that he may gain the greater consideration under the shadow of his name, and then proceeds to re-enact, but in a broader and more spiritual manner, and with true prophetic inspiration, the chief portions of the earlier legislation. But such a hypothesis is devoid of all probability. For what writer in later times would ever have presumed, unless he were equal to Moses, to correct or supplement the Law of Moses? And if he were equal to Moses, why borrow his name (as Ewald supposes the Deuteronomist to have done) in order to lend greater weight and sanction to his book? The truth is, those who make such a supposition import modern ideas into ancient writings. They forget that what might be allowable in a modern writer of fiction would not have been tolerated in one who claimed to have a divine commission, who came forward as a prophet to rebuke and to reform the people. Which would be more weighty to win their obedience, “Thus saith Jehovah,” or “Moses wrote all these words?” It has been argued indeed that in thus assuming a feigned character the writer does no more than is done by the author of Ecclesiastes. He in like manner takes the name of Solomon that he may gain a better hearing for his words of wisdom. But the cases are not parallel. The Preacher only pretends to give an old man's view of life, as seen by one who had had a large experience and no common reputation for wisdom. Deuteronomy claims to be a law imposed on the highest authority, and demanding implicit obedience. The first is a record of the struggles, disappointments, and victory of a human heart. The last is an absolute rule of life, to which nothing may be added, and from which nothing may be taken (Deu 4:2; Deu 31:1).

But, besides the fact that Deuteronomy claims to have been written by Moses, there is other evidence which establishes the great antiquity of the book.

(a) It is remarkable for its allusions to Egypt, which are just what would be expected supposing Moses to have been the author. It is a significant fact that Ewald, who will have it that Deuteronomy was written in the reign of Manasseh, is obliged to make his supposed author live in Egypt, in order to account plausibly for the acquaintance with Egyptian customs which is discernible in the book. Without insisting upon it that in such passages as Deu 4:15-18, or Deu 6:8, and Deu 11:18-20 (comp. Exo 13:16), where the command is given to wear the law after the fashion of an amulet,  or Deu 27:1-8, where writing on stones covered with plaster is mentioned, are probable references to Egyptian customs, we may point to more certain examples. In Deu 20:5 there is an allusion to Egyptian regulations in time of war; in Deu 25:2, to the Egyptian bastinado; in Deu 11:10, to the Egyptian mode of irrigation. The references which Delitzsch sees in Deu 22:5 to the custom of the Egyptian priests to hold solemn processions in the masks of different deities, and in Deu 8:9 to Egyptian mining operations, are by no means so certain. Again, among the curses threatened are the sicknesses of Egypt (Deu 28:60; comp. Deu 7:15). According to Deu 28:68, Egypt is the type of all the oppressors of Israel: “Remember that thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt,” is an expression which is several times made use of as a motive in enforcing the obligations of the book (Deu 5:15; Deu 24:18; Deu 24:22; see the same appeal in Lev 19:34, a passage occurring in the remarkable section Leviticus 17-20, which has so much affinity with Deuteronomy). Lastly, references to the sojourning in Egypt are numerous: “We were Pharaoh's bondmen in Egypt,” etc. (Lev 6:21-23; see also Lev 7:8; Lev 7:18; Lev 11:3); and these occur even in the laws, as in the law of the king (Lev 17:16), which would be very extraordinary if the book had only been written in the time of Manasseh.

(b) The phraseology of the book, and the archaisms found in it, stamp it as of the same age with the rest of the Pentateuch. The form הוא, instead of היא, for the feminine of the pronoun (which occurs in all 195 times in the Pentateuch), is found thirty-six times in Deuteronomy. Nowhere do we meet with היאin this book, though in the rest of the Pentateuch it occurs eleven times. In the same way, like the other books, Deuteronomy has נִעִר of a maiden, instead of the feminine נִעֲרָה, which is only used once (Deu 22:19). It has also the third pers. pret. חִי, which in prose occurs only in the Pentateuch (Ewald, Lehrbuch, § 142 b). The demonstrative pronoun הָאֵל (which, according to Ewald, § 183 a, is characteristic of the Pentateuch) occurs in Deu 4:42; Deu 7:22; Deu 19:11, and nowhere else out of the books of Moses, except in the late book, 1Ch 20:8, and the Aramaic Ezr 5:15. The use of the ה locale, which is comparatively rare in later writings, is common to Deuteronomy with the other books of the Pentateuch; and so is the old and rare form of writing תַּמְצֶאן, and the termination of the future in אּיּן. The last, according to  Konig (A.-T. Stud. 2 Heft), is more common in the Pentateuch than in any other book: it occurs fifty-eight times in Deuteronomy. Twice even in the preterite (Deu 8:3; Deu 8:16) a like termination presents itself; on the peculiarity of which Ewald (§ 190 b, note) remarks, as being the original and fuller form. Other archaisms which are common to the whole five books are: the shortening of the Hiphil, לִרְאֹת, 33; לִעְשֵׁר, Deu 26:12, etc.; the use of קרה קרא, “to meet;” the construction of the passive with אֵה of the object (for instance, Deu 20:8); the interchange of the older כֶּשֶׂב (Deu 14:4) with the more usual כֶּבֶשׂ; the use of זָכוּר. (instead of זָכָר), Deu 16:16; Deu 20:13, a form which disappears altogether after the Pentateuch; many ancient words, such as שְׁגִר יְקוּם אָבַיב (שֶׁגֶי, Exo 13:12). Among these are some which occur besides only in the book of Joshua, or else in very late writers, like Ezekiel, who, as is always the case in the decay of a language, studiously imitated the oldest forms; some which are found afterwards only in poetry, as אֲלָפַים (Eze 7:13; Eze 28:4, etc.) and מְתַים, so common in Deuteronomy. Again, this book has a number of words which have an archaic character. Such are, חֶרְמֵשׁ(for the later מִגָּל), טֶנֶא(instead of סִל); the old Canaanitish הִצּאֹן עִשְׁתְּרוֹת, “offspring of the flocks;” יְשֻׁרוּן, which as a name of Israel is borrowed, Isa 44:2; הֵהַין (Deu 1:41), “to act rashly,” הִסְכַּית, “to be silent;” הֶעֵַניק, (Deu 15:14), “to give,” lit. “to put like a collar on the neck;” הַתְעִמֵּר, “to play the lord;” מִדְוֶה, “sickness.”

(c) A fondness for the use of figures is another peculiarity of Deuteronomy. See Deu 29:17. Deuteronomy 18; Deu 28:13; Deu 28:44; Deu 1:31; Deu 1:44; Deu 8:5; Deu 28:29; Deu 28:49. Of similar comparisons there are but few (Delitzsch says but three) in the other books. The results are most surprising when we compare Deuteronomy with the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19-24) on the one hand, and with Psalms 90 (which is said to be Mosaic) on the other. To cite but one example: the images of devouring fire and of the bearing on eagles' wings occur only in the Book of the Covenant and in Deuteronomy. Comp. Exo 24:17 with Deu 4:24; Deu 9:3; and Exo 19:4 with Deu 22:11. So again, not to mention numberless undesigned coincidences between Psalms 90 and the book of Deuteronomy, especially chap. 32, we need only here cite the phrase מִעֲשֵׂה יָדִיַם (Psalms 90, 17), “work of the hands,” as descriptive of human action generally,  which runs through the whole of Deu 2:7; Deu 14:29; Deu 16:15; Deu 24:19; Deu 28:12; Deu 30:9. The same close affinity, both as to matter and style, exists between the section to which we have already referred in Leviticus (chap. 17-20, so manifestly different from the rest of that book), the Book of the Covenant (Exodus 19-24), and Deuteronomy.

(d) In addition to all this, and very much more might be said — for a whole harvest has been gleaned on this field by Schultz in the Introduction to his work on Deuteronomy — in addition to all these peculiarities which are arguments for the Mosaic authorship of the book, we have here, too, the evidence strong and clear from post-Mosaic times and writings. The attempt, by a wrong interpretation of 2 Kings 22 and 2 Chronicles 34, to bring down Deuteronomy as low as the time of Manasseh fails utterly. A century earlier the Jewish prophets borrow their words and their thoughts from Deuteronomy. Amos shows how intimate his acquaintance was with Deuteronomy by such passages as Deu 2:9; Deu 4:11; Deu 9:7, whose matter and form are both colored by those of that book. Hosea, who is richer than Amos in these references to the past, while full of allusions to the whole law (Hos 6:7; Hos 12:4, etc.; Hos 13:9-10), in one passage (Hos 8:12) using the remarkable expression, “I have written to him the ten thousand things of my law,” manifestly includes Deuteronomy (comp. 11:8 with Deu 29:22), and in many places shows that that book was in his mind. Comp. 4:13 with Deu 12:2; Deu 8:13 with Deu 28:68; Deu 11:3 with Deu 1:31; Deu 13:6 with Deu 8:11-14. Isaiah begins his prophecy with the words, “Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth,” taken from the mouth of Moses in Deu 32:1. In fact, echoes of the tones of Deuteronomy are heard throughout the solemn and majestic discourse with which his prophecy opens. (See Caspari, Beitr age zur Eninl. in d. Buch Jesaia, p. 203-210., The same may be said of Micah. In his protest against the apostasy of the nation from the covenant with Jehovah, he appeals to the mountains as the sure foundations of the earth, in like manner as Moses (Deu 32:1) to the heavens and the earth. The controversy of Jehovah with his people (Mic 6:3-5) is a compendium, as it were, of the history of the Pentateuch from Exodus onwards, while the expression עֲבָדַים בֵּית, “slave-house” of Egypt, is taken from Deu 7:8; Deu 13:5. In 6:8 there is no doubt an allusion to Deu 10:12, and the threatenings of 6:13-16 remind us of Deuteronomy 28 as well as of Leviticus 26. Since, then, not only Jeremiah  and Ezekiel, but Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah speak in the words of Deuteronomy, as well as in words borrowed from other portions of the Pentateuch, we see at once how untenable is the theory of those who, like Ewald, maintain that Deuteronomy was composed during the reign of Manasseh, or, as Vaihinger does, during that of Hezekiah.

(e) But, in truth, the book speaks for itself. No imitator could have written in such a strain. We scarcely need the express testimony of the work to its own authorship. But, having it, we find all the internal evidence conspiring to show that it came from Moses. Those magnificent discourses, the grand roll of which can be heard and felt even in a translation, came warm from the heart and fresh from the lips of Israel's lawgiver. They are the outpourings of a solicitude which is nothing less than parental. It is the father uttering his dying advice to his children, no less than the prophet counseling and admonishing his people. What book can vie with it either in majesty or in tenderness? What words ever bore more surely the stamp of genuineness? If Deuteronomy be only the production of some timorous reformer, who, conscious of his own weakness, tried to borrow dignity and weight from the name of Moses, then assuredly all arguments drawn from internal evidence for the composition of any work are utterly useless. We can never tell whether an author is wearing the mask of another, or whether it is he himself who speaks to us. In spite, therefore, of the dogmatism of modern critics, we declare unhesitatingly for the Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. SEE DEUTERONOMY.

3. Testimony of other Witnesses to the Author. —

(1.) Our Lord and his Apostles. — Their language is such that the hypothesis of the Pentateuch not being the work of Moses must create a very painful feeling in the mind of every true and simple-hearted follower of Christ. Comp. Mat 15:1-9 and Mar 7:1-13, where the fifth commandment and the law which sentenced to death the man who cursed his parents are ascribed indifferently to God and to Moses, and are put in opposition to the commandments of men which had grown up by a course of traditions. In Mat 22:24 we read of the Sadducees attempting to puzzle our Lord about the resurrection: “Master, Moses said,” etc., or as it is in Mark and Luke, “Moses wrote unto us,” referring to the law in Deu 25:5-10. Jesus answered them, “Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God... But as touching the resurrection of the dead. have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God,  saying,” etc.; or as in Mark, “Have ye not read in the book of Moses;” or as in Luke, “That the dead are raised, even Moses showed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord,” etc.; all three quoting from Exo 3:6. Again, in Mat 19:4-5, in answer to the Pharisees who tempted him on the subject of divorce, our Lord said to them, “Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female, and said,” etc., quoting Gen 2:24. Upon this they asked him, “Why did Moses then commanded to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?” referring to Deu 24:1. He replied, “Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives.” The language is not less distinct in the parallel passage (Mar 10:2-9). There is also the testimony of the risen Savior to the written law of Moses as distinguished from the other Scriptures, namely, the Prophets and the Psalms (Luk 24:27; Luk 24:44-45). Without insisting on others of less distinctness (such as Luk 2:23-24; Joh 8:17; Act 7:37; Act 7:44; Act 15:21; Rom 10:5; Rom 10:19; 1Co 9:9; Heb 8:5), we ask particular attention to two statements by our Lord. In Luk 16:29; Luk 16:31, “They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. .... If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead.” Without even the slight intervention of a parable, our Lord said (Joh 5:46-47), “Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words? “In illustration of our Lord's argument, and as a last testimony to Moses by the apostles, we quote the confession of Paul to king Agrippa (Act 26:22), “Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this (lay, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come;” and his earlier confession to Felix (24:14), “After the manner which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets.” These two statements by Paul make it plain that what he meant by the writings of Moses was the written law as received among the Jews of his day, and not any shorter work, such as critics have imagined to be the genuine work of Moses and the germ which expanded into our present Pentateuch; a hypothesis which is also contradicted by the fact that the quotations of our Lord and his apostles are as freely made from the portions which the critics ascribe with greatest confidence to later writers as from the other portions which they concede to be more ancient.  In reference to these testimonies we observe,

(a) the habitual reply has indeed been that it was not the business of our Lord and his apostles to teach Biblical criticism. But the rejoinder of Witsius is as satisfactory as ever, though the precise matter in debate has somewhat shifted since his time. “Certainly Christ and his apostles were not teachers of criticism, such as those men demand that they themselves shall be considered, who at the present day claim as their own the realm of literature in every branch of knowledge whatsoever: yet they were teachers of the truth, and they did not permit themselves to be imposed upon by the ignorance of the masses or by the astuteness of the ruling class. They certainly did not come into the world to foster vulgar errors and to protect them by their authority, and to spread them, not among the Jews alone, but also far and wide among the nations who depended exclusively upon them.”

(b) A fairer reply has been that the name “the law of Moses,” or the expression “Moses wrote,” etc., implies no more than “the psalms of David,” “David said,” etc.; and that if the latter class of phrases may be used without affirming the entire psalter to be David's own composition, or without decisively attributing to David the particular psalm which is quoted, we are justified in taking the former class of phrases equally in an indeterminate sense. It is probably in this way that a man's mind most readily finds relief when critical objections disturb his faith in the composition of the Pentateuch by Moses. and at the same time he holds fast his faith in Scripture as a whole; and it is well that there are such halting-places where one may rest in a downward course, and from which he may start in the hope of recovering himself. But we cannot concede that the phrases are really parallel. Were there no other difference, there is plainly a broad distinction between a collection of devotional poetry, which may be partly or wholly anonymous without injury to its character and usefulness, and the authoritative history of the commencement of Israel's national existence, of its covenant relation to God, and of its constitution and laws as a state; for this is a document whose value is intimately connected with the age and circumstances of its author.

(2.) The Rest of the Old-Testament Scriptures. — These were in existence centuries before these testimonies of Jesus and his apostles, and they contain copious evidence that the Pentateuch was written at the time of Moses, and by himself or under his directions. Beyond all doubt there are  numerous most striking references both in the prophets and in the books of Kings to passages which are found in our present Pentateuch. One thing is certain, that the theory of men like Von Bohlen, Vatke, and others, who suppose the Pentateuch to have been written in the times of the latest kings, is utterly absurd. It is established in the most convincing manner that the legal portions of the Pentateuch already existed in writing before the separation of the two kingdoms. Even as regards the historical portions, there are often in the later books almost verbal coincidences of expression, which render it more than probable that these also existed in writing. All this has been argued with much learning, the most indefatigable research, and in some instances with great success, by Hengstenberg in his Authentie des Pentateuchs. We will satisfy ourselves by pointing out some of the most striking passages in which the coincidences between the later books and the Pentateuch (omitting Deuteronomy here) appear.

(a) Beginning with the historical books, the references to the law of Moses as a written work of supreme authority in Israel are particularly numerous and distinct in the book of Joshua, as might be expected in the history of the personal friend of Moses, and the close attendant upon him, to whom, by divine direction, Moses intrusted the completion of the work of conquering the Promised Land, and settling the people in it, and establishing among them the worship and the laws of God. The evidence is so abundant and indubitable that the only resource of our opponents has been an allegation, without any evidence, that the book of Joshua is comparatively of very recent origin, written perhaps after the Exile, or at least not long before it; an allegation which has been somewhat modified by others, but only to make it more arbitrary and improbable, when they pronounce it to be a sixth book of that history of the original of the Hebrew nation which has come down to us under the name of the five books of Moses, with certain ancient elements in it, yet wrought up to its present form only in a very late age, much as they imagine the Pentateuch to have been. The book of Judges has been said to want such clear evidence to the Pentateuch; if so, the reason must be sought, partly in the greater distance from it in point of time, and still more in its nature, as a series of sketches of the defections of the people and the chastisements which followed in order to lead them to repentance. Yet the entire work is meant to bring the conduct and condition of the people to the test of the law of God, as the known and acknowledged standard of duty: the opening account of the criminal neglect which left so many remnants of Canaanites  in the midst of the tribes of Israel is meaningless except on the supposition that the law of Moses and the transactions of Joshua are already known; and some parts of it, such as the histories of Gideon and of Samson, abound in admitted references both to the facts of the Pentateuch and to its language. Nay, the cases of, grossest divergence from the law of Moses which it records are no proof that this law was unknown, or destitute of authority, at the time its author lived, as has been rashly asserted: on the contrary, they carry evidence within themselves that they were sinful; because they were the acts of men whose whole conduct was vile and disorderly, or because it is noticed that they drew down divine judgments on those who were concerned in perpetrating them. The succeeding historical books of Ruth, Samuel, and Kings present similar evidence. In the books of Kings we have references as follows: 1Ki 20:42 to Lev 27:29; Lev 21:3 to Lev 25:23, Num 36:8; Num 21:10 to Num 35:30 (comp. Deu 17:6-7; Deu 19:15); 22:17 to Num 27:16; Num 27:11; 2Ki 3:20 to Exo 29:38, etc.; Exo 4:1 to Lev 25:39, etc.; Lev 5:27 to Exo 4:6, Num 12:10; Num 6:18 to Gen 19:11 to Lev 26:29; Lev 7:2; Lev 7:19 to Gen 7:14; Gen 7:3 to Lev 13:46 (comp. Num 5:3).

(b) Especially remarkable is the testimony arising from the existence of the line of prophets in Israel; men who spoke in the style of the law of Moses, and used its language, and enforced and applied its lessons, without any civil support, often in opposition to the habits of the people and the wishes of the government; not without suffering persecution occasionally, yet without one word being uttered against the authority of the prophetic office and their abstract right to prophesy in the name of Jehovah and in support of his law. In Joel, who prophesied only in the kingdom of Judah; in Amos, who prophesied in both kingdoms; and in Hosea, whose ministry was confined to Israel, we find references which imply the existence of a written code of laws. The following comparison of passages may satisfy us on this point: Joe 2:2 with Exo 10:14; Exo 2:3 with Gen 2:8-9 (comp. Gen 13:10); Gen 2:17 with Num 14:13; Num 2:20 with Exo 10:19; Exo 3:1 [2:28, E.V.] with Gen 6:12; Gen 2:13 with Exo 34:6; Exo 4:18 [Exo 3:18], with Num 25:1. — Again, Amo 2:2 with Num 21:28; Num 2:7 with Exo 23:6, Lev 20:3; Lev 2:8 with Exo 22:25, etc.; Exo 2:9 with Num 13:32, etc.; Num 3:7 with Gen 18:17; Gen 4:4 with Lev 24:3, and Deu 14:28; Deu 26:12; Deu 26:12 with Num 35:31 (comp. Exo 23:6 and Amo 2:7; Amo 5:17 with  Exo 12:12; Exo 5:21, etc., with Num 29:35, Lev 23:36; Lev 6:1 with Num 1:17; Num 6:6 with Gen 37:25 (this is probably the reference: Hengstenberg's is wrong); Gen 6:8 with Lev 26:19; Lev 6:14 with Num 34:8; Num 8:6 with Exo 21:2, Lev 25:39; Lev 9:13 with Lev 26:3-5 (comp. Exo 3:8). — Again, Hos 1:2 with Lev 20:5-7; Lev 2:1; Lev 1:10] with Gen 22:17; Gen 32:12; Gen 2:2 [1:11] with Exo 1:10; Exo 3:2 with Exo 21:32; Exo 4:8 with Lev 6:17, etc., and Lev 7:1, etc.; Lev 4:10 with Lev 26:26; Lev 4:17 with Exo 32:9-10; Exo 5:6 with Exo 10:9; Exo 6:2 with Gen 17:18; Gen 7:8 with Exo 34:12-16; Exo 12:6 [A.V. Exo 12:5] with Exo 3:15; Exo 12:10 [Exo 12:9] with Lev 23:43 with Gen 9:5. This fact is the more worthy of consideration, inasmuch as these prophets were to be found actively at work, not merely in the kingdom of Judah, in which the process of elaborating the Pentateuch is imagined to have been carried on, but also in the kingdom of the ten tribes, in which the true spirit of the theocracy was confessedly at a very low ebb. Those of the prophets who have left their writings as a portion of Scripture have furnished references to facts and phrases in the books of Moses, sometimes longer and more direct, sometimes briefer and more incidental, but so various and multiplied that it has been found necessary to frame the hypothesis that the prophetic writings were the originals out of which our present Pentateuch was formed: a supposition in itself sufficiently unnatural, and, if it were admitted, still forcing us back upon the question, What, then, was the foundation of divine authority, as acknowledged by the people of Israel, on which the prophetic office rested, and to which the prophets in their teaching appealed?

(c) A strong support is also furnished by two books of Scripture which are of a very different nature from any that have yet been noticed — the books of Psalms and of Proverbs: the one dealing with the devotional feelings, the other with the practical life of the people of Israel, and both often naming the law, and continually referring to it, or tacitly assuming that it was known and reverenced.

(d) It is unnecessary to speak of the testimony of books written after the return from Babylon, as Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles: a testimony which is admitted to be so full and explicit that there is no way of destroying its force, or of even materially diminishing its value, unless by affirming boldly that these are such late writings that they are he authorities  upon the question; as in fact the history given in the books of Chronicles is often pronounced incorrect and untrustworthy.

(e) But now if, as appears from the examination of all the extant Jewish literature, the Pentateuch existed as a canonical book; if; moreover, it was a book so well known that its words had become household words among the people; and if the prophets could appeal to it as a recognized and well- known document — how comes it to pass that in the reign of Josiah, one of the latest kings, its existence as a canonical book seems to have been almost forgotten? Yet such was evidently the fact. The circumstances, as narrated in 2Ch 34:14, etc., were these: In the eighteenth year of his reign, the king, who had already taken active measures for the suppression of idolatry, determined to execute the necessary repairs of the Temple, which had become seriously dilapidated, and to restore the worship of Jehovah in its purity. He accordingly directed Hilkiah the highpriest to take charge of the moneys that were contributed for this purpose. During the progress of the work, Hilkiah, who was busy in the Temple, came upon a copy of the book of the Law — which must have long lain neglected and forgotten — and told Shaphan the scribe of his discovery. The effect produced by this was very remarkable. The king, to whom Shaphan read the words of the book, was filled with consternation when he learned for the first time how far the nation had departed from the law of Jehovah. He sent Hilkiah and others to consult the prophetess Huldah, who only confirmed his fears. The consequence was that he held a solemn assembly in the house of the Lord, and read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant that was found in the house of the Lord.” How are we to explain this surprise and alarm in the mind of Josiah, betraying as it does such utter ignorance of the book of the Law, and of the severity of its threatenings, except on the supposition that as a written document it had well-nigh perished? This must have been the case, and it is not so extraordinary a fact, perhaps, as it appears at first sight. It is quite true that in the reign of Jehoshaphat pains had been taken to make the nation at large acquainted with the law. That monarch not only instituted “teaching priests,” but we are told that as they went about the country they had the book of the Law with them. But that was 300 years before a period equal to that between the days of Luther and our own; and in such an interval great changes must have taken place. It is true that in the reign of Ahaz the prophet Isaiah directed the people, who in their hopeless infatuation were seeking counsel of ventriloquists and necromancers, to  turn “to the law and to the testimony;” and Hezekiah, who succeeded Ahaz, had no doubt reigned in the spirit of the prophet's advice.

But the next monarch was guilty of outrageous wickedness, and filled Jerusalem with idols. How great a desolation might one wicked prince effect, especially during a lengthened reign! To this we must add that at no time, in all probability, were there many copies of the law existing in writing. It was probably then the custom, as it still is in the East, to trust largely to the memory for its transmission. Just as at this day in Egypt persons are to be found, even illiterate in other respects, who can repeat the whole Koran by heart, and as some modern Jews are able to recite the whole of the five books of Moses, so it probably was then: the law, for the great bulk of the nation, was orally preserved and inculcated. (See Mr. Grove's very interesting paper on Nablus and the Samaritans in Vacation Tourists, 1861. Speaking of the service of the yom kippur in the Samaritan synagogue, he says that the recitation of the Pentateuch was continued through the night, “without even the feeble lamp which on every other night of the year but this burns in front of the holy books. The two priests and a few of the people know the whole of the Torah by heart” [p. 346].) The ritual would easily be perpetuated by the mere force of observance, though much of it doubtless became perverted, and some part of it perhaps obsolete, through the neglect of the priests. Still it is against the perfunctory and lifeless manner of their worship, not against their total neglect, that the burning words of the prophets are directed. The command of Moses, which laid upon the king the obligation of making a copy of the law for himself, had of course long been disregarded. Here and there, perhaps, only some prophet or righteous man possessed a copy of the sacred book. The bulk of the nation were without it. Nor was there any reason why copies should be brought under the notice of the king. We may understand this by a parallel case. How easy it would have been in England, before the invention of printing, for a similar circumstance to have happened. How many copies, do we suppose, of the Scriptures were made? Such as did exist would be in the hands of a few learned men, or more probably in the libraries of monasteries. Even after a translation, like Wickliffe's, had been made, the people as a whole would know nothing whatever of the Bible; and yet they were a Christian people, and were in some measure at least instructed out of the Scriptures, though the volume itself could scarcely ever have been seen. Even the monarch, unless he happened to be a man of learning or piety, would remain in the same ignorance as his subjects. Whatever knowledge there was of the Bible and of religion would be kept alive  chiefly by means of the liturgies used in public worship. So it was in Judah. The oral transmission of the law and the living testimony, of the prophets had superseded the written document, till at last it had become so scarce as to be almost unknown. But the hand of God so ordered it that when king and people were both zealous for reformation, and ripest for the reception of the truth, the written document itself was brought to light.

If this direct verbal testimony had been absent, the entire structure of the scriptural books from Joshua to Malachi would have necessitated the same conclusion. These books never could have been written in their existing form, unless by men familiarly conversant with the Pentateuch. Thence are derived the ultimate principles which underlie the whole. They are united to it by a mass of reference so complex, intricate, and minute, as to constitute a study in itself. The grand monotheism which pervades the whole, the overruling Providence which is everywhere thrown into the foreground; the national election of the Jew, and his relation to his forefathers in the perpetual covenant sealed between God and them, would all be inexplicable without this reference to the transactions of the past. Throughout the prophetical books especially the tone of thought and feeling, the language employed, the illustrations used, the accents of blended reproach, warning, and promise, the allusions to the past, and the predictions of the future, would be unintelligible to the student if the Pentateuch were not in his possession to interpret them. This is as true, and perhaps more forcibly evident in regard to the N.T. and the teaching of our Lord and his apostles than it is in the O.T. and in the language of the prophets. The Pentateuch is the thread of gold which runs, now latent, now prominent, throughout the whole body of the Scriptures. Retain it in its place, and the whole is united by a consistent purpose from end to end; take it away, and all the rest of revelation becomes a mass of inextricable confusion. The recognition of this bearing of the authority of the Pentateuch on the authority of the other scriptural books is most necessary. For the purpose, however, of succinctly stating the positive argument in favor of the authorship and divine authority of the five books of Moses, it is sufficient to trace the line of testimony down to the time of Malachi, for here we find that firm footing in the acknowledged facts of profane history which enables us to close every avenue against the objections of unbelief.

To take the facts of the books subsequent to the Pentateuch, and reduce them to anything like consistency, on the supposition that the Pentateuch itself is mythical, framing a connected and credible story out of them, is a  task which baffles all human ingenuity. The only alternative appears to be to make a clean sweep of the history altogether; but this is no sooner proposed to the mind than both the past and the present lift up their protest against it. The past forbids it, because at many points the history of the Jew has come into contact with the history of the other great nations of antiquity, and to destroy the one would involve the destruction of the other likewise; for modern research has conclusively proved the harmony of sacred history with profane in a very considerable number of instances. The Mosaic authorship is expressly affirmed by Hecataeus, Manetho, Lysimachus, Tacitus, Juvenal, and Longinus. In regard to the Pentateuch itself, the Mosaic cosmogony, the scriptural account of the deluge, and the dispersion of mankind at Babel receive confirmation from Berosus the Chaldaean; the ethnological list in Genesis is strongly corroborated by the Babylonian monuments; the account of the exodus, by the distorted narrative of Manetho the Egyptian. Coming to later times, the Jewish conquest of Canaan is confirmed by an ancient Phoenician inscription noticed by three old writers; David's conquest of Syria by two heathen writers of repute; the history of his relations with Hiram, king of Tyre. by Herodotus, Dius, and Menander. Similar points of contact occur all down the history, till, in the period of the captivity, we emerge from the darkness of prehistoric times to the period of authentic history (see Rawlinson's Bamnpton Lectures and Ancient Monarchies). If the Jewish history be all fabulous. what becomes of the profane? and how is it that the ancient Babylonian monuments, now yielding their precious stores of information to the diligence of modern inquiry, corroborate in so many points the statements of the sacred books. The two branches of history, the sacred and the profane, are so interwoven that the denial of the one must involve likewise the denial of the other. Say that the past history of the Jew before the times of the Ptolemies is a myth altogether, and the history of the Egyptian, the Babylonian, and the Assyrian must become at least equally apocryphal. Acknowledge the history to be true, and the truth of the history involves the divine authority of the Pentateuch which records it.

But the argument is at least equally strong when we trace the line of proof upward from the time of the Ptolemies, in regard to the existence of the Jewish Scriptures, as in regard to the facts of Jewish history. The still extant Septuagint proves the existence of the O.-T. Scriptures in their completed form at this date, and that they were universally received by the Jewish race as the authoritative and divinely inspired compositions of the  authors to whom they are ascribed. The Pentateuch, for instance, was implicitly received as being the work of Moses, and as supplying the divinely ordained platform on which the whole superstructure of Jewish polity and religion had been reared, and as the authoritative record of it. To cast a doubt on its genuineness and sacred authority would have been esteemed blasphemy. The case is strengthened by the position held by the Pentateuch as the most ancient of their writings, and as underlying, so to speak, all the rest. For they were accepted not only as existing from former times, but as the first of a long series of sacred books, united by a regular historical sequence with each other, and all of them received from the tradition of the preceding times. The supposition, therefore, that the Pentateuch is unhistorical does not end with the destruction of the sacred authority of the Mosaic books, but destroys the authority of all the rest of the O.-T. Scriptures likewise; for all these without exception are founded on the authority of the Pentateuch, and the historic reality of the events recorded in it. If this is denied, either the later books must be considered part of the same imposture as that which produced the Pentateuch in its connected form; or their authors must have knowingly endorsed and availed themselves of this imposture; or, lastly, they must ignorantly have received human and imaginary compositions as veritable and divinely inspired history.

The enormous difficulty of even conceiving the possibility of a fraud under such circumstances is increased by the wide dispersion of the Jewish race, and the mighty separation which had divided the original people into two jealous if not hostile nations. If one portion of the dispersed had been disposed to acquiesce in the fraud, or, in the depth of their superstitious ignorance, had been induced to accept a religious romance composed by some member of the college of the prophets as the ancient Scriptures of their nation, still it is inconceivable that all the communities of Jews established in the different cities of the known world could have been brought to the same conclusion. Or if the exclusive and intense spirit of nationality by which they were actuated, and which becomes on this supposition itself an effect without a cause, can be believed to have accomplished even this result, it still remains to be conceived how the Samaritan people could have been induced to adopt the same belief, instead of indignantly protesting, as a people so sensitively jealous would inevitably have done, against what must have been either an enormous folly or a criminal imposture. Yet an independent Samaritan version of the  Pentateuch carries the evidence for the national acceptance of the Mosaic writings as high as the times of Solomon and David, within little more than 400 years of the conquest of Canaan. Every theory hitherto suggested to explain the existence of the Jewish Scriptures, and the profound veneration entertained for them during all periods by the historic Jew, bristles with difficulties which contradict every experience of human history and every known principle of human conduct.

(3.) Proof of the early composition of the Pentateuch exists in the fact that the Samaritans had their own copies of it, not differing very materially from those possessed by the Jews, except in a few passages which had probably been purposely tampered with and altered; such, for instance, as Exo 12:40; Deu 27:5. The Samaritans, it would seem, must have derived their book of the Law from the ten tribes, whose land they occupied; on the other hand, it is out of the question to suppose that the ten tribes would be willing to accept religious books from the two, unless these were already in general circulation and of long-established authority. Hence the conclusion seems to be irresistible that the Pentateuch must have existed in its present form before the separation of Israel from Judah; the only part of the O.T. which was the common heritage of both. There is not indeed any historical notice of a rupture between the Jews and Samaritans prior to the return from Babylon, except so far as the schismatic calf-worship, and the mongrel character of the inhabitants introduced by the Assyrian conquerors, would naturally produce it; and there are traces of a religious association, more or less close, during the later period of the Hebrew monarchy; but the notable fact that none of the prophetical writings were admitted by the Samaritans strongly argues that their copy dates from a very early period. This view is confirmed by the fact that it is written in the ancient character, which certainly was not in use after the Exile. The only objection of any considerable weight to this conclusion is the fact that it agrees remarkably with the existing Hebrew Pentateuch, and that, too, in those passages which are manifestly interpolations and corrections as late as the time of Ezra. Hence many incline to the view of Prideaux (Connect. bk. vi, ch. iii) that the Samaritan Pentateuch was in fact a transcript of Ezra's revised copy. The same view is virtually adopted by Gesenius (De Pent. Sam. p. 8, 9). SEE SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH.

(4.) The unvarying conviction of the Jews, and of the Christian Church also, has been that the Pentateuch, substantially as we have it now, and  without any alterations beyond what are conceded to be admissible in all books which have been handed down from remote antiquity, is the writing of Moses. As we have seen above, until near the end of last century the universality of this conviction may be pronounced absolute; the alleged exceptions are so trifling or so dubious that the mere mention of them, as they have been carefully hunted out, gives us an impression of the strength of the traditional belief such as we might not otherwise have had. The case of some obscure early heretical sects among so-called Christians would scarcely be to the point, even if it could be established: but really they do not seem to have denied that Moses was the author of the book; their denial had reference to its divine origin and authority. The first distinct adverse statement was made by Carlstadt, the Reformer with whom Luther was associated for a time, but from whom he was compelled to separate on account of his rashness and want of good sense. Carlstadt admitted that Moses had received the law from God, and that he communicated it to the people; but he doubted whether the words and the thread of discourse in the Pentateuch did not proceed from some later writer, though he rejected the notion that Ezra was the writer. Masius, a learned Roman Catholic, whose commentary on Joshua was published in 1574, after his death, held that at least there was rearrangement and supplementing by Ezra or some other inspired person. These two Christian writers perhaps had a predecessor among the Jewish rabbins, the learned Aben-Ezra, of Toledo, who lived probably A.D. 1095-1168; he hinted his opinion that a few passages had not come from the hand of Moses, and he notices the similar opinion, as to one passage, of another rabbin in the 11th century, a man, however, who is otherwise wholly unknown to us. Finally, about the end of the 17th and beginning of the 18th century, there were a few theologianis, both Romanist and Reformed — Pevrerius, Richard Simon, Van Dale, and Le Clerc — who adopted the opinion, more or less decidedly, that Ezra was the author of the Pentateuch. The last of these, an eminent man among the Dutch Arminianls, is by far the best known of the whole number; and he professed himself convinced by subsequent discussions that he had been in error, and in his commentary on the Pentateuch retracted his opinion.

4. Confirmation of the Mosaic Authorship. — Of this confirmatory evidence we offer the following specimens, in addition to the considerations urged above to prove the unity of the entire five books.

(1.) Internal indications occur that the Pentateuch does belong to the age of Moses. —

(a.) References to matters somewhat earlier than his own time, which he might well have opportunities of knowing, and which might be expected to attract the interest of the generation of Israelites who came out of Egypt and entered Canaan, while they would less probably have been incorporated into his history by a writer of a much later period. Such are the details in Genesis xiv of the wars between the four kings of the East and the five kings of Sodom, etc.; the peculiar list of nations in Canaan during the earlier part of Abraham's sojourn (Gen 15:19-21), differing very considerably from the ordinary list of these nations in the age of Moses, several centuries later; the designation of Abraham's original home as “Ur of the Chaldees” (Gen 11:31), though really in Mesopotamia (Act 7:2), in the mountains of which country it seems that the Chaldees were settled at a remote period, whereas later Jewish history represents them as settled much farther south, in the plains of Babylonia; the curious notices scattered throughout Deuteronomy 2 of the old nations in and around Canaan, who had been dispossessed by the Philistines, the Edomites, the Moabites, and the Ammonites — notices well fitted, and we believe intended, to encourage Israel in rooting out their enemies the Canaanites with the promised special help of God, although the higher criticism has induced its votaries to pronounce them ill-judged interpolations.

(b.) The record of particulars respecting the origin of the people that have every token of verisimilitude, at once from the simplicity with which they are related, and from the absence of features which characterize the fabulous accounts of early things by the Greeks and others.

(c.) The prominence given to many events, and the minuteness and vividness of the descriptions, such as are common in the narratives of eye- witnesses and men personally engaged in the transactions; with which may be associated the evidence of intimate (yet not obtruded) acquaintance with both Egypt and the wilderness.

(d.) Confirmatory evidence may be found in many of the laws which were applicable to the Israelites only while in motion through the wilderness, or while gathered close together in the camp; as indeed “the camp” is very frequently mentioned in the course of these laws, for instance in Lev 13:46; Lev 14:8; Lev 16:26; Lev 17:3; Num 5:3. So also the commands are many a time laid, not upon the priests as a body, but upon Aaron personally, or upon “Aaron and his sons.” To this may be added  what has already been said of certain slight modifications of laws in Deuteronomy, which were natural with the progress of events during the forty years; compare also Deuteronomy 14 and Leviticus 11, Leviticus alone mentioning the permission to eat the locusts, which would be common in the wilderness, etc.

(e.) Add to this the antique forms of words and expressions which are generally conceded to occur throughout the Pentateuch. This is no doubt a kind of argument which must be handled with care and moderation; and it has been employed very frequently, and been pushed to a most extravagant length, by many Continental scholars in support of views which they have really adopted on other grounds. But three things may be asserted very confidently, and they are sufficiently plain to be appreciated by the mere English reader, although he is not in circumstances to verify them. First, that there are many traces of very early simple language in the Pentateuch, as the habitual use of הוּא for “he” and “she,” נִעִר for “young man” and “young woman,” without the distinction of gender invariably found in the rest of the Old Testament. Secondly, that the differences of the Elohistic and the Jehovistic and the Deuteronomic vocabulary (to use the barbarous words descriptive of peculiar notions which have been introduced into this controversy) are reduced to extremely narrow limits by such a competent scholar as Delitzsch, whose peculiar theory leads him to occupy an intermediate or neutral place in these discussions. Thirdly, that a difference is at once plainly discernible when we pass from the vocabulary of the Pentateuch to that of the books generally reckoned nearest to it in point of age — namely, Joshua and Judges.

(2.) If we deny that Moses was the author of this book, it is impossible to fix with satisfaction on any later age for the date of composition. — This will be evident on a slight examination of the various dates proposed.

(a.) The inclination is very strong to fix the date of the composition of Deuteronomy, as well as the final arrangement of the other four books, somewhere perhaps in the reign of Hezekiah — the character of whose administration, however, is inconsistent with the admission of religious novelties (emphatically in the rule of faith), since he was bent upon removing all the abuses which had crept into the institutions of Moses; or in the reign of his profligate son Manasseh, although the heathenish party in Judah were at the time so completely in the ascendant that their opponents were at their mercy, and they are thought to have subjected the  prophets of Jehovah to bloody persecution; or perhaps in the reign of Josiah, when the corruption was still deeper and more widespread, and when so distinguished a prophet as Jeremiah was impotent to stem the tide of evil. It may be asserted very confidently that no one of these reigns was more favorable for interpolating or annexing a new section of the law of Moses than the age of the Reformation would have been for adding another epistle to the New Testament. Any of these dates is ridiculously ill- suited for the composition in Deuteronomy of those consecutive chapters (6, 7, 8) which are filled with warnings against worldliness in consequence of peacefully possessing the land, and an improper toleration of the doomed nations of Canaan, and pride in victories achieved and wealth enjoyed.

(b.) Or shall we assume an earlier date, the period of the first and best times of the kingdom, before the death of Jehoshaphat, which is generally regarded by the critics as a time of prophetic activity in composing the early history of the nation? The Pentateuch, however, cannot well have been composed later than the schism in religion, and the rise of two hostile kingdoms, after the death of Solomon; for it uniformly supposes Israel to be in an undivided condition, both civilly and ecclesiastically. There is never a hint of the existence of such a division; nay, after that division had taken place many of the laws must have met with impediments in their execution. Again, had the book been composed later than the date of the schism, the ten tribes would have protested, and justly too, against such laws as bore hard upon them; while at the same time we are warranted in inferring from the strong language in the acknowledged writings of the prophets, that, had they been the writers of the legislation, its language would have been found to be distinct and pointed against the schism. Similar remarks may be made upon the historical portions of the Pentateuch. A prophetic historian in the kingdom of Judah would have been likely to identify more distinctly than is done “the land of Moriah,” where Abraham was ready to offer Isaac, with “Mount Moriah,” where the Temple was built; and he would have been likely to assign less religious prominence in the patriarchal and early national history to Shechem, the scene of the revolt and the seat of Jeroboam's government. Nor could we expect him to say nothing in praise of Levi, in Jacob's dying blessing; nor in the blessing of Moses, while mentioning Levi, to give so slight a blessing to Judah in comparison with that given to Ephraim and Manasseh.

(c.) Nor yet is the earlier age of David and Solomon satisfactory as the assumed date of this composition. If the Pentateuch had been a recent work, of the age of these kings, it would have been wholly thrown aside by Jeroboam, who must have found inconvenience and positive danger from it; and in casting it away he would have easily and naturally represented himself as a reformer of religion, delivering the people from one of the yokes of bondage which the house of David had been imposing on them, and restoring to them their primitive civil liberty and religious simplicity, according to the genuine institutions of Moses. Instead of this, it is evident that from the first Jeroboam was condemned and resisted by the prophets and the priests and the Levites, and generally by multitudes of the people, whose hearts were reverent towards the acknowledged and established law of God. The entire law of the kingdom (Deuteronomy 17), which has been represented as furnishing evidence of late authorship, is on the contrary a witness to a much earlier date of composition. In the days of David and Solomon there would have been no need to forbid the appointment of a foreigner to the throne, since it was established in this family of the tribe of Judah, and this with divine sanctions and promises of perpetuity; while the language in which the multiplication of horses and wives and silver and gold is prohibited would have needed to be very different to suit that age. The oft-repeated command to extirpate the Canaanites, and not to let them dwell in the midst of Israel (so far from being a production of the age of David and Solomon), was no longer applicable, after it had been neglected for so many centuries: in their totally altered circumstances the remains of these nations appear to have become converts to the worship of Jehovah, and in some sense members of the congregation of Israel; and a fearful curse fell upon Saul and his bloody house on account of his zeal in exterminating the Gibeonites.

(d.) If we are thus driven back to a period indefinitely anterior to the time of David, there is no other age than that of Moses himself at which we can rest with reason or satisfaction. There is no one whose name could be suggested as the author, with any degree of probability, during the disturbed period of the judges, in the course of which religion was rather retrograding, and the revivals of it were very far from favoring new legislation. SEE JUDGES. Samuel has indeed been named, and there is no doubt of the eminent position which he occupied at the crisis in which the Hebrew republic passed into a monarchy; still there is no evidence that he was competent to write the Pentateuch. Besides there are two special  objections: his closeness to the age of David and Solomon, than which the book seems much more ancient; and the necessity of supposing a known and acknowledged law of God in Israel as the basis on which all his labors rested, and the rule of life and worship to which it was his aim to bring the people back.

(e.) There are not wanting traces which point to the patriarchal age as the time in which the writer of the Pentateuch lived. A writer subsequent to the time at which “the laws of Moses” (rightly or wrongly so called) had taken hold of the national mind, would have been little likely to represent their ancestor Abraham as marrying his sister, half-sister though she might be; and Jacob as setting up his pillar and anointing it. The primitive age of the writer is evinced by his entire silence on the subject of temples for the worship of false gods, as well as of any house for Jehovah. It may be doubted. too, whether a later legislator would have spoken of priests in Israel prior to the institution of Aaron's priesthood, and of young men of the children of Israel offering the sacrifices, under the direction of Moses, at the establishment of the covenant in Sinai (Exo 19:24; Exo 24:5).

(f.) Moreover, that “law of Moses” was very burdensome in its ritual, in respect to both trouble and expense and no one could have introduced it, thereby in fact accomplishing an unparalleled social revolution, if he had not had the support of overwhelming authority as the recognized messenger of Jehovah. Nor, when once established. could that legislation have been altered throughout successive ages by numberless nameless authors such as the critics have discovered.

(g.) The prophetic passages, those of Moses himself, and those of Balaam, have puzzled the critics when attempting to fix a later date for them.

(h.) A most tempting subject for any one who wishes to turn upon the critics is the irreconcilable diversity of the hypotheses which they have framed, in spite of every imaginable advantage enjoyed by them — learning, leisure, mutual concert, and entire absence of any belief in the need of evidence for their endless suppositions. We noticed, at an early part of our argument, that there is a fundamental difference among them: much the greater number believing, as we do, that Deuteronomy was composed later than the other four books, while a small minority, comprising some distinguished scholars, invert the relation of the two parts, assigning the higher antiquity to Deuteronomy, and considering the legislation in the preceding books to be developed from it. By both schools  “the Deuteronomist” is regarded as a different person from “the Elohist” and “the Jehovist” (or the older and younger Elohistic and Jehovistic writers, according to those critics who make each of these names represent a class rather than an individual), to whom is assigned the composition of almost the whole of the first four books and a small portion of history towards the close of the fifth. It would occupy too much space to reckon up the variety of opinions as to the number of these imaginary authors and the ages in which they respectively flourished: those who wish to see this practice of making hypotheses in its most extravagant and self-sufficient form may find it in the commencement of Ewald's History of the People of Israel. We wish, however, to remind our readers that these varieties in the hypotheses are not to be overlooked, as if they were mere differences of detail. To us, on the contrary, they appear to be essential or fatal defects in these critical schemes; for when Moses has been denied to be the author, there is nothing on which to depend except critical sagacity; and since this critical sagacity not unfrequently contradicts itself, and is ever contradicting the sagacity of some other critic quite as much to be respected as the one we are studying at the time, it furnishes convincing evidence that it is itself an unsafe guide. The critics allege, indeed, that their testimony agrees in many points; and this is true, so long as they confine themselves to generalities, because they start from the same false principles, as to miracles, prophecy, etc. They do also agree in a great many particulars; but this is not wonderful, considering how they read one another's productions, compare them, and dovetail their statements together, altering and amending as often as they are charged with error or confusion, by one another or by those who adhere to the old opinion. We do not blame them for this procedure; but it makes their agreement, so far as it goes, of very little worth as concurrent testimony.

(i.) There are gaps in “the fundamental document” which need to be filled up; and there are references in it to the so-called later or supplementary matter, which we therefore believe to be a composition as early as the other which they pronounce to be alone the original. The individual proofs of this assertion we cannot here adduce; and indeed, as often as instances are given, some new critic starts up to make a different arrangement of the original and the supplementary matter which escapes from the objection charged upon the scheme of his predecessor — a process which is not so difficult after all, as nothing more is required than his own unsupported assertion.  It is to be remembered, however, that a person may hold the common opinion that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, and yet along with this may also hold (rightly or wrongly) that there are extents in it which are not from the hand of Moses, but which have come to be incorporated with it by accidents to which all very ancient books are liable. Thus there are various ways of dealing with near half a dozen difficulties, such as the mention of Dan, or of the district called Havoth-jair “unto this day,” or the testimony to the surpassing meekness of Moses, or the geographical and antiquarian statements in Deuteronomy 2. If the mind of any. one remains unsatisfied with the explanations offered, he has it in his power to cut the knot which he is not able to untie. He may say that the general and direct evidence, on account of which he believes Moses to be the author of the Pentateuch, is overwhelming; and in regard to these few incidental passages which puzzle him, he may incline to consider them glosses or explanations thrown in by some copyist or annotator, whether authorized or not, and he can imagine these removed without any serious alteration in the book, as it reverts precisely to the form in which he conceives it to have come from Moses. That unauthorized copyists might make such changes is a notion for which parallels more or less satisfactory can be adduced; yet it might be preferable to think of an editor whose annotations or alterations were authoritative, and such an editor Ezra is supposed to have been by many who follow old Jewish traditions. How far the influence of such an editor might alter the work is a matter for those to settle who embrace this opinion; certainly it ought not to be supposed to extend far, or they run the risk of virtually injuring their faith in Moses as the author. On the other hand, of course, those who adhere most strenuously to the old opinion deny that they are committed by their views to the absurdity of believing that Moses wrote the account of his own death and burial. There is a tradition in the Talmud that Joshua wrote the last eight verses of Deuteronomy; although it is now more commonly supposed that the work of Moses ends at ch. 31:23 (or even earlier,Exodus 24 :rse 8; Baumgarten says at ch. 30:20), and that Joshua, or whoever recorded these closing details, inserted the song and the blessing of Moses, along with the accounts of his final charge, his view of the Promised Land, his death, etc.

5. Objections against the Mosaic Authorship. — These have been numerous and vehemently urged, especially by rationalists, as we might expect from the importance of the subject. On the opposite side, these critical doubts respecting the authenticity of the Pentateuch have produced  in modern times several works in defense of its genuineness; such as Kanne's Biblische Untersuchungen (1820, 2 vols.); the observations by Jahn, Rosenmüller, and Bleek; Ranke's Untersuchungen uber den Pentateuch (2 vols.); Hengstenberg's Beitr agqe zur Einleitung (vols. ii and iii); Havernick's Einleitung in daas Alte Testament (vol. i); Drechsler's Ueber die Einheit und Authentie der Genesis; Kinig's Alt-testamentliche Studien (No. ii); Sack's Apolegetik, etc. From the most recent of these we extract the following, as presenting a condensed view of the argument (see RawlinSoLn's Historical Evidence, p. 51 sq.). As above stated the ancient, positive, and uniform tradition of the Jews assigned the authorship of the Pentateuch, with the exception of the last chapter of Deuteronomy, to Moses (see Horne's Introd. 1:51-56; Graves, Lectures; Stuart, O.T. Canon, p. 42); and this tradition is prima facie evidence of the fact, such at least as throws the burden of proof upon those who call it in question. It is an admitted rule of all sound criticism that books are to be regarded as proceeding from the writers whose names they bear, unless very strong reasons indeed can be adduced to the contrary (comp. Gladstone, Homer, 1:3, 4). In the present instance, the reasons which have been urged are weak and puerile in the extreme; they rest in part on misconception of the meaning of passages (e.g. De Wette, Einl. § 147, with regard to בְּעֵבֶר, which means as well “this side” as “the other side” of Jordan; Buxtorf, Lex. p. 527); in part upon interpolations into the original text, which are sometimes very palpable (e.g. Gen 36:31-39; Exo 16:35-36; and perhaps Deu 2:14; comp. Fritzsche, Prufung, p. 135). Mainly, however, they have their source in arbitrary and unproved hypotheses: as that a contemporary writer would not have introduced an account of miracles (De Wette, Einl. § 145); that the culture indicated by the book is beyond that of the age of Moses (ibid. § 163); that if Moses had written the book, he would not have spoken of himself in the third person (Hartmann, Forschungen, p. 545; Norton, Genuineness, 2, 444; comp. Spinoza, Tractatus Theo.-Pol. p. 154); that he would have given a fuller and more complete account of his own history (De Wette, § 167); and that he would not have applied to himself terms of praise and expressions of honor (Hartmann, l.c.; comp. Spinoza, l.c.). It is enough to observe of these objections that they are such as might equally be urged against the genuineness of Paul's epistles (which is allowed even by Strauss, Leben Jesu, 1:60) — against that of the works of Homer, Chaucer, and indeed of all writers in advance of their age — against Caesar's Commentaries and Xenophon's Expedition of Cyrus — against  the Acts of the Apostles (which even Strauss allows may be the work of Luke, Leben Jesu, 1:60), and against the Gospel of John.

For Paul relates contemporary miracles; Homer and Chaucer exhibit a culture and a tone which, but for them, we should have supposed unattainable in their age; Caesar and Xenophon write throughout in the third person; Luke omits all account of his own doings at Philippi; and John applies to himself the most honorable of all titles, “the disciple whom Jesus loved” (Joh 13:23; Joh 14:26). In fact a priori conceptions as to how an author of a certain time and country would write, what he would or would not say, or how he would express himself, are among the weakest of all presumptions, and must be regarded as outweighed by a very small amount of positive testimony to authorship. Moreover, for an argument of this sort to have any force at all, it is necessary that we should possess, from other sources besides the author who is judged, a tolerably complete knowledge of the age to which he is assigned, and a fair acquaintance with the literature of his period. In the case of Moses, our knowledge of the age is exceedingly limited, while of the literature we have scarcely any knowledge at all, beyond that which is furnished by the sacred records next in succession — the books of Joshua and Judges with (perhaps) that of Job — and these are so far from supporting the notion that such a work as the Pentateuch could not be produced in the time of Moses that they actually presuppose the contrary by constantly appealing to it or as being evidently based upon it. We propose to examine these objections here in detail, as they relate more or less to all the books of the Pentateuch. For other difficulties, see each book in its place.

We mention here one objection of a general character. The history of the art of writing among the Hebrews has often been appealed to in order to disprove the authenticity of the Pentateuch. It is true that in our days no critic of good repute for learning ventures any longer to assert that the art of writing was invented subsequent to the Mosaical age (Ewald, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, p. 64 sq.); but it is questioned whether the Hebrews were acquainted with that art. Such a doubt proceeds from erroneous ideas concerning the condition of this people, and concerning the civilization necessarily imparted to them in Egypt. The reality of this civilization is proved by indubitable testimony. It is said that a work of such extent as the Pentateuch was beyond the means of the primitive modes of writing then existing. But various testimonies, not merely in the Pentateuch itself, but also derived from other sources, from the period  immediately subsequent to that of Moses, prove that a knowledge of the art of writing was widely diffused among the Hebrews (comp. Jdg 8:14).

If there were any knowledge of this art, its application would entirely depend upon the particular circumstances of a given period. Some writers seem to entertain the opinion that the materials for writing were yet, in the days of Moses, too clumsy for the execution of larger works. This opinion is refuted by the fact that the Hebrews became acquainted, just in the Mosaical period, with the use of very good materials for writing, such as papyrus, byssus, parchment, etc. (comp. Herodotus, v. 58). There are, indeed, mentioned in the Pentateuch some more solid materials for writing, such as tables of stone (Exo 24:12; Exo 31:18; Exo 34:1, etc.); but this does not prove that in those days nothing was written except upon stone. Stone was employed, on account of its durability, for specific purposes. SEE WRITING.

The arguments on which the authorship of the Pentateuch is denied to Moses are, it will be perceived, wholly of an internal character (except that noticed above, and the one drawn from 2Ch 34:14 sq.). They have varied considerably with the taste and the information of those who urged them. There are some which were advanced very confidently a generation ago, but now are scarcely mentioned. But of those which have been urged with greatest confidence and plausibility, and still continue to be so, we believe the following to be the chief:

(1.) The supernatural character of much of the book — namely, the miracles and prophecies occurring abundantly in the history. This really is the great objection, even in many minds which have not been fully aware that it was so; and they have therefore been propping up their opinion with other arguments, that would never have had much of even apparent solidity and strength if they had been destitute of this foundation. But this objection need not be discussed in this article, for it concerns the entire Bible. SEE MIRACLE; SEE PROPHECY.

(2.) The alleged inaccuracies and impossibilities in the history, even apart from the miracles with which it is interspersed. This is a line of argument which has in general been found very difficult to manage; and in connection with which, therefore, there has not been very much attempted by learned and cautious writers. It has, however, recently attained to a temporary prominence and importance by the writings of bishop Colenso. The  particular instances are not of a nature which really requires much consideration, though the most important may be briefly noticed.

(a.) The vast increase of Jacob's descendants in Egypt, and the difficulty as to the proportion between the whole number of them and that of the first- born. On these and some other matters, SEE NUMBERS.

(b.) The chronological difficulty that the census was not taken till the second month of the second year of the Exodus, while yet the tabernacle is represented as having been finished a month sooner, and the silver used in its construction as having been obtained by a poll-tax of half a shekel on occasion of the census being taken. In this there is nothing very puzzling; for it is evident that before the formal and exact census, in the course of which all the names were written down, there was a preliminary enumeration of the people, by which a close approximation was made to their number; and if the payment of the poll-tax did not take place earlier or was not superseded as unnecessary on account of the superabundance of voluntary offerings, which the people needed to be restrained from bringing, there could be no difficulty in finding those who would advance the money in the certainty of speedy repayment.

(c.) The other chronological difficulty, that such a multitude of events are crowded into the short space between the death of Aaron on the first day of the fifth month of the last year of the wandering and the delivery of the prophetic message in Deuteronomy on the first day of the eleventh month. A calm examination, however, will show that they are not so crowded as has been supposed. Yet no doubt there was a marvelous concentration of interest and hastening of the course of Providence during those six months of grace and power manifested on behalf of the young faithful generation of Israelites who were to enjoy the blessings of their redemption from the house of bondage and to take possession of the Land of Promise. In like manner our Lord hints that events may be crowded and carried forward with marvelous rapidity when the glory of the latter day is to be ushered in, and when he is to come again (Mat 24:22).

(d.) The difficulties connected with the extent to which the sacrifices and other Levitical institutions were set up and kept up ill the wilderness. But the very letter of the law many a time shows that these institutions were not meant to be set up till the people entered the Land of Promise; and at other times the intention is at least doubtful. The difficulties are unspeakably diminished When we take into account the sin of the people in  refusing to go forward after the report of the unbelieving spies, and the semi-excommunication or suspension from Church privileges for the rest of the forty years under which in consequence they were laid (comp. Jos 5:4-9).

(e.) The blank in the narrative for the thirty-eight years during which that unbelieving generation were dying out; so that the suspicion has been expressed that this space of time is fabulous, and that either vastly less than forty years elapsed between the Exodus and the conquest of Ganaan, or else that the most of that period was spent, not in the desert properly so called, but on the eastern side of the Jordan, in a protracted struggle with the kingdoms of Sihon and Og. Without giving attention to this fancy, we confine ourselves to the blank of thirty-eight years in the history, which we regard without any of the surprise and suspicion which the critics have exhibited. Had the Pentateuch been an ordinary history, it might have had much to tell of these thirty-eight years, and of the manner in which the Israelites contrived to spend the time and to support themselves; but since it is a theocratic history, an account of the progress in the kingdom of God and in the manifestation of his way of mercy to his people, a blank occurs, because there was little or nothing to tell during these years of suspended privileges. Such periods of protracted silence occur also in the history of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and remarkably in the four hundred and thirty years of the sojourn in Egypt. If we go beyond the Pentateuch, we believe that the same explanation is to be given of the silence in reference to the period after the end of Joshua's administration, the long periods between those critical times in which the Lord raised up judges to save his people, the seventy years of captivity in Babylon, the eighty years or thereabouts between Zerubbabel and Ezra, and the four hundred years between the Old-Testament Scriptures and the New.

(f.) The assumed difficulties of supporting so large a multitude in the desert, and of their setting out so suddenly and moving so rapidly, the impossibility of their entire mass assembling at the Tabernacle-door (as is incorrectly alleged to be the meaning of numerous passages), and kindred arithmetical objections, we here pass over, as they have been repeatedly and amply refuted, and many of them are noticed elsewhere in this Cyclopaedia.

(3.) There is one striking fact lying on the face of the record-the only important fact, as we believe, to which advocates for the disintegration of  the Pentateuch can point as seeming to favor their views of a plurality of authors; and that is the fact, above referred to, which Astruc noticed so clearly — the use of two names for the Divine Being, ELOHIM and JEHOVAH, in the Authorized Version usually “God” and “LORD.” Astruc's theory of composition was very coarse and mechanical, that there were two documents, known by the barbarous titles of the Elohistic and the Jehovistic documents respectively, by two writers who confined themselves each to one of these names; and that from these two narratives and ten documents of small comparative importance the book of Genesis was strung together by Moses. Enormous labor, great stores of learning, and unbridled fancy have altered Astruc's theory over and over again, in order to elaborate some satisfactory hypothesis by which to account for the existence of our present Pentateuch; but no fact of essential importance has been added; and no proof has been furnished of the truth of his assumption that the use of these two names of God is due to the existence of two different authors. The only circumstance that can even appear to be a proof of this assumption is a text, of which, accordingly, abundant use has been made in this controversy (Exo 6:2-3):, “And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I [am] Jehovah: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by [the name of] God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them.”

The opinion is of some antiquity, though it first obtained prominence and currency through the labors of these critics, that according to this statement the very vocable Jehovah was unknown until the revelation made of it to Moses; and the older interpreters who held this opinion supposed further that, whenever the name Jehovah had been used in earlier passages, this was done merely by anticipation — a supposition which may be unnecessary, yet which is by no means very strange or unnatural. But the explanation given for near a century by one class of writers is that this text comes from the pen of the Elohist, and expresses his belief; and that where the name occurs in earlier passages, these have not been written by him, but by another author, who did not notice or did not recognize this distinction in the divine names. This explanation, however unsupported by evidence, is at least perfectly intelligible, if we adopt the exploded hypothesis of independent historians, each with his own document, and perhaps each ignorant of the document composed by the other; but it raises some curious questions in relation to the final editor who could patch together such incongruous materials, questions all the more troublesome according to the fashionable hypothesis of supplementers. Bishop Colenso, indeed, like some others, speaks very  candidly of the Jehovist writing as he did, “without perceiving, or at least without FEELING VERY STRONGLY [his own capitals] the contradiction thereby imported into the narrative; “of which procedure he gives two parallel instances in the Jehovistic additions the Elohistic accounts of the creation and of the flood. But in these two cases the contradiction has not been perceived to this hour by many who have examined the matter as carefully as they could (and this with the advantage of having the alleged discovery pointed out to them), and whose capacities for judging are as fair as those of their neighbors, and whose conviction it is that no contradiction exists except in the imagination of these critics; whereas, in the case of the habitual use of the name Jehovah, in the age of the patriarchs, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the assertion that this name was kept a secret till that age was over, the man who combined these two things in one narrative, without seeing the flat contradiction which he introduced into it, must have been destitute of reason and commonsense.

On other occasions these critics are ready enough to affirm that the later writer (or writers) suppressed and altered portions of the original document, in order the better to fit his own story into it; and they allege that his operation has been achieved so neatly that most people have never suspected it, nor can detect it for themselves even after the sagacity of the critics has discovered it and pointed it out. But in this particular instance these critics insist on so interpreting a text, which is especially prominent and important as giving the account of the revelation of this name Jehovah from God and its introduction into use among men, that it shall be a contradiction in terms to a multitude of passages which the editor or supplementer had indulged himself by inserting amid the comparatively brief original details. The truth is given in the common old interpretation of Exo 6:2-3, that not the syllables, but the signification of the name JEHOVAH SEE JEHOVAH (q.v.), as the independent, unchangeable fulfiller of his promises to the patriarchs, was revealed to Moses at the bush. It is true that these merely natural perfections would fail to inspire right feelings towards God, if they were to be contemplated as in a state of separation from moral perfections. But the two classes of attributes are inseparable in actual reality, and probably were never even conceived of by the, Hebrew mind as separable, if we judge from the line of argument in the closing chapters of Job. Certainly Exo 34:6-7 makes an express claim for the inclusion of moral perfection, as well as omnipotence and unchangeableness, in the signification of the name Jehovah — “Jehovah, Jehovah El, merciful and gracious, longsuffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping  mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear [the guilty]; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth [generation].” The concluding words of this proclamation of the name Jehovah, by him to whom it belongs, make the truth apparent that the name Jehovah could not come out in its full and true meaning except through many successive generations, and therefore could not be properly known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but became known to their descendants as they observed the unchanging course of his special providence towards Israel. Once more, it must never be forgotten that God Almighty and Jehovah are not names sharply opposed to one another, much less diametrically so, as is necessarily assumed in the interpretation of Exo 6:3 which we have been controverting; on the contrary, so far as it goes, God Almighty is identical with or included under Jehovah, giving the meaning of it incompletely, as the Almighty God, yet failing to bring into view that he is unchangeable besides. Nevertheless, it is only by its incompleteness that El Shaddai differs from Jehovah; there is no antagonism between them, there is a mere difference of degree.

The children of Israel were now to think of their God as Jehovah, almighty, and also unchangeable, as he was manifesting himself to be; whereas it was his almightiness alone of which their fathers had had experience. In the age of those patriarchs, therefore, and considering the imperfect view which they could have of him, so far from El Shaddai and Jehovah being opposing titles, they were practically one and the same; precisely as a cube appears to be merely a square when we take notice of its length and breadth, but cannot observe its thickness. To bring this out is to lay bare the real source of many critical misconceptions about the text which has been so greatly misused, and about the patriarchal history. Accordingly the identity of these two names in the patriarchal times is explicitly enough asserted in Gen 17:1, “And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, Jehovah appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am El Shaddai, walk before me, and be thou perfect.” The critics concede that this text belongs to the fundamental document, as they call it; and since it makes their interpretation of Exo 6:3 impossible, and in fact dashes to pieces their hypothesis of a distinction of writers according to the use of the one divine name or the other, they have been driven to make a purely conjectural alteration of the text, and to read Elohim instead of Jehovah. This is a desperate expedient, which involves the confession that the facts of the case are fatal to their hypotheses, and that the editor or  supplementer must be supposed to have made an intentional change of the divine name, which they detect and correct, as they restore the original word Elohim. How desperate the resource is may be understood the better when we recollect that they make the Jehovist or the editor such a simpleton as to be unaware that Exo 6:3 pours contempt upon all his previous interpolations; and yet they imagine him so wary or cunning here as to strike out the original word Elohim in order to make the better piece of patchwork by substituting his favorite title Jehovah.

The text, as it stands, is conclusive evidence that in the days of Abraham El Shaddai was identical with Jehovah so far as the signification of this latter word had then been unfolded; that is, there was then no difference in the subjective apprehension of the meaning of the two names.: But the objective significance of Jehovah was always deeper and fuller; and at the time of the mission of Moses they came to be distinguished in the apprehension of the church, for the element of unchangeableness was seen to be involved in the name Jehovah. From the time of the worship of the golden calf, and of the gracious pardon granted to the people at the intercession of Moses, to whom a new revelation of the name and character of the covenant God was vouchsafed, the moral characteristics of the name Jehovah came out more prominently still, as in Exo 34:6-7, already quoted. Yet it is only in the times of the New Testament that its full .meaning has been unfolded (that is, as fully as it can be in this world), in connection with the person and work of him who is Jehovah Tsidkenu, “the LORD our Righteousness;” who said of himself, “Before Abraham was, I am;” and who in the epistle to the Hebrew Christians has this nane applied to him and explained of him, that he is Jehovah, who in the beginning laid the foundation of heaven and earth, and who shall continue the same when they shall be folded together like a garment, the Savior who has offered one sacrifice for sins forever, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday and to-day and forever.

Undoubtedly, as we have intimated above, there are questions more easily asked than answered in relation to the use of these two names, Jehovah and Elohim, in the history previous to the time of Moses. Possibly those who uphold the common belief that Moses wrote the whole of it have passed over these difficulties too lightly, or have spoken too confidently of having fully explained them; if so, their fault has really been that they have attempted more than they were under any obligation to attempt. Elohim and Jehovah have their differences, yet vastly more numerous and  important are their points of agreement; and it may be too much to assert that, whenever they were used, there was retained a consideration of their distinctive meanings. This much, however, we may affirm with perfect confidence-and in doing so we go beyond any requirement which can fairly be made by those who differ from us in this discussion — to a considerable extent it is very easy to show in Genesis, as well as in the later books of Scripture, that these two divine names are employed with an intentional discrimination — Elohim expressing more generally the Deity, and Jehovah expressing God in covenant with Israel, possessed of every perfection, and using it for the good of his people, as his character is manifested in their history. If so, the use of the one or the other name is no proof at all of a difference of authorship.

We may moreover assert that the hypothesis of the modern critics entirely breaks down as to this text (Exo 6:3), the solitary passage in which they can even profess to find countenance given to their views; and owing to the importance which they cannot but attach to it, we have examined it at considerable length, in order to show that it is in fact opposed to them as soon as it is rightly interpreted. Moreover, when they press this argument in favor of different writers in the Pentateuch, on account of the different names for the Divine Being, they will find that they need to account for a great deal more than the use of the two words Jehovah and Elohim. There is also El, which Knobel, commenting on this text, reckons an intermediate title; and there is the occasional use of Elohim with a plural verb, as to which Gesenius and others have coarsely suggested that it may be an indication of polytheism left in the syntax of the language; there is also the variation of the presence or the absence of the article with Ei'ohimn; and there is the use of another divine title, Adonai. He who reads the history of Balaam, and observes the use of the three names Elohim, El, and Jehovah, will find difficulty in believing that these are not intentionally varied by the same writer; as indeed the critics in general do not hesitate to ascribe the entire section to the Jehovist. He who notices how Jacob and Israel are used in the closing chapters of Genesis to denote the same individual will probably hesitate to assert that a difference of names for a person, be he man or God, ought to be accounted for by the difference of authorship. This has certainly been affirmed to some extent by Colenso; but his statement will perhaps not meet with more support from those who agree with him in his leading principles than his other statement that Jehovah was a name invented about the age of Samuel and David. We have already noticed that the interpretation of Exo 6:3, to which the critical school are  committed, assumes that the word Jehovah was till then unknown; whereas there is varied evidence for its earlier existence. Vaihinger indeed makes the further concession that in the original document, “as is confessed by almost all,” the name Jehovah is employed by Jacob a few times (Gen 28:21; Gen 32:10; Gen 49:18). SEE GOD.

(4.) Yet the admission that the name Jehovah was not unknown before the age of Moses, and the consequent impossibility of making the different divine names a proof of diversity of authorship. and of drawing confirmation of this opinion from Exo 6:3, are not felt by the critical school at the present day to be so damaging as they would have been felt by their predecessors, or as they will generally be felt by those who take an impartial view of the arguments. For the tendency now is to rest more upon an alleged difference of style and thought, which is discovered by comparing the fundamental document uith the additions. This line of reasoning necessitates a considerable amount of acquaintance with the language, and also of patient drudgery, even to understand its meaning, and to estimate its value, however roughly; it is therefore impossible to discuss it within our limits here. We have no hesitation, however, in expressing our opinion that it is excessively wearisome in the process, and so vague in the results that these are likely to be estimated very much in conformity with the previous inclinations of the investigator. One of the so- called critical commentaries may present long lists of words peculiar to the different authors; but the imposing array of evidence is collected by a vicious reasoning in a circle. The existence of different authors is inferred from the existence of different sets of words and phrases; but in order to arrive at the grouping of these words and phrases into different sets, the continuous narrative needs to be cut up in the most minute and fantastic manner among different authors. It is a mere assumption, and antecedently improbable in a high degree, that a chapter in Genesis or Exodus is a patchwork of authorship such as modern criticism pronounces it to be; but if we are to believe this on the evidence of the differences in the language and composition of the different parts, we need something more than the assertions of the critics to make us believe that these parts really are different; for all the time they appear to uninitiated readers to be one consecutive and homogeneous piece of writing. It is impossible for the critics to establish any clear usus loquendi without tearing the book often into shreds, and pronouncing passages, and single verses, and clauses of verses, and individual words to be interpolations or alterations; a process  which insures its own condemnation. In fact, if there were no other difficulty, he who has attempted the humble task of following the statements of the critics on the subject must have been often brought to a stand-still by their disagreement as to the several writers to whom their respective gifts of sagacity lead them to ascribe the individual passages. On the other hand, there is abundant evidence of diversity of language in passages which they are pretty well agreed in ascribing to the same author, as well as of remarkable similarity of language in writings which they generally attribute to different authors.

In this argument from style in general, as in the previous one from the use of the divine names in particular, we have no object to gain by pressing our reply to the uttermost, and, as some might think, unduly. We might grant that there are traces of a difference of style, and yet deny that this fact is any evidence whatever of difference of authorship; and we should be supported in our denial by the common experience and opinion of men respecting parallel cases in literature, where no theological bias comes in to warp their judgment. The language of Deuteronomy furnishes by far the best case for the critics, although in it (as above detailed) we see many traces of the author of the rest of the Pentateuch; but there are certain peculiarities which we have no difficulty ill attributing to the oratorical character of the book. If anything of the same kind call be established as to certain classes of passages in the first four books, in their genealogical and legislative portions respectively, or in passages involving prophetic announcements, etc., no allegation is simpler or fairer than that the style is intentionally varied with the change of subject; in fact, many of the words paraded in lists of differences of style are naturally or even unavoidably connected with the subjects treated in only a few places. If there were evidence from some other quarter that these passages proceeded from certain different authors, modern criticism could then make use of the peculiar language with propriety in confirmation of its disintegrating hypotheses; but to do so at present is to indulge in the vicious reasoning in a circle of which we have already spoken, or to fall into another great logical vice, by begging the question, in affirming that difference of subject- matter is evidence of difference of authorship. In short, we call admit the existence of differences of style and language only within limits so narrow that they appear as nothing in comparison with the exaggerated estimate that is often given of them. In so far as comparatively trifling differences do exist, while we are ready to suggest reasons in the subject-matter (or even  in external circumstances as the use of “Sinai” or “Horeb”) which may often explain them, we feel and acknowledge no incumbent duty to do so. For we hold it to be the indefeasible right of every author to change his style and language under the influence of motives which may be inappreciable to his readers; and we hold that this right is exercised by every author in proportion to the strength and freshness of his own individual mind, or of the mind of the age and nation to which he belongs, the variety and compass of the work with which he is engaged, the wealth of the language which he uses, or the culture he has received, and the demand of the human spirit that occasionally changes shall occur, for no other reason than to give it rest from the monotony of a mechanical uniformity.

Before leaving the consideration of this argument, it may be right to notice how it combines in itself so many great fallacies; for it involves also a mistake as to the point which is to be proved. The critics profess to prove that Moses is not the writer of the Pentateuch; and, on their own showing, the evidence of this fact is that there are in it traces of different authors. But this is nothing to the purpose, unless they also prove that these authors were subsequent to the time of Moses. So learned and cautious and orthodox a theologian as Vitringa long ago gave expression to the opinion that Moses may probably have made use of written documents prepared by the patriarchs and safely handed down among the Israelites, till he arose to collect and arrange and supplement them; but if we shrink from asserting that written instruction was given to the patriarchal Church, we must all the more exalt the strength and value of primeval tradition-tradition upon the very subjects which are handled in the book of Genesis. There is, then, no difficulty whatever in maintaining that, before the time of Moses, there existed a body of instruction as to the dealings of God with men, which was known and preserved ill the family that had been called to the knowledge of his grace; and the language of that instruction must have assumed a certain fixity of form, whether we affirm or deny that it was written out and laid up in the repositories of the patriarchs. When Moses began to write the Pentateuch, there was already, therefore, a religious and historical phraseology. Grant everything that the critics imagine they have established, and their original document might be nothing more than the pre-Mosaic writing or tradition; while the editor or supplementer might be Moses himself: or if there be traces of several hands and several styles, nevertheless, as Astruc himself believed, these may be no more than traces  of the different (but not contradictory or untrustworthy) rills of patriarchal tradition, which he was guided to collect into one channel, and send down to posterity in the clear, continuous, consistent stream of the narrative in Genesis. The influence of these varieties of style might tell upon him still as he continued his labors in the composition of the other books. This is all a supposition; but it is a supposition vastly more modest and credible than that of the modern disintegrating criticism; and it admits everything which that criticism can even profess to have established by the most microscopic study of the language, and the most merciless vivisection of the subject of its experiments.

(5.) An objection to the unity of the authorship has been drawn from the repetitions which occur in the book; for it is said that these are a sure mark of at least two authors, whose accounts have been thrown into one. This objection presented a more formidable aspect as long as the hypothesis was in favor according to which there were two independent and continuous histories, the Elohistic and the Jehovistic, afterwards combined: the occurrence of double narratives gives an air of plausibility to this supposition. But as soon as we recollect that this hypothesis has been generally abandoned for another, according to which there is only one original continuous history, subsequently interpolated, the objection loses any prima facie verisimilitude that it ever possessed: for why should an editor burden and disfigure the clear narrative as it lay before him, by interpolating accounts which had the look of repetitions, unless the events did really occur a second time? The attempt to assign one of these double accounts to the Elohist and the other to the Jehovist breaks down from time to time by the confession of the critics themselves. Here we introduce a remark in explanation of one or two passages in which a repeated account is given of the same event: this repetition in fill, instead of a mere reference which we might prefer to make, is of a piece with the simple and uninvolved style of thought which characterizes the very structure of the Hebrew language. In cases where our Western languages would express a complex proposition by a compound sentence, in which the subordinate members are introduced and kept in their true pilce by means of relative pronouns and conjunctions, the Hebrew uses simple sentences, and unites his statements by his favorite conjunction “and,” to which translators assign a great variety of meanings, according to the exigencies of the moment. By this method, however, his gain in simplicity is counterbalanced by a loss of terseness; since he has often to repeat at length what might have been  noticed only incidentally and by an allusion. This mode of dealing with sentences is extended to paragraphs, and has given rise to the occurrence of titles prefixed to sections, and of repeated statements, which misled the earlier disintegrating critics into the belief that here they had evidence of fragments which were afterwards brought together with little care or judgment; whereas their successors have thrown aside the hypothesis of fragments, having become more wary by experience. The clearest case of such repetition is the Elohistic account of creation (Gen 1:1 to Gen 2:3), and the Jehovistic account (Gen 2:4-25). But it is surely plain enough that the second is an incomplete account, implying that the general comprehensive narrative had gone before; and throwing in additional information of a particular kind in reference to the creation of man, the creature formed in God's image and placed under his moral government, as briefly stated in the first chapter, but now stated more fully in this introduction to the history of redemption, which throws the account of the creation of other beings more into the background.

Besides, it is an entirely erroneous philosophy which prompts men to find fault with the unity or truthfulness of a history because it contains narratives bearing a resemblance to one another. Such repetitions (if this be the correct designation of these narratives) are recorded in all histories of individuals and communities; indeed otherwise experience would not be the great means of disciplining and training mankind. To take no wider range, instances of such repetition, certainly not less remarkable than anything in the books of Moses, occur in other parts of the Bible, including the life of our Lord; and they cannot be escaped, unless by a universally destructive criticism.

Occasionally the charge is put differently in this way: instead of the allegation that there are two varying reports of one transaction, which have been erroneously understood of two different events, it is alleged that two accounts occur of what is confessedly the same matter, and that these accounts are varying or even contradictory; and the explanation given of these alleged contradictions is that they proceed from two different authors. The instances are obtained sometimes by comparing the first four books of Moses among themselves, and sometimes by comparing them with Deuteronomy.

(a.) Those of the former class, contradictions within the compass of the first four books, are of little importance, and demand no lengthened  consideration in this condensed statement. Such are the two accounts of creation, to which we have had occasion to refer as illustrating the different aspects of a narrative according as logical connection or the chronological principle of arrangement predominates; the names of Esau's wives. SEE AHOLIBAMAH.

A favorite instance is the account in Exo 33:7-11 of the tabernacle of the congregation which Moses was to pitch “without the camp, afar off from the camp,” whereas the ordinary accounts place the tabernacle inside the camp, at its very center. But there really is no serious difficulty in the way of accepting the common explanation that this was a preliminary tabernacle, used till the regular tabernacle was constructed, and placed outside the camp at the time when the people were saved by the special intercession of Moses, when on the point of being destroyed for the sin of the golden calf: an opinion which has been slightly modified by those who think it was the private tent of Moses which received this honor at the time when he had declined the Lord's offer to make of him a great nation n the ruin of apostate Israel. Yet the simplest view would be to Exo 33:5-11 as one speech of the Lord to Moses, the whole being in the Hebrew in the future or unfinished tense; except Exo 33:6 parenthetically relates, in the perfect tense, how the people humbled themselves according to the opening part of the Lord's directions, whereas the rest of these directions may never have been carried out after the intercession of Moses was completed.

(b.) Passing to the other class of alleged contradictions, in which the four earlier books are placed on the one side and Deuteronomy on the other, as if it belonged to a later age than the latest of them, and betrayed certain differences of belief and sentiment, it deserves to be noticed that a great deal used to be said of the historical contradictions; whereas the wisest of the destructive critics now concede that nothing can be made of these, especially when the oratorical nature of Deuteronomy is considered, and weight is assigned to the form which narratives would assume in a discourse whose object was exhortation. The only cases which require consideration are those in which the laws as laid down in Deuteronomy are said to be different from some in the three preceding books. We admit willingly that there are modifications, within certain comparatively narrow limits, and easily enough explained by recollecting that forty years elapsed between the covenanting in Horeb and that in the land of Moab (Deu 29:1 [28:69 in Hebrew]); the latter also taking into consideration the new circumstances of the people when they should be  settled in their own land. The chief instance of this is the permission to the people to eat flesh anywhere throughout the land of Canaan, if only they took care to pour out the blood upon the earth (Deu 12:15-16; Deu 12:20-25), for the previous law upon the subject in Leviticus 17 became physically impracticable as soon as the people ceased to live together in the camp. In connection with this there is the account of the priests' share of the sacrifices (Deu 18:3), which differs from the account in Leviticus and Numbers of the parts of sacrifices which were assigned to the priests. But this statement of “the priests' dues from the people,” is in addition to “the offerings of the Lord made by fire,” which have already been mentioned Deu 18:1; it is a plausible conjecture that these additional dues were assigned to them on purpose to indemnify them for losses sustained by the repeal of the law in Leviticus 17, and in fact there seems to be a reference to this particular statute in Deuteronomy in the account of the evil conduct of Eli's sons in 1Sa 2:13-16.

There is also another class of cases in which the alleged contradiction is probably the result of our ignorance, and can be at least hypothetically met and removed. A good example of this is the difficulty alleged to exist in Deu 15:19-20, as if it gave to the people at large the right to eat the firstlings of their flocks and herds in holy feasts, whereas the earlier legislation had given these firstlings to the priests (Num 18:15-18); for it is plain that the author of Deuteronomy did not contemplate any contradiction of the divine lot in this arrangement, to which he had made repeated allusion already (Deu 12:6; Deu 12:17; Deu 14:22-23). But, in point of fact, nothing is simpler than to understand the law in Deuteronomy as addressed to the collective Israelites as if they were a single individual, in “thou shalt sanctify . . thou shalt eat,” etc., leaving the priests and the rest of the people to adjust their respective duties and privileges by the well-known directions of the law in Numbers; and along with this to remember that the earlier law naturally suggests that the priests should make a sacred feast of the first-born animals given to them, at which feast none could more reasonably be expected to be guests than the persons to whom these animals had belonged.

The most important allegation of contradiction between the legislation in the middle books and that in Deuteronomy has reference to the three great orders in the theocracy — the prophetic, the priestly, and the kingly. The first and last must be passed over almost in silence. It is enough to say that the law of the kingdom in Deuteronomy 17 need not surprise any one who  observes that the king is represented as the mere viceroy of Jehovah, himself the true and everlasting King of Israel, according to Exo 15:18; Num 23:21; and who recollects the promises that kings should spring from the loins of the patriarchs Abraham and Jacob (Gen 17:16; Gen 35:11), and along with this the notice that kings had not yet arisen in Israel although they did exist in Edom (Gen 36:31). But certain passages, already considered in so far as they refer to the privileges of the priests, are brought into connection with others in such a way as to suggest the inference that a vast revolution had taken place in the position of the priests and Levites before the time when the author of Deuteronomy published his work, in which his object was to prop up the tottering institutions of his country.

The two orders of priests and Levites had come to be confused, the Levites having been all admitted to priestly functions; and the tithes having been seldom paid, they had sunk into poverty, and the scheme of this writer was to compound the matter by securing to them a certain share in these tithes, which were henceforth to be spent in religious feasts at the Temple, where the Levites should have a place along with the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow. This representation must be characterized as a mass of unsupported suppositions. That the Levites might often be poor is probable enough, but there is no appearance of general starvation, such as would have been their condition if their chief support had been this share in the sacred feasts. There is no need to puzzle ourselves about the tithe which was spent at these feasts (Deu 12:6-7; Deu 12:11; Deu 12:17-19, and especially Deu 14:22-29 and Deu 26:12-15), which plainly was quite distinct from the other tithe given to the tribe of Levi as a compensation for having no share in the territorial allotment of Canaan (Num 18:20; Num 18:32). This is rightly expressed in the apocryphal book of Tobit (Tob 1:6-7), though in the original it is still more distinct than in our A.V.: “But I alone went often to Jerusalem at the feasts, as it was ordained to all the people of Israel by an everlasting decree, having the first-fruits and tenths of increase, with that which was first shorn; and them gave I at the altar to the priests the children of Aaron. The first tenth part of all increase I gave to the sons of Aaron, who ministered at Jerusalem; another tenth part I sold away, and went and spent it every year at Jerusalem.” This hypothesis of a radical change in the position of the priests and Levites, at that late age to which the composition of Deuteronomy is assigned, has been supposed to be supported by two expressions — “the priests the Levites” (Deu 18:1), or “the priests the sons of Levi”  (Deu 21:5), as if it established the conclusion that all the Levites were represented in this book as performing priestly functions. But; “the priests the Levites” would be a proof of this only if it meant “the priestly Levites,” which it does not; its only fair interpretation is “the Levitical priests.” Yet it is true that the offices of the Levites and of the priests did come very close to one another, the ministry of the altar being the sole exclusive prerogative of the latter.

Hence it is no wonder that in Deuteronomy, which is, comparatively speaking, the people's book of the law, it is the points of agreement which are noted rather than the points of difference; especially since none of the regulations as to sacrifices are given anywhere in the book. The close connection of the priests and the rest of the Levites is taken for granted throughout the whole law, as in the first dedication of the entire tribe, on occasion of the worship of the golden calf (Exo 32:25-29), and this representation of them in united privileges or duties continues through the book of Joshua (in which the critics are forced to imagine absurdly that the same confusion of the two orders appears, see Jos 3:3) down to the arguments in Mal 2:1-9 and in Hebrews 7. Where, as in the earlier books of the law “the sons of Aaron” are mentioned very naturally, while he was living and they were literally his sons; after his death, and as a new generation of priests was growing up, it was equally natural to alter the expression into in “the priests the sons of Levi,” or “the Levitical priests.” This name was peculiarly appropriate after the revolt of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram: it reminded the Levites of their high honor as God's servants, although the service of the altar was restricted to a single family among them (see Num 16:7-10; Num 17:3; Hebrews]); and it summoned the whole congregation of Israel to give honor in spiritual things to this tribe which had so few political advantages, and whose fortunes had undergone a marvelous revolution since the time when Jacob pronounced a curse upon them. SEE LEVI and SEE LEVITE.

(6.) It is alleged that in the Pentateuch there are distinct traces of any age later than that of Moses; and certainly, if this can be established, it follows either that Moses did not write the book, or else that it has been interpolated.

(a.) There are certain geographical names, particularly Bethel and Hebron, which are supposed not to have been in use till the Israelites took possession of the land, and so displaced the ancient names Luz and Kirjatharba. But there is no real difficulty in such cases, nor in another, for  which SEE HORMAH. The only truly difficult case is that of Dan (Gen 14:14, comp. Jdg 18:29). Even of this several plausible solutions can be offered, and there is another mode of dealing with it to which we have adverted. SEE DAN.

(b.) There are sentences which are said to bear evidence that they were not written by Moses. There are but one or two of these that lend much plausibility to this argument; and deferring what may be said of them, if this be true, till we revert to the case of Dan just noticed, we reply at present that we see no serious difficulty in the way of attributing them to the pen of Moses. It is written (Exo 16:35), “And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited: they did eat manna until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan.” There is no reason why Moses should not have written all this, except on the unwarrantable and erroneous assumption that we make the middle books of the Pentateuch a kind of journal written at the time when each event occurred, and not even remodeled before the work was finished. Just as little do we see difficulty in attributing to Moses himself the observation (Num 12:3), “Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.” It is no more a difficulty than that David should plead his righteousness and integrity as he often does; or Paul speak of his not being a whit behind the very chiefest apostles, and of his laboring more abundantly than all of them; or that John should habitually name himself “the disciple whom Jesus loved,” or “the beloved disciple.” Such language is due to the fact that the “holy men of old,” who “spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,” thought so little of themselves when they were writing, that they were equally ready to tell the defects of their own character and the graces bestowed on them by God, when it was fitting that such a statement should be made. In this particular case there was such a fitness, as well to show plainly how unreasonable the conduct of the brother and sister of Moses was, as to give point to the statement that Jehovah himself suddenly interposed to vindicate his faithful and honored servant, who might probably never have spoken in his own vindication.

(c.) A phrase has been thought to betray a more recent date than the age of Moses, when something is said to have occurred the results of which continue “unto this day.” But this is a phrase which by no means necessarily indicates any great length of time; which indicates occasionally a pretty short time, so far as we can infer from the probabilities of the case; and which sometimes must be understood of a short time, as in Jos 6:25 (for it is frequent in Joshua as well as in the Pentateuch, and the same inference has been drawn in regard to both these books), “And Joshua saved Rahab the harlot alive, and her father's household, and all that she had; and she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day.” In fairness we mention one passage which may occasion serious difficulty to some minds, and we know of no other; it is Deu 3:14 : “Jair the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi, and called them after his own name, Bashan-havoth-jair, unto this day.” Yet even in this case, referring to an interval of no more than a few months, we ought to recollect how difficult it is to change the name of an entire district; if Jair succeeded in this at first, securing for the first six months both his position in the land and his new name for it by way of a memorial of himself, there was less risk of the name being subsequently lost. In general, as well as in reference to this particular case, we ought to take into account the marvelous revolution — religious, social, and political — which was involved in the transition occurring at the end of the life and administration of Moses, from the patriarchal period of wandering to that of Israel settled in the Land of Promise; and though a few months might be all that separated two events in point of time, yet within that little period were compressed transactions more remarkable and important than are often witnessed in whole ages of common history. At such a turning- point in the history of the Church and people of Israel, it does not surprise us that Moses should use the expression that events occurred and changes were ushered in which continued “unto this day.”

(d.) The quotation from “the book of the wars of the Lord” (Num 21:14-15), and others apparently of a similar kind in the same chapter, are thought to be incredible in a contemporary history, though natural enough in a writing of a later age, when these snatches of song might become valuable as the testimony of eye-witnesses. But there is no evidence of the assumption that it was the historian's object to secure corroboration of his statements. While there is no obligation lying on us to assign the reason why these snatches of hymns appear where they do, the supposition is natural enough that Moses incorporated them in his history as specimens of the new spiritual life which had been wakened in the young generation of Israelites, and as evidences that God had indeed visited them with his grace, and was fitting them to take up the mission which had fallen from the unworthy hands of those who, in Exodus 15, “sang his praise,” but “soon forgat his works” (Psa 106:12-13; comp. the  anticipations, Exo 15:14-16, with the fulfillments, Num 21:21-35; Num 22:2-4, etc.).

(e.) It is scarcely worth while to dwell upon certain incidental expressions which have been said to betray the hand of a later writer. Such are, that “the Canaanite was then (אָז) in the land” (Gen 12:6; comp. 13:7); and Joseph's words, “I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews” (Gen 40:15). We select one case on account of its seeming greater strength. In Lev 18:28 the Israelites are warned to avoid the practices by which the land of Canaan had already been polluted, “that the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations that were before you;” from which it is inferred that this was not written till after the Canaanites had been exterminated. But in truth the Hebrew language is very poorly furnished with tenses. Had this speech been in Latin, and had the future perfect been used — “that the land may not spue you out, in your defiling it, as it shall have spued out the nations that were before you” — a translation of it into Hebrew could not have been better expressed than in the present words of the Hebrew Bible. This really future meaning we take to be the meaning of the passage. Yet if the literal past time is insisted on by any one, there are two explanations, either of which is easy enough: either the sentence received its present form of expression as Moses revised his work, after the people of Sihon and Og had been destroyed; or else the very repulsiveness of the metaphorical language was meant to teach that the strength of the Canaanites was only apparent, that the land had already vomited them forth, and that they lay upon its surface as a loathsome incumbrance which must now be removed by Israel.

(7.) Scientific Objections. — Many who are able to explain to their satisfaction most of the above difficulties, are still troubled by others of a different class resting on alleged contradictions between the language of the Mosaic books and the facts of science. For instance, the Adamic creation is declared to contradict the conclusions of geology, inasmuch as the period required for bringing the crust of the earth into its existing condition must have included countless centuries, and not a brief period of six days. In the same way it is first argued that the scriptural narrative involves a universal deluge, and then, this meaning being assumed, that such a deluge, with all its accompanying circumstances, as recorded in Genesis, cannot have taken place without a miracle wholly stupendous. A third objection is grounded on the chronology of the Bible, and on the asserted fact that the duration of man upon the earth has extended to a  period at least exceeding four or five times the 6000 years allotted to him in the Pentateuch. A fourth objection is directed against the descent of all mankind from a single pair, and their primary migrations as recorded by Moses. It assumes that the physical peculiarities distinguishing the various races of the world are the results of a difference in species, not of a variety caused by the influence of climatic, physical, and social circumstances. There are many other minor objections of a more frivolous character, such as that which insists on fixing upon the word “firmament,” in Gen 1:6, the sense of a permanent solid vault, and then pointing out the opposition in which such an idea stands to astronomical science; or such as the objection against the language of Joshua (Jos 10:12), which is sufficiently answered by reference to the language of any modern almanac, and by the observation that if the ancient Scriptures had been written in the terminology of science, they would have been simply unintelligible to the generation to which they were first given. But these captious difficulties are of little weight compared to the four objections mentioned above, all of which touch questions of the gravest importance. In addition to those general elements of error which We shall proceed to point out as belonging in common to all the modern objections urged against the Pentateuch, there are some considerations bearing specially upon this scientific class of difficulties to which it is necessary briefly to call attention.

(a.) In regard to theories of the creation and the deluge, it is necessary to distinguish with the utmost possible precision between the language of Scripture and any private interpretations of it. When the question is propounded whether the six days of the Adamic creation were literal days of one revolution of the globe, or were successive periods of time; when it is asked whether the deluge was partial or universal, the particular opinion which each man may form must not be fastened on the scriptural language, as if it were its necessary and only admissible interpretation. It must be acknowledged that opinions on either side are equally consistent with a devout acceptance of the inspired Word. Experience teaches the necessity of this caution; for the lessons of geology have compelled us to separate between the creation and the beginning of Gen 1:1, and the Adamic creation of the later verses, and to allow the existence of untold periods between them. Now that we are accustomed to this, we find that the change of interpretation has not put any dishonor on the text, and we must feel that what has happened in regard to one verse may happen in regard to others. Modern science has undoubtedly proved the pre-existence of  immense geological periods; but we are quite able to reconcile them with the scriptural narrative. SEE CREATION.

(b.) The same observation applies to the question of the deluge, and however these questions may be finally solved, the apologist for the Pentateuch must stand by the text of Scripture, and, whether he believes in a partial deluge or a universal deluge, must not confuse the infallible text with his own fallible interpretation of it. SEE DELUGE.

(c.) Lastly, the state of the controversy relative to the antiquity of man and the origin of races illustrates with peculiar force the crude and incomplete state of all scientific investigation on these subjects, and the consequent rashness of all conclusions drawn from them unfavorable to the authority of the Pentateuch. For the rationalistic attack is urged from two contrary directions, and is supported by arguments directly contradictory to each other. On the one side we are told that the distinctive physical peculiarities of different human races are so deep, so irremovable, that they must be considered to indicate diversity of species, and not simply varieties of one species; that no climatic and social influences call explain them; that consequently the races of men must have been created distinct, and the scriptural narrative which asserts the common descent of all mankind must be unworthy of credit. SEE PREADAMITES.

On the other side, the very fact of an intelligent creation is called into question, on the ground that there are in the world no distinctions of fixed species, but only variations so mutable that all existing differences are the mere result of natural causes. The inevitable conclusion from such premises is that all forms of life whatever are self-developed out of one common primal form, and the idea of creation becomes superfluous, for the original monad can scarcely be considered as less self-developed than all the forms which have sprung from it. That such is the natural tendency of Mr. Darwin's theory of the origin of species we have a most impartial witness. “This theory, when fully enunciated, founds the pedigree of living nature upon the most elementary form of vitalized matter. One step farther would carry us back, without greater violence to probability, to inorganic rudiments, and then we should be called upon to recognize in ourselves, and in the exquisite elaborations of the animal and vegetable kingdoms, the ultimate results of mere material forces, left free to follow their own unaided tendencies” (Sir W. Armstrong at the British Association at Newcastle, 1863). On the one side we are called to believe in the evidence of fixed species; and on the other side to believe in their non-existence. We are asked to believe that all living beings  whatever, including man himself, have descended from original monads, and at the same time to believe that the races of mankind cannot have descended from a common parentage. The two arguments are totally irreconcilable and till something like congruity can be introduced into our scientific theories, it is premature even to suggest their possible contradiction to the inspired authority of the Pentateuch. SEE SPECIES, ORIGIN OF.

(8.) Alleged Moral Incongruities in the Pentateuch. This class of objections is so indefinite in its nature as to make explanation and refutation, in the brief space of an article, equally difficult. They are all founded on the sufficiency of the human consciousness to pass a verdict on the propriety or impropriety of certain acts ascribed to God in the Pentateuch. The form they take is, however, more subtle than this. Certain acts imputed to God are contrary to the ideal which the human mind frames of the Deity; therefore it is argued that God cannot have done them, and consequently the books which attribute them to him cannot declare the truth, cannot be divinely inspired. The ideal God in the human consciousness is made the standard whereby revelation is measured. For instance, it is argued that the destruction of the Canaanitish nations by the sword of Israel under express command was a cruel deed, at which the human mind revolts, and which it is impossible to believe that God could have done. Objections of the same kind are urged against the Mosaic law, both against its positive enactments, as in the case of slavery, and against the minute and apparently trivial character of many of its details; and then, in support of these allegations, a contrast is drawn between the spirit of the Mosaic code and the spirit of the Gospels and epistles. It will be enough for the present purpose to reply that these objections rest almost entirely, and derive any force they may appear to have, from a misapprehension of the facts of the case, and an erroneous estimate of the Mosaic code on the one side, and of the Christian dispensation upon the other. A candid examination of the whole narrative shows that the destruction of the Canaanitish nations was purely a judicial act, wherein God was the judge and the people of Israel the authorized and divinely appointed executioners. It will be found that the utmost care was taken to present the whole transaction in this specific aspect, and that this act of judicial severity stood in the sharpest possible contrast to the general tenor of the Mosaic law, which was tolerant, gentle, and singularly beneficent both in spirit and in. its positive provisions. Looking at the Pentateuch, we find in  it the same law of love which we find in the Gospels; and looking at the Gospel, we find in God the same attribute of punitive justice which stands conspicuous in the law. The argument may be carried farther, for the analogy between God's character and dealings in providence and his dealings in grace, as contained in the book of revelation, is close and exact in the highest degree. On this whole question Bp. Butler's immortal Analogy may safely be referred to. SEE CANAANITE.

Into the details of these various objections — critical, historical, scientific, and moral — this article will not farther enter, partly from considerations of space, partly because many of them will be found treated in other articles of this Cyclopaedia. The student is referred, for their more formal refutation, to the almost voluminous literature which the controversy of the last few years has called into existence. With reference to the special form they have assumed in the Critical Examination of the Pentateuch, by Dr. Colenso, bishop of Natal, every information will be found in recent publications. The general questions of scholarship will be found ably handled in the Examination of Dr. Colenso's work, issued by the late lamented Dr. M'Caul. Reference may also be usefully made to Colenso's Defections Examined (Lond. 1863), by Dr. Benisch, a Jewish doctor. For the numerical calculations, the student should refer to the Exodus of Israel (Lond. 1863), by Rev. P. R. Birks, in which the are submitted to a searching examination. For questions of topography, a smaller work, entitled The Pentateuch and the Gospel (Lond. 1865), by Prof. Porter, of Belfast, the well-known author of Five Years in Damascus, Murray's Hand-book of Syria, etc., will be found full of valuable information.

V. Literature. — Some of this has been cited above; and much of the remainder is contained in general introductions or commentaries on the whole of the O.T., or on the several books of Moses. We mention here only the critical and exegetical works on the whole Pentateuch separately. De Bafiolas, פֵּרוּשׁ (Mantua, 1476-80, fol., and later); Aben-Ezra, סֵפֶר הִיָּשָׁר (Naples, 1488, fol., and often later in various formns and combinations); Fostat R. C.], Commentanus [includ. other books] (Hisp. 1491, etc., 4to); Sal. Jizchaki (Rashi), פֵּרוּשׁ הִתּוֹרָה (Salonica, 1515, fol., and very often since [last ed. Berlin, 1867]; in Latin, by Breithaupt, Gotha, 1713, 4to; in German, by Haymann, Bonn, 1833, 8vo; by Dukes, Prague, 1838, 8vo); Bechor-Schor, פֵּרוּשׁ (Constant. 1520, fol.); Aboab, פֵּרוּשׁ (ibid. 1525, 4to; Ven. 1548; Cracow, 1587; Wilmend. 1713, fol.); D'Illescas, אַמְרֵי נֹעִם (Constant. 1540, 4to, and since); Achai, סֵפֶר שְׁאֶלְתּוֹת (ed. Chaffi, Ven. 1546; ed. Berlin, Dyckerfurt, 1786, fol.); Jehudah ben-Isaac, עֶשְׂרַים וְאִרְבִע (ed. Jechiel ben-Jekuthiel, Venice, 1547, 4to); Oleaster [R. C.], Commentarius (Olyssop. 1556, etc., fol.); Elijah of Mantua, אוֹר עֵינִים (Cremona, 1557, 8vo); Bresch, חוּמִשׁ (ibid. 1560, fol., and later); Ferus [R. C.], Enarrationes (Colon. 1572-4, 2 vols. 8vo); Abrabanel, פֵּרוּשׁ הִתּוֹרָה (Ven. 1579, 1604, fol.; ed. Van Bashuysen, Hanau, 1710, fol.; also Amst. 1768-71, 4 vols. 4to); Arvivo, תִּנְחוּמוֹת אֵל (Salonica, 1583, fol.); Galesinus [R. C.], Commentarius (Romans 1587, 4to); Alscheich, תּוֹרִת משֶׁה (Constant. 159-, fol., and often later); Chytraeus, Narrationes (Vitemb. 1590, fol.; also in Opp. i); Capponus [R. C.], Commentarius (Ven. 1590, fol.); Junius, Explicationes (L. B. 1594, 1602; Genev. 1609, 5 vols. 4to); Marbach, Hypomnemata (Argent. 1597, 2 vols. 4to); Pelargus, Comnmentaria (Lips. 1598-1609, 5 vols. 4to); Aretius,-Commentarii (Bern 1602 8vo); Mos. Albelda, דָּרִשׁ משֶׁה (Ven. 1603, fol.); Abigdors, פֵּרוּשׁ (Cracow, 1604, 4to); Heerbrand, Commentarius (Tubing. 1609, fol.); Ainsworth, Annotations [includ. Psalm and Cant.] (Lond. 1612-23, 6 vols. 4to, and later; also in Dutch, Leoward. 1690, fol.); Leyser, בְּאֵר מִיַם חִיַּים (Venice, 1614; Frankfort-on-the- Main, 1707, fol.); Schick, זְרַיעִת יַצְחָק (Prague, 1615, 4to); A Lapide, In Pentateuchum (Antw. 1616, 4to); Drusius, Commentarius [on difficult passages] (Franeck. 1617, 4to); Marius [R. C.], Comnmentarius (Colon. 1621, fol.); Bonfrere [R. C.], Commentarius (Antw. 1625, fol.); Cromm [R. C.], Illustrationes (Lovan. 1629, 1630, 2 vols. 4to); Alstedt, Adnotationes (Herb. 1631, 1640, 8vo); Jansenius [R. C.], Commentarius (Lovan. 1639, 1641, 1644; Par. 1649, 1661, 4to); Heilpron, אִחֲבִת צַיּוֹן (Loblin, 1639, fol.); Polno, אוֹר תּוֹרָה (ibid. 1642, 4to); Walther, Spongia Mosaica (Norib. 1642, 4to); Novarinus [R. C.], Notce (Veron. 1646, 2 vols. fol.); Amato, שֶׁמֶן הִטּוֹב (Venice, 1657, fol.); Varenius, Decades (Rost. 1659-75, 4 vols. 4to); Cregut, Revelator Arcanorum (Genev. 1666, 4to); Osiander, Commentarius (Tubing. 1676-8, 5 vols. fol.); Aboab [Israelite], Parafrasis (Amst. 1681, fol.); Ising, Exrercitationes (Regroin. 1683, 4to); Von der Hardt, Ephemerides Philologicce (Helmst. 1693, 8vo; 1696, 4to); Kidder, Commentary (Lond. 1694, 4to); Loria, פֵּרוּשׁ הִתּוֹרָה (Herbon, 1694, 8vo); Calvoer, Gloria Mosis (Gosl. 1696, 4to); Sterring, Animadversiones (Leovard. 1696; L. B. 1721, 4to); Athar, אוֹר הִחִיַּים (Venice, 17-, 4to, and often); Dupin, Notce (Par. 1702, 2 vols. 8vo); Frassen [R. C.], Disquisitiones (ibid. 1705, 4to); Meir (Rashbam), פֵּרוּשׁ עִל הִתּוֹרָה (Berl. 1705, 2 vols. 4to; Amst. 1760, 2 vols. 4to); Gensburg, נִפְתָּלַי שְׁבִע רָצוֹן (Hamb. 3708, fol.); Tomaschov, פֵּרוּשׁ (Venice, 1710, fol.); Chefez, מְלֶאכֶת מִחֲשֶׁבֶת (ibid. 1710, fol.); Engelschall, Betracht. aus d.f. B. Mosis (Dresd. 1712, 2 vols. 8vo); Helvig [R. C.], Qucestiones (Colossians 1713, fol.); Marck, Analysis Exegetica (L. B. 1713, 4to); Zarfati, צוּ דְּבִשׁ (Amst. 1718, fol.); Bender, Auslegung (F. ad M. 1721, 4to); Israel ben-Isaac, חֲכָמַים אֲסַיפִת (ed. Brod, Offenb. 1722, 8vo; ed. Spetz, ibid. 1802, 4to); Landsberger, שׁוֹמֵר אמֵוּנַים (Offenb. 1724, 4to); Abulefia, עֵוֹ חִיַּים (Smyrna, 1726, fol.) also יוֹסֵ לֶקִח (ibid. 1731, 4to); A. Cattenburgh [R. C.], Syntagma (Amst. 1737, 4to); Jameson, E: — position (Lond. 1748, fol.); Ostrob, בָּרוּךְ מַבָּנַים אָשֵׁר (Zolk.. 1749, fol.); Alexander-Susskind, מַצְנֶפֶת בִּד (ibid. 1757, fol.); Tismenitz, בֵּית חַלֵּל (Fr. ad 0. 1760, 4to); Jacob ben-Pesach, זֶרִע יִעֲקוֹב (Fiirth, 1765, 4to); Robertson, Clavis (Edinb. 1770, 8vo); Bate, Notes [includ. other books] (Lond. 1773, 4to); Moldenhauer, Commentarius (Quedlinb. 1774-5, 2 vols. 4to); Nacho mani, זֶרִע שַׁמְשׁוֹן (Mantua, 1778, fol.); Mendelssohn, Auslegung (Berl. 1780-3, 5 vols. 8vo); Dathe, Note (Hal, 1781, 1792, 8vo); Jehudah ben-Eliezer, יְהוּדָה מַנְחִת, also Nicola, פֵּרוּשׁ (ed. Nunez- Vaez, Leghorn, 1783, fol.); Di Trani, נַמּוּקֵי הִחוּמִשׁ (ed. Asulai, Leghorn, 1792, fol.); Marsh, Authenticity of Pentateuch (Lond. 1792, 8vo); Gaab, Erklar. (Tub. 1796, 8vo); Wittmann, Annotationes (Regensb. 1796, 8vo); Jones, Authenticity of Pentateuch (Lond. 1797, 8vo); Zebi, חֶמֶד צְבַי (Fiirth, 1798, 4to); Solestein, Erakl'r. (Berl. 1800, 8vo); Asulai, נִחִל קְדוּמַים (Leghorn, 1800, 4to); Faber, Horce Mosaicce (Lond. 1801, 1818, 2 vols. 8vo); Vater, Commentar; Jacob ben-A , פֵּרוּשׁ (ed. liBr, Zolk. 1806, 4to; ed. Rosenthal, Hanov. 1838, 4to); Griesinger, Ueb. d. Pentateuch (Stuttg. 1806, 8vo); Schrenzel, נֹעֵם מְגָדַים (Lemb. 1807, 1859, 4to); Morison, Introductory Key (Perth, 1810, 8vo); Meyer, Apologie d. Pentat. (Sulzb. 1811, 8vo); Kelle, Wurdigung d. Mos. Schrift. (Freib. 1811 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); also Anmerk. (ibid. 1817-21, 2 vols. 8vo); Neumann, Ansicht d. Pentat. (Bresl. 1812, 4to); Fritzsche, Aechtheit d. Pentat. (Leipz. 1814, 8vo); Aharon hal-Levi, חַדּוּשַׁים, etc. (Leghorn, 1815, fol.); Herbst, De Pentat. auctore et editore (Elvee, 1817, 8vo); Calvo, מַנְחָה חֲדָשָׁה (Rodelh. 1818, 8vo); Heiden., heim, חוּמִשׁ מְאוֹר עֵינִים (ibid. 1818-21, 8vo); Venusi, Uebersetz. (Prag. 1820, 4to); Aharon ben-Elia, פֶתֶר תּוֹרָה (ed. Kosegarten, Jena, 1824, 4to); Horwitz, פָּנַים רָפוֹת (Ostrob. 1824, 8vo); Pfister, Betracht. (Wurzb. 1828, 8vo); Hagel, Apologie d. Moses (Sulzb. 1828, 8vo); Schumann, Notce (vol. i, Lips. 1829, 8vo); Hartmann, Plan d. funf B. Mosis (Rost. 1831, 8vo); Heinemann [Israelite], Commentar (Berlin, 1831-3, 5 vols. 8vo); Blunt, Principles of the Mos. Writings (Lond. 1833, 8vo); Wittman, Pentat. Mosis (Lat. and Ger. Landsb. 1834, 8vo); Ranke, Unters. iib. d. Pentat. (Erlang. 1834-40, 2 vols. 8vo); Stahelin, Unters. ub. d. Pentat. (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1835, p. 461 sq.); Hengstenberg, Authentie d. Pent. (Berl. 1836-9, 2 vols. 8vo; tr. Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); also Die Biicher Mosis (Berl. 1841, 8vo; tr. Edinb. 1845, 8vo); Thistlethwaite, Sermons (Lond. 1837-8, 4 vols. 12mo); Landauer. Form d. Pentat. (Stattg. 1838, 8vo); Meklenburg, Ctommeniarius (Lips. 1839, 8vo); Caunter, Poetry of the Pentat. (Lond. 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); Arnheim [Israelite], Anmerk. (Glogau, 1839-41, 5 vols.; ibid. 1842, 7 vols. 8vo); Bertheau, Die sieben Gruppen, etc. (Gott. 1840, 8vo); Herxheimer [Israelite], Erklar. (Berl. 1841,1850,1865, 8vo); Thiersch, De Pentat. versione Alex. (Berol. 1841, 8vo); Thornton, Lectures (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Kurtz, Einleit. in d. Pentat. (Leipz. 1844, 8vo); Baumgarten, Commentar (Kiel, 1844, 2 vols. 8vo); Von Gerlach, Commentary (from the Germ. Edinb. 1846, 8vo); Graves, Lectures (Lond. 1846, 8vo); Homberg, הִכּוֹרֵם (Vienna, 1846-9, 8vo); Havernick, Introduction (from the German, Edinb. 1850, 8vo); Weiss [Israelite], Investigation of the Pentat. (Dundee, 1850, 8vo); Hamilton, Defence of the Pentat. (Lond. 1851; N. Y. 1852, 8vo); Sorensen, Inhalt u. Alter d. Pentat. (pt. i, Kiel, 1851, 8vo); Sanguinetti, חֲדָשָׁה עיֹלָה (Leghorn, 1853, fol.); Riehm, Gesetzgebung Mosis (Leips. 1854. 8vo); Macdonald, Introduction to the Pent. (Edinb. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo); E. Wilna [IsraeliteJ, Commentarius (ed. Fischel, Berl. 1862, 8vo); Mosar, דִּע מָה (Berl. 1862, 8vo); Wogue, Traduction et Notes (Par. 1862 sq., 5 vols. 8vo); Bartlett, Character and Authorship of the Pentat. (in the Bibliotheca Sacra, Apr. and July, 1863, July and Oct. 1864); De Solla, Vocabulary of the Pent. (Lond. 1865, 8vo); Hirsch, Erlaut. (vol. i and ii, F. ad M. 1867 sq. 8vo); Smith (W. J. D.), Authorship, etc., of the Pentateuch (vol. i, Lond. 1868, 8vo); Norton, The Pentateuch in relation of Jewish and Christian Dispensations (Lond. 1870, 8vo); Margoliouth, Poetry ofthe Pentateuch (ibid. 1871, 8vo). See also Rawlinson's refutation (in Aids to Faith, a reply to the Essays and Reviews, repub. N. Y. 1852, Essay 6) of the rationalistic attacks upon the Pentateuch by Bunsen and others. Bishop Colenso's Pentateuch and Joshua Examined (Lond. 1852, 8vo) was answered by numerous books and reviews (see a list in Low's Publisher's Circular, Jan. 15, 1863). SEE COMMENTARY.

## Pentecost[[@Headword:Pentecost]]

             (Πεντηκοστή, scil. ἡμέρα), the second of the three great annual festivals on which all the males were required to appear before the Lord in the national sanctuary, the other two being the feasts of Passover and Tabernacles. It fell in due course on the sixth day of Sivan, and its rites, according to the Law, were restricted to a single day. The most important passages relating to it are Exo 23:16; Lev 23:15-22; Num 28:26-31; Deu 16:9-12; The following article treats of its observance from a Scriptural as well as Talmudical point of view. SEE FESTIVAL.

I. Name and its Signification. —

1. This festival is called, חִג הִשָּׁבוּעוֹתἑορτὴ ἑβδομάδων, solemnitas hebdomadorum, the Festival of Weeks (Exo 34:22; Deu 16:10; Deu 16:16; 2Ch 8:13), because it was celebrated seven complete weeks, or fifty days, after the Passover (Lev 23:15-16).

2. For this reason it is also called in the Jewish writings חִג חֲמַשַּׁים יוֹם, the feast of the fifty days (comp. Joseph. War, 2:3, 1), whence ἡμέρα τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς (Joseph. Ant. 3:10, 6; Tob 2:1; 2Ma 12:32; Act 2:1; Act 20:16; 1Co 16:8), the Latin Pentecoste, and our appellation Pentecost.

3. חִג הִקָּצַיר, the festival of the harvest (Exo 23:16), because it concluded the harvest of the later grains.

4. יוֹם הִבַּכּוּרַיםἡμέρα τῶν νέων, dies prinitivorum, “the day of first- fruits” (Num 28:26), because the first loaves made from the new corn were then offered on the altar (Lev 23:17), for which reason Philo (Opp. 2:294) calls it ἑορτὴ πρωτογεννημάτων.

5. It is also denominated in the postcanonical Jewish writings חִג הָעֲצֶרֶת, the festival of conclusion (or assembly), i.e. of the Passover, or simply עֲצֶרֶת (comp. πεντηκοστή, ἣν ῾Εβραῖοι Α᾿σαρθά [—=עצרתא, Chaldee] καλοῦσι, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο πεντηκοστήν, Joseph. Ant. 3:10, 6; Mishna, Bikkurim, 1:3, 7, 10; Rosh Ha-Shana, 1:2; Chagiga, 2:4), because it completed what the Passover commenced; and 6, מִתִּן תּוֹרָתֵנוּ

זְמִן, the time of the giving of our law, because the Jews believe that on this day the revelation of the Decalogue took place.

II. The Time at which this Festival was celebrated. — The time fixed for the celebration of Pentecost is the fiftieth day reckoning from “the morrow after the Sabbath” (מַמָּחַרִת הִשִּׁבָּת) of the Passover (Lev 23:11; Lev 23:15-16.) The precise meaning, however, of the word שׁבתin this connection, which determines the date for celebrating this festival, has been matter of dispute from time immemorial. The Boethusians (ביתוַסים) and the Sadducees in the time of the second Temple (Mishna, Menachoth, 10:3), and the Karaites since the 8th century of the Christian era (comp. Jehudah Hedessi, Eshkol Ha-Kopher, Alphab. p. 221-224; ibid. p. 85 b), took תה שׁךנ its literal and ordinary sense as denoting the seventh day of the week, or the Sabbath of creation), and maintained that the omer was offered on the day following that weekly Sabbath which might happen to fall within the seven days of the Passover, so that Pentecost would always be on the first day of the week. But against this it is urged

(a.) that Jos 5:11, where ממחרת הפסחis used for thממהרת הש, shows that תה שךנ Lev 23:11 denotes the first day of Passover, which was to be a day of rest.

(b.) The definite article in תה השךנ Lev 23:11 refers to one of the preceding festival days.

(c.) The expression תה שךס also used for the Day of Atonement (Lev 23:32), and the abstract שבתון is applied to the first and eighth days of Tabernacle Lev 23:39) and the Feast of Trumpets (Lev 23:24), as well as to week (Lev 23:15; Lev 25:8); hence this use of σάββατον in the N.T. (Mar 16:2; Mar 16:9; Luk 18:12).

(d.) According to Lev 23:15 the seventh week, at the end of which Pentecost is to be celebrated, is to be reckoned from this Sabbath. Now, if this Sabbath were not fixed, but could happen on any one of the seven Passover days, possibly on the fifth or sixth day of the festival, the Passover would in ,the course of time be displaced from the fundamental position which it occupies in the order of the annual festivals.

(e.) The Sabbatic idea which underlies all the festivals, and which is scrupulously observed in all of them, shows that the reckoning could not have been left to the fifth or sixth day of the festival, but must have fixedly begun on the 16th of Nisan. Thus, each Sabbath comes after six even periods: 1. the Sabbath of days, after six days; 2. the Sabbath of months, after six months; 3. the Sabbath of years, after six years; 4. the Sabbath of Sabbatic years, after six Sabbatic years; 5. the Sabbath of festivals = the Day of Atonement, after six festivals, SEE JUBILEE, THE YEAR OF; hence the Sabbath of weeks, i.e. Pentecost, must also be at the end of six common weeks after Passover, which could be obtained only by reckoning from the 16th of Nisan, as this alone yields six common weeks; for the first week during which the counting goes on belongs to the feast of Passover, and is not common.

(f.) The Sept. (ἡ ἐοπαύριον τῆς πρώτης), Josephus (τῇ δευτέρᾷ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡμέρᾷ, Ant. 3:10, 5, 6), Philo (Opp. 2:294), Onkelos (מבתר יומא טבא), and the synagogue have understood it in this way, and most Christian commentators espouse the traditional interpretation. SEE SABBATH. Still more objectionable is the hypothesis of Hitzig (Ostern und Pfingsten, Heidelberg, 1837), defended by Hupfeld (De primit. et vera festorum ap. Hebraeos ratione, 2:3 sq.), and Knobel (Die Bacher Exodus und Leviticus, Leipsic, 1857, p. 544), that the sacred or festival year of the Hebrews always began on the Sabbath, so that the 7th (i.e. the first day of Passover), the 14th (i.e. the last day of the festival), and the 21st of Nisan, were always Sabbath days; and that the omer was offered on the 22d day of the month, which was “the morrow after the Sabbath” terminating the festival, and from which the fifty days were reckoned (Hitzig, Hupfield), or that the omer was offered on the 8th of the month, which was also “the morrow after the Sabbath,” thus preventing it from being post festum (Knobel). It will be seen that this hypothesis, in order to obtain Sabbaths for the 14th and 21st days of the month as the beginning and termination of Passover, is always obliged to make the religious new year begin on a  Sabbath day, and hence has to assume a stereotyped form of the Jewish year, which as a rule terminated with an incomplete week. Now this assumption —

1. Is utterly at variance with the unsettled state of the Jewish calendar, which was constantly regulated by the appearance of the disk of the new moon, SEE NEW MOON, DAY OF THE;

2. It rudely disturbs the weekly division, which is based upon the works of creation, and which the Jews regarded with the utmost sanctity; and

3. It is inconceivable that the Mosaic law, which, as we have seen, regarded the Sabbatic division of time as so peculiarly sacred that it made it the basis of the whole cycle of festivals, would adopt a plan for fixing the time for celebrating the Passover whereby the last week of almost every expiring year is to be cut short, and the hebdomadal cycle, as well as the celebration of the Sabbath, interrupted (comp. Keil, On Lev 23:11).

It is therefore argued that the Jews, who during the second Temple kept Pentecost fifty days after the 16th of Nisan, rightly interpreted the injunction contained in Lev 23:15-22. The fiftieth day, or the feast of Pentecost, according to the Jewish canons, may fall on the 5th, 6th, or 7th of Sivan (סיון), the third month of the year from the new moon of May to the new moon of June (Rosh Ha-Shana, 6 b; Sabbath, 87 b). The fifty days formally included the period of grain-harvest, commencing with the offering of the first sheaf of the barley-harvest in the Passover, and ending with that of the first two loaves which were made front the wheat-harvest, at this festival. It was the offering of these two loaves which was the distinguishing rite of the day of Pentecost. SEE WAVE-OFFERING.

III. The Manner in which this Festival was Celebrated. — Not to confound the practices which obtained in the course of time, and which were called forth by the ever-shifting circumstances of the Jewish nation, we shall divide the description of the manner in which this festival was and still is celebrated into three sections.

1. The Pentateuchal Ordinances. — The Mosaic enactments about the manner in which this festival is to be celebrated are as follows: On the day of Pentecost there is to be a holy convocation; no manner of work is to be done on this festival (Lev 23:21 : Num 28:26); all the able-  bodied male members of the congregation, who are not legally precluded from it are to appear in the place of the national sanctuary, as on the Passover and Tabernacles (Exo 23:14; Exo 23:17; Exo 34:23), where “a new meat-offering” (חדשה מנחה) of the new Palestine crop (Lev 23:16; Num 28:26; Deu 16:10), consisting of two unleavened loaves, made respectively of the tenth of an ephah (=about 3.5 quarts) of the finest wheaten flour (Exo 34:18; Lev 23:17), is to be offered before the Lord as firstlings (בכורים, Exo 34:17), whence this festival derived its name, the day of firstlings (יוֹם בכורים, Num 28:26).

In the above prescription, the phrase “Out of your habitations,” מַמּוֹשְׁבֹתֵיכֶם (Lev 23:17), has been explained by the Jewish canons, which obtained during the time of the second Temple, as an ellipsis for מארוֹ מושבותיכם (Num 15:2), the land of your habitations, i.e. Palestine (Menachoth, 77 b, with Mishna, Menachoth, 8:1); hence the rendering of Jonathan b. — Uzziel's reputed Chaldee paraphrase, מאתר מותבניכין, the Sept. ἀπὸ τῆς κατοικίας ὑμῶν, from your habitation, in the singular referring to Palestine; the remark ofRashi, ממושבתיכם ילא מחוצה לארוֹ, from where your habitations are, but not from any part outside the land, i.e. of Israel; Rashban (ad loc.) and Maimnonides (lad Ha - Chezaka, tilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin, 8:2), who rightly distinguish between ממושבתיכםas here used, and בכל מושבתיכם (Exo 12:20; Exo 35:3; Lev 3:17; Lev 7:26; Lev 23:3; Lev 23:14; Lev 23:21; Num 35:29), the former referring to injunctions which are binding in the land of Canaan, and the latter to commandments to be observed in every place, or wherever the Jews might reside; comp. Rashban on Lev 23:16. The rendering of the Vulgate (ex omnibus habitaculis vestris), therefore which is followed by Luther (aus alien eueren Wohnungen), inserting בכל, is most arbitrary and unjustifiable. Inadmissible, too, is the opinion of Calvin, Osiander, George (Die altenjiud. Feste, p. 130, 273), etc., that two loaves were brought out of every house, or at least out of every town, based upon the plural ממושבתיכם; or the view of Vaihinger (in Herzog's Real-Encyklopdie, s.v. Pfingstfest, p. 479) and Keil (on Lev 23:17), that the plural משבתיכםis used in a singular sense, i.e. from one of your habitations (comp. Gen 8:4; Jdg 12:7; Neh 6:2; Ecc 10:1); and denotes that the two loaves are to be offered from the habitations of the Israelites, and not from those prepared for the sanctuary or from its treasury.

With the two loaves were to be offered as a burnt offering seven lambs of the first year and without blemish, one young bullock, and two lambs, with the usual meat and drink offerings; while a goat is to be offered as a sin- offering, and two lambs of the first year are to be offered as a thanksgiving or peace offering (Lev 23:18-20). The peace-offering, consisting of the two lambs with the two firstling loaves, are to be waved before the Lord by the priests. These are to be additions to the two loaves, and must not be confounded with the proper festival sacrifice appointed for Pentecost. which is given in Num 28:27, and which is to be a burnt- offering, consisting of two bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs. That these two passages are not contradictory, as is maintained by Knobel (Comment. on Lev 23:15-22), Vaihinger (in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. s.v. Pfingstfest, p. 480), and others, but refer to two distinct sacrifices, viz. one to accompany the wave-loaves (על הלחם, Lev 23:18), and the other the properly appointed sacrifice for the festival (Num 28:27), is evident from the context and design of the enactments in the respective passages, as well as from the practice of the Jews in the Temple, where both prescriptions were obeyed.

Hence Josephus (Ant. 3:10, 6), in summing up the number of animal sacrifices on this festival, says that there were fourteen lambs, three young bullocks, and three goats; the number two, instead of three goats, being manifestly a transcriber's error, as Vaihinger himself admits. When Vaihinger characterizes this statement of Josephus “as one of the many exegetical and historical blunders of the Jewish historian,” and maintains that it does not follow from Menachoth, 4:2, we can only say that — 1. Josephus simply describes what he himself saw in the Temple, and what every ancient Jewish document on the same subject declares; 2. The third section of the very Mishna (Menachoth, 4:3) which Vaihinger quotes distinctly declares, “The kind of sacrifice prescribed in Num 28:27 was offered in the wilderness, and the kind of sacrifice enjoined in Lev 23:18 was not offered in the wilderness; but when they [i.e. the Israelites] entered the Promised Land they sacrificed both kinds; “see also the Gemara on this Mishna (Babylon Menachoth, 45 b), where the reasons are given more largely than in the Mishna why the former kind of sacrifice was not offered in the wilderness; and 3. Maimonides, who also summarizes the ancient canons on these two  kinds of sacrifices for Pentecost, shows beyond the shadow of a doubt how these enactments were carried out in the second Temple. He says: “On the fiftieth day, counting from the offering of the omer, is the feast of Pentecost and Azereth (צצרת). Now on this day additional sacrifices are offered, like the additional ones for new moon, SEE NEW MOON, THE FEAST OF, consisting of two bullocks, one ram, and seven lambs, ail of them being burnt-offerings, and of a goat as sin-offering. These are sacrifices ordered in Num 28:26-27; Num 28:30, and they constitute the addition for the day. Besides this addition, however, a new meat-offering of two loaves is also brought, and with the loaves are offered one bullock, two rams, and seven lambs, all burnt-offerings; a goat for a sin-offering, and two lambs for a peace-offering. These are the sacrifices ordered in Lev 23:18. Hence the sacrifice on this day exceeds the two daily sacrifices by three bullocks, three rams, fourteen lambs (all these twenty animals being a burnt-offering); two goats for a sin-offering, which are eaten; and two lambs for a peace-offering, which are not eaten” (lad la- Chezaka, Hilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin, 8:1).

Besides the two loaves with their accompanying sacrifices, and the special festival sacrifices which were offered for the whole nation, each individual who came to the sanctuary was expected to bring, on this festival, as on Passover and the feast of Tabernacles, a free-will offering according to his circumstances (Deu 16:10-12), a portion of which was given to the priests and Levites, and the rest was eaten by the respective families, who invited the poor and strangers to share it. It would seem that the character of this festival partook of a more free and hospitable liberality than that of the Passover, which was rather of the kind that belongs to the mere family gathering. In this respect it resembled the feast of Tabernacles. The Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow were to be brought within its influence (Deu 16:11; Deu 16:14). The mention of the gleanings to be left in the fields at harvest for “‘the poor and the stranger,” in connection with Pentecost, may perhaps have a bearing on the liberality which belonged to the festival (Lev 23:22). At Pentecost (as at the Passover) the people were to be reminded of their bondage in Egypt, and they were especially admonished of their obligation to keep the divine law (Deu 16:12).

2. The Post-exilian Observance of this Festival. — More minute is the information in the non-canonical documents about the preparation of the sacrifices and the observance of this festival in and before the time of  Christ. The pilgrims went up to Jerusalem the day previous to the commencement of the festival, when they prepared everything necessary for its solemn observance; and the approach of the holy convocation was proclaimed in the evening by blasts of the trumpets. The altar of the burnt- sacrifice was cleansed in the first night-watch of the preparation-day, and the gates of the Temple, as well as those of the inner court, were opened immediately after midnight for the convenience of the priests, who resided in the city, and for the people, who filled the court before the cock crew, to have their burnt-sacrifices and thanksgiving offerings duly examined by the priests. When the time of sacrifice arrived, the daily morning sacrifice was first offered, then the festival sacrifices prescribed in Num 28:26-27; Num 28:30, while the Levites were chanting the Great Hallel (q.v.), in which the people joined; whereupon the congregation solemnly and heartily thanked God for the successful harvest, and the loaves of the new corn, with the accompanying sacrifices prescribed in Lev 23:18, were offered to the Lord. The two loaves for the wave-offering were prepared in the following manner: “Three seahs of new wheat were brought into the court of the Temple; they were beaten and trodden like all meat-offerings, and ground into flour, two omers of which were sifted through twelve sieves, and the remainder was redeemed and eaten by any one.

The two omers of flour, of which the two loaves were made, were respectively obtained from a seah and a half... kneaded separately and baked separately. Like all meat-offerings, they were kneaded and prepared outside, but baked inside the Temple, and did not set aside the festival, much less the Sabbath, so that they were baked on the day preceding the festival. Hence, if the preparation-day (ערב יום טוב) happened to be on a Sabbath, the loaves were baked on Friday (שבה ערב), and eaten on the third day after they were baked, which was the feast day.” They were leavened loaves according to the declaration of the law, and made as follows: “The leaven was fetched from some other place, put into the omer, the omer filled with flour, which was leavened with the said leaven. The length of each loaf was seven hand-breadths; the breadth, four hand-breadths; and the height, four fingers” (Maimonides, lad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin, 8:3-10, with Mishna, Menachoth, 6:6, 7; 11:2; 4:9). The two loaves thus prepared were then offered as wave-offerings, with two lambs, constituting the peace-offering, in the following manner: “The two lambs were brought into the Temple and waved together by the priest while yet alive, as it is written, ‘And he shall wave them... a wave-offering' (Lev 23:20); but if he waved each one separately, it was also valid, whereupon they  were slain and flayed. The priest then took the breast and the shoulder of each one (comp. Lev 7:30; Lev 7:32), laid them down by the side of the two loaves, put both his hands under them, and waved them all together as if they were one, towards the east side — the place of all wave offering — doing it forwards and backwards, up and down; but it was also valid if he waved each separately. Hereupon he burned the fat of the two lambs, and the remainder of the flesh was eaten by the priests. As to the two loaves, the high-priest took one of them, and the second was divided among all the officiating priests (המשמרות), and both of them were eaten up within the same day and half the following night, just as the flesh of the most holy things” (Maimonides, lad Ita-Chezaka, Hilchoth Tamidin U-Mosaphin, 8:11. See Mishna, Menachoth, v. 6; Joseph. Ant. 3:10, 6; War, 6:5, 3). After the prescribed daily sacrifice, the festival and the harvest sacrifice were offered for the whole nation. Each individual brought the free-will offering, which formed the cheerful and hospitable meal of the family, and to which the Levite, the widow, the orphan, the poor, and the stranger were invited. The festival in a minor degree continued for a whole week, during which time those who did not offer on the first day repaired their defects or negligence (Rosh Ha-Shana, 4 b). The offering of the first fruits also began at this time (Mishna, Bikkurim, 1:7, 10); and it was for this reason, as well as for the joyous semi-festival days which followed the day of Holy Convocation, that we find so large a concourse of Jews attending Pentecost (Acts 2; Joseph. Ant. 14:13, 14; 17:10, 2; far, 2:3, 1).

No occasional offering of first-fruits could be made in the Temple before Pentecost (Bikkurim, 1:3, 6). Hence probably the two loaves were designated “the first of the first-fruits” (Exo 23:19), although the offering of the omer had preceded them. The proper time for offering first- fruits was the interval between Pentecost and Tabernacles (Bikk. 1:6, 10; comp. Exo 23:16). SEE FIRST-FRUITS.

The connection between the omer and the two loaves of Pentecost appears never to have been lost sight of. The former was called by Philo, προεότριος ἑτέρας ἑορτῆς μείζονος (De Sept. § 21, v. 25; comp. De Decem Orac. 4:302, ed. Tauch.). He elsewhere mentions the festival of Pentecost with the same marked respect. He speaks of a peculiar feast kept by the Therapeutse as προεόρτιος μεγίστης ἑορτῆς sc. Πεντηκοστῆς (De Vit. Contemp. v. 334). The interval between the Passover and Pentecost was evidently regarded as a religious season. The custom has probably been handed down from ancient times, which is observed by the  modern Jews, of keeping a regular computation of the fifty days by a formal observance, beginning with a short prayer on the evening of the day of the omer, and continued on each succeeding day by a solemn declaration of its number in the succession, at evening prayer, while the members of the family are standing with respectful attention (Buxtorf, Syn. Jud 1:20, p. 440). According to the most generally received interpretation of the word δευτερόπρωτος (Luk 6:1), the period was marked by a regularly designated succession of Sabbaths, similar to the several successions of Sundays in our own calendar. It is assumed that the day of the omer was called δεύτερα (in the Sept., Lev 23:11, ἡ ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης). The Sabbath which came next after it was termed δευτερόπρωτον; the second, δευτεροδεύτερον; the third, δευτεροτριτον; and so onwards till Pentecost. This explanation was first proposed by Scaliger (De Emend. Temp. lib. 6, p. 527), and has been adopted by Frischmuth, Petavius, Casaubon, Lightfoot, Godwyn, Carpzov, and many others.

3. The Observance of this Festival to the Present Day. — This festival, like all the feasts and fasts ordained or sanctioned in the Old Test., is annually and sacredly kept by the Jews to the present day on the 6th and 7th of Sivan, i.e. between the second half of May and the first half of June. Thus, although, according to the law, the observance of Pentecost lasted but a single day, the Jews in foreign countries, since the Captivity, have prolonged it to two days. They have treated the feast of Trumpets in the same way. The alteration appears to have been made to meet the possibility of an error in calculating the true day (Lightfoot, Exercit. Heb. Act 2:1; Reland, Antig. 4:4, 5; Selden, De Ann. Civ. c. vii). It is said by Bartenora and Maimonides that, while the Temple was standing, though the religious rites were confined to the day, the festivities and the bringing in of gifts continued through seven days (Notes to Chagiga, 2:4). As above noted, in accordance with the injunction in Lev 23:15-16, the Jews regularly count every evening the fifty days from the second day of Passover until Pentecost, and they recite a prayer over it, which is given in the article PASSOVER SEE PASSOVER . As the counting (ספירה) of these fifty days, on the first of which the sickle was brought out for cutting the corn, and on the last of which it was laid up again because the harvest was entirely finished, is not only a connecting link between Passover and Pentecost, but may be regarded as preparatory for the feast of Pentecost, we must notice the events and practices connected therewith. Owing to a  fearful plague which broke out on the second day of Passover or the first of Omer, and which, after raging thirty-two days, and carrying off between Gabath and Antiparos no less than 24,000 disciples of the celebrated R. Akiba, suddenly ceased on the 18th of Jiar, the second month, i.e. the thirty-third of Omer (Babylon Jebamoth, 62 b; Midrash Bereshith Rabba, Seder חיי שרה, sec. 61, p. 134, ed. Stettin, 1863), it was ordained that, in memory of this calamity, three days are to be kept as a time of mourning, during which no marriage is to take place, no enjoyments and pleasures are to be indulged in, nor even is the beard to be removed (Orach Chajim, Hilchoth Pesach, sec. 493); and that the thirty-third of Omer, on which the epidemic disappeared, is to be kept as a holiday, especially among the students, for which reason it is called the scholars' feast. The reason which R. Jochanan ben-Nori assigns for regarding this period as a time of mourning — i.e. that the wicked are punished in hell in these days, and that judgment is passed on the produce of the land — is simply a modern cabalistic form given to an ancient usage.

The three days preceding the festival, on which, as we shall see hereafter, the Jews commemorate the giving of the law on Sinai, are called (ימי הגבלה שלשת8) the three days of separation and sanctification, because the Lord commanded Moses to set bounds around the mountain, and that the people should sanctify themselves three days prior to the giving of the law (Exo 19:12; Exo 19:14; Exo 19:23). On the preparation day (ערב שברעות) the synagogues and the private houses are adorned with flowers and odoriferous herbs; the male members of the community purify themselves by immersion and confession of sins, put on their festive garments, and resort to the synagogue, where, after the evening prayer (מעריב), the hallowed nature of the festival is proclaimed by the cantor in the blessing pronounced over a cup of wine (קידוש), which is also done by every head of the family at home before the evening repast. After supper both the learned and the illiterate are either to go again into the synagogue or to congregate in private houses and read all night:

(a) The first three and the last three verses of every book in the Hebrew Scriptures, but some portions have to be read entire;

(b) the first and last Mishna of every tractate in the Talmud;

(c) the beginning and end of the book Jezirah;

(d) passages from the Sohar;

(e) the 613 commandments into which the Mosaic law is divided, SEE SCHOOL; and

(f) the Song of Songs.

The whole must be recited in thirteen divisions, so that the prayer Kadish (קדיש) might be said between each division, and the letters of the word אחד(the unity in the Deity) = 4+8+1 -13, be obtained (comp. Magen Abraham, Orach Chajim, sec. 494). The reason for this watching all night, given by R. Abraham, the author of the Magen Abraham, is as follows: When God was about to reveal his law to Israel, he had to wake them up from their sleep. Hence, to remove the sin of that sleep, the Jews are now to wake all night (comp. Brick, Rabbinische Ceremonial gebrduche [Breslau, 1837], p. 8-22, and the ritual for this night, entitled שבועות תיקון ליל). In the general festival service of the morning special prayers are inserted for this day, which set forth the glory of the Lawgiver and Israel, the glory of the Lord in creating the universe, etc., and in which the Decalogue is interwoven, the great Hallel is recited, Exo 19:1; Exo 20:26 is read as the lesson from the law, Num 18:26-31 as Maphtir, and Eze 1:1-28; Eze 3:12, as the lesson from the prophets, SEE HAPHTARAH; whereupon the Musajh is offered, and the priests, after having their hands washed by the Levites, pronounce chantingly the benediction (Num 6:23-27) on the congregation, who receive it with their heads covered by the fringed wrapper. SEE FRINGE. On the second evening they again resort to the synagogue, use the ritual for the festivals, in which are again inserted special prayers for this occasion, being chiefly on the greatness of God and the giving of the law and the Decalogue; the sanctification of the festival (קידוש) is again pronounced, both by the praelector in the synagogue and the heads of families at home; and prayers different from those of the first day, also celebrating the giving of the law, are intermingled with the ordinary festival prayers; the Hallel is recited, as well as the book of Ruth; Deu 15:19 to Deu 16:17, with Num 28:26-31 is read as the lesson from the law; Habbakuk 2:20- 3:19, as the lesson from the prophets; the prayer is offered for depaited relatives; the Musaph Ritual is recited; the priests pronounce the benediction as on the former day; and the festival concludes after the afternoon service, as soon as the stars appear or darkness sets in. It must  be remarked that milk and honey form an essential part of the meals during this festival, which is of a particularly joyous character, to symbolize “the honey and milk which are under the tongue” of the spouse (Son 4:11), by virtue of the law which the bridegroom gave her.

The less educated of the modern Jews regard the fifty days with strange superstition, and, it would seem, are always impatient for them to come to an end. During their continuance they have a dread of sudden death, of the effect of malaria, and of the influence of evil spirits over children. They relate with gross exaggeration the above-mentioned case of a great mortality which, during the first twenty-three days of the period, befell the pupils of Akiba, the great Mishnical doctor of the second century, at Jaffa. They do not ride, or drive, or go on the water, unless they are impelled by absolute necessity. They are careful not to whistle in the evening, lest it should bring ill-luck. They scrupulously put off marriages till Pentecost (Stauben, La Vie Juive en Alsace [Paris, 1860], p. 124; Mills, British Jews, p. 207).

IV. Origin and Import of this Festival. — There is no clear notice in the Scriptures of any historical significance belonging to Pentecost. Yet, looking simply at the text of the Bible, there can be little doubt that Pentecost owes its origin entirely and exclusively to the harvest which terminated at this time. It is to be expected that, in common with other nations of antiquity who celebrated the ingathering of the corn by offering to the Deity, among other firstling offerings, the fine flour of wheat as θαλύσιος ἄρτος (Eustath. Ad Iliad. 9:530; Athen. 3:80; Theocrit. 7:3), the Jews, as an agricultural people, would thankfully acknowledge the goodness of God in giving them the fruits of the earth, by offering to the Bountiful Giver of all good things the first-fruits of their harvest. That this was primarily the origin and import of Pentecost is most unquestionably indicated by its very names, e.g. the festival of (הקציר) the cut-off corn, i.e. end of the harvest (Exo 23:16), which commenced on the morrow of the Passover, when the sickle was first brought into the field (Deu 16:9); and so intimately connected are the beginning of the harvest at Passover with the termination of it at this festival, that Pentecost was actually denominated, during the time of the second Temple, and is called in the Jewish literature to the present day, עצרת, the conclusion, or, עצרת של פסח, the termination of Passover. To the same effect is the name חג השבועות, the festival of weeks, which, as Bahr  rightly remarks, would be a very strange and enigmatical designation of a festival, simply because of the intervening time between it and a preceding festival, if it did not stand in a fixed and essential relationship to this intervening time, and if in its nature it did not belong thereto, since the weeks themselves have nothing which could be the subject of a religious festival, except the harvest that took place in these weeks (Symbolik, 2:647). Being the culmination of Passover, and agrarian in its character, the pre-Mosaic celebration of this festival among the Jews will hardly be questioned; for it will not be supposed that the patriarchs, who in common with other nations were devoted to agriculture, would yet be behind these nations in not celebrating the harvest festival, to acknowledge the goodness of God in giving them the fruits of the earth, which obtained among the heathen nations to the remotest times. Indeed, the Book of Jubilees, as will be seen in the sequel, actually ascribes a pre-Mosaic existence to it. In incorporating this festival into the cycle of the canonical feasts, the Mosaic legislation, as usual, divested it of all idolatrous rites, consecrated it in an especial manner to him who filleth us with the finest of wheat (Psa 147:14), by enjoining the Hebrews to impart liberally to the needy from that which they have been permitted to reap, and to remember that they themselves were once needy and oppressed in Egypt, and were now in the possession of liberty and of the bounties of Providence (Deu 16:11-12). The Mosaic code, moreover, constituted it a member of the Hebrew family of festivals, by putting Pentecost on the sacred basis of seven, which, as we have seen, underlies the whole organism of the feasts.

But though the canonical Scriptures speak of Pentecost as simply a harvest festival, yet the non-canonical documents show, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the Jews, at least as early as the days of Christ, connected with it, and commemorated on the 6th of Sivan, the third month, the giving of the Decalogue. It is made out from Exodus 19 that the law was delivered on the fiftieth day after the deliverance from Egypt (Selden, De Jur. Nat. et Gent. 3:11). It has been conjectured that a connection between the event and the festival may possibly be hinted at in the reference to the observance of the law in Deu 16:12. But neither Philo nor Josephus has a word on the subject. Philo expressly states that it was at the feast of Trumpets that the giving of the law was commemorated (De Sept. c. 22). SEE TRUMPETS, FEAST OF.

There is, however, a tradition of a custom which Schottgen supposes to be at least as ancient as the apostolic times, that the night before Pentecost was a time especially appropriated  for thanking God for the gift of the law (Hor. Hebr. ad Act 2:1). The Talmud declares that “the rabbins propounded that the Decalogue was given to Israel on the 6th of Sivan” (Sabbath, 86 b), and this is deduced from Exodus 19, for, according to tradition, Moses ascended the mountain on the 2d of Sivan, the third month (Exo 19:1-3); received the answer of the people on the Exo 19:7); reascended the mountain on the Exo 19:8); commanded the people to sanctify themselves three days, which were the 4th, 5th, and 6th (Exo 19:12; Exo 19:14; Exo 19:23); and on the third of these three days of sanctification, which was the sixth day of the month, delivered the Decalogue to them (Exo 19:10-11; Exo 19:15-16). This is the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition. It is given in the Mechilta on Exodus 19 (p. 83-90, ed. Wilna, 1844, SEE MIDRASH ); in the Chaldee paraphrase of Jonathan ben-Uzziel, which renders ויהי ביום השלישי(Exo 19:16) by בירחא והוה ביומא תליתאה בשיתא, and it came to pass on the third day, on the sixth of the month, i.e. Sivan; by Rashi (Comment. on Exo 19:1-16); and by Maimonides, who remarks: “Pentecost is the day on which the law was given, and in order to magnify this day, the days are counted from the first festival (i.e. Passover) to it, just as one who is expecting the most faithful of his friends is accustomed to count the days and hours of his arrival; for this is the reason of counting the omer from the day of our Exodus from Egypt to the day of the giving of the law, which was the ultimate object of the exodus, as it is said, I bare you on eagles' wings, and brought you unto myself.' And because this great manifestation did not last more than one day, therefore we annually commemorate it only one day” (More Nebochim, 3:43). To this effect is R. Jehudah (born circa 1086), in his celebrated work Cusari, 3:10; Nachmanides (born about 1195), in his commentary on the Pentateuch (Exo 19:1-25; Lev 23:17), and all the Jewish commentators, as well as the ritual for this festival. Even Abrabanel, who denies that the primary object in the institution of this festival was to celebrate the gift of the law, most emphatically declares that the Decalogue was given on Mount Sinai on Pentecost, as may be seen from the following remark: “The law was not given with a design to this festival, so that it should commemorate the gift of the law, since the festival was not instituted to commemorate the giving of the law; as our divine law and the prophecy are their own witnesses, and did not require a day to be sanctified to commemorate them; but the design of the feast of weeks was to commence the wheat harvest. For just as the feast of Tabernacles was intended to finish the ingathering of the produce, so the festival of weeks  was intended to begin the harvest, as it was the will of the Lord that at the commencement of the ingathering of the fruits which are the food of man, the first of which is the wheat, and which began to be cut on the feast of weeks, a festival should be celebrated to render praise to him who giveth food to all flesh; and that another festival should be celebrated at the end of the ingathering of the fruits. Still, there is no doubt that the law was given on the day of the feast of weeks, although this festival was not instituted to commemorate it” (Commentary on the Pentateuch, Parshath אמור, p. 211 a, ed. Hanau, 1710).

Those early fathers who were best acquainted with the Jewish tradition testify to the same thing, that the law was given on Pentecost, and that the Jews commemorate the event on this festival. It was therefore on this day, when the apostles, in common with their Jewish brethren, were assembled to commemorate the anniversary of the giving of the law from Sinai, and were engaged in the study of Holy Writ, in accordance with the custom of the day, that the Holy Spirit descended upon them, and sent them forth to proclaim “the wonderful works of God,” as revealed in the Gospel (Acts 2). Thus, St. Jerome tells us, “Supputemus numerum, et inveniemus quinquagesimo die egressionis Israel ex AEgypto in vertice montis Sinay legem datam. Unde et Pentecostes celebratur solemnitas, et postea evangelii sacramentum in Spiritus Sancti descensione completur” (Epist. ad Fabiolam, 12; in Opp. 1:1074, ed. Par. 1609). Similarly St. Augustine, “Pentecosten etiaim, id est, a passione et resurrectione Domini, quinquagesimum diem celebramus, quo nobis Sanctum Spiritum Paracletum quem promiserat misit; quod futurum etiam per Judaeorum pascha significatum est, cum quinquagesimo die post celebrationem ovis occisee, Moyses digito Dei scriptam legem accepit in monte” (Contra Faustzum, lib. 33, c. 12). Comp. also De Lyra, Comment. on Leviticus 23; Bishop Patrick on Erod. 19. It is very curious that the apocryphal Book of Jubilees, which was written in the first century before Christ, SEE JUBILEES, BOOK OF, should connect this festival, which was celebrated on the third month, with the third month of Noah's leaving the ark, and maintain that it was ordained to be celebrated in this month, to renew annually the covenant which God made with this patriarch not to destroy the world again by a flood (ch. 6:57 sq.). Such an opinion would hardly have been hazarded by a Jew if it had not. been believed by many of his co-religionists that this festival had a pre-Mosaic existence. Since the destruction of Jerusalem, and the impossibility of giving prominence to that part of the festival which bears on the Palestinian harvest, the Jews have almost entirely made Pentecost to commemorate the giving of the law, and  the only references they make in the ritual to the harvest, which was the primary object of its institution, is in the reading of the book of Ruth, wherein the harvest is described.

If the feast of Pentecost stood without an organic connection with any other rites, we should have no certain warrant in the Old Testament for regarding it as more than the divinely appointed solemn thanksgiving for the yearly supply of the most useful sort of food. Every reference to its meaning seems to bear immediately upon the completion of the grain harvest. It might have been a Gentile festival, having no proper reference to the election of the chosen race. It might have taken a place in the religion of any people who merely felt that it is God who gives rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, and who fills our hearts with food and gladness (Act 14:17). But it was, as we have seen, essentially linked to the Passover — that festival which, above all others, expressed the fact of a race chosen and separated from other nations. It was not an insulated day. It stood as the culminating point of the Pentecostal season. If the offering of the omer was a supplication for the divine blessing on the harvest which was just commencing, and the offering of the two loaves was a thanksgiving for its completion, each rite was brought into a higher significance in consequence of the omer forming an integral part of the Passover. It was thus set forth that He who had delivered his people from Egypt, who had raised them from the condition of slaves to that of free men in immediate covenant with himself, was the same that was sustaining them with bread from year to year. The inspired teacher declared to God's chosen one, “He maketh peace in thy borders, he filleth thee with the finest of the wheat” (Psa 147:14). If we thus regard the day of Pentecost as the solemn termination of the consecrated period, intended, as the seasons came round, to teach this lesson to the people, we may see the fitness of the name by which the Jews have mostly called it, עֲצֶרֶת, the concluding assembly.

As the two loaves were leavened, they could not be offered on the altar, like the unleavened sacrificial bread. Abrabanel (in Leviticus 23) has proposed a reason for their being leavened which seems hardly to admit of a doubt. He thinks that they were intended to represent the best produce of the earth in' the actual condition in which it ministers to the support of human life. Thus they express, in the most significant manner, what is evidently the idea of the festival.  We need not suppose that the grain harvest in the Holy Land was in all years precisely completed between the Passover and Pentecost. The period of seven weeks was evidently appointed in conformity with the Sabbatical number, which so frequently recurs in the arrangements of the Mosaic law. SEE FEASTS; SEE JUBILEE. Hence, probably, the prevailing use of the name, “The Feast of Weeks,” which might always have suggested the close religious connection in which the festival stood to the Passover.

It is not surprising that, without any direct authority in the O.T., the coincidence of the day on which the festival was observed with that on which the law appears to have been given to Moses, should have strongly impressed the minds of Christians in the early ages of the Church. The divine Providence had ordained that the Holy Spirit should come down in a special manner, to give spiritual life and unity to the Church, on that very same day in the year on which the law had been bestowed on the children of Israel which gave to them national life and unity. They must have seen that, as the possession of the law had completed the deliverance of the Hebrew race wrought by the hand of Moses, so the gift of the Spirit perfected the work of Christ in the establishment of his kingdom upon earth.

It may have been on this account that Pentecost was the last Jewish festival (so far as we know) which the apostle Paul was anxious to observe (Act 20:16; 1Co 16:8), and that Whitsuntide came to be the first annual festival instituted in the Christian Church (Hessey, Bampton Lectures, p. 88, 96). It was rightly regarded as the Church's birthday, and the Pentecostal season, the period between it and Easter, bearing as it does such a clear analogy to the fifty days of the old law, thus became the ordinary time for the baptism of converts (Tertullian, De Bapt. c. 19; Jerome, in Zec 14:8). SEE PENTECOSTAL EFFUSION.

V. Literature. — Mishna, Menachoth and Bikkurim; Joseph. Ant. 14:13, 4; 17:12. 2; War, 2:3, 1; faimonides, Iad Ha-Chezaka, Hilchoth Tamidin U- Mosaphin, c. 8; Abrabanel, Commentary on the Pentateuch, p. 211 (ed. Hanau, 1710); Meyer, De Fest. Heb 2:13; Bahr, Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus, 2:619 sq., 645 sq.; Diedricli, in Ersch and Gruber's Encyklopadie, s.v. Pfingsten, sec. iii, vol. xx, p. 418-431; The Jewish Ritual called Derach Ha-Chajim (Vienna, 1859), p. 253 b, sq.; The Ritual for the Cycle of Festivals, entitled (מחזור) Machsor on ( שבועות) the Festival of Weeks; Carpzov, App. Crit. 3:5; Reland, Antiq. 4:4; Lightfoot, Temple  Service, sec. 3; Exercit. in Act 2:1; Spencer, De Leg. Heb. I, 9:2; III, 8:2; Hupfeld, De Fest. Heb. ii; Iken, De Duobus Panibus Pentecost. (Brem. 1729); Drusius, Notoe Majores in Lev 23:15; Lev 23:21 (Crit. Sac.); Otho, Lex. Rab. s.v. Festa; Buxtorf, Synagogal. Judenthum, c. 20. SEE FESTIVAL.

## Pentecostal Effusion Of The Holy Spirit[[@Headword:Pentecostal Effusion Of The Holy Spirit]]

             (as recorded in Acts 2). The commencement of the Christian Church on the day of Pentecost, preceded as it was by our Lord's ascension,. attached a peculiar interest to this season, and eventually led to its being set apart for the commemoration of these great events. It was not, however, established as one of the great festivals until the 4th century. The combination of two events (the Ascension and the descent of the Holy Ghost) in one festival has a parallel in the original Jewish feast, which is held to have included the feast of first-fruits and of the delivering of the law (Exo 23:16; Lev 23:14-21; Num 28:26). Indeed, this festival in some respects bears a close analogy to the Jewish one; and is evidently little more than a modification of it. The converts of that day, on which the Holy Ghost descended, were the first- fruits of the Spirit. Jerome (Ad Fabium, § 7) elegantly contrasts this with the giving of the law on Mount Sinai: “Utraque facta est quinquagesimo die a Paschate; illo, in Sina; haec, in Sion. Ibi terrae motu contremuit mons; hic, domus apostolorum. Ibi, inter flaruinas igniumn et micantia.fulgura, turbo ventorum, et fragor tonitruorum personuit; hic, cum ignearum visione linguarum sonitus pariter de ccelo, tanquam spiritus vehementis adversit. Ibi, clangor, buccinae, legis verba perstrepuit; hie, tuba evangelica apostolorum ore inltonlllit.” This festival became one of the three great festivals (Tertullian, De Baptist. c. 19: Jerome, in Zach. 14:8); and it derives its name of Whitsunday, not from baptism, but from a corruption of the name Pentecost, through the German Pfingsten.

In the early Christian Church the entire period between Easter and Pentecost was named from the latter (Tertullian, De Idol. c. 14; De Bapti. c. 19; Can. Ap. c. 37; Can. Ant. c. 30; Cyril. Hieros. Ad Const.). The feast was observed as the festival of the Holy Spirit (Greg. Naz. De Pent. Hom. c. 44) at a very early date, allusion being made to it by Tertullian, as shown above, and by Orien (Contra Cels e. [ed. Cantab. 1677], viii, p. 392). All public games were interdicted by Theodosius the Younger during the Pentecostal as during the Paschal solemnity (Cod. Theod. 15:5, “De  Spectac.”). During these weeks the Acts of the Apostles were read, as being most suitable for the period during which the risen Lord appeared to pis disciples in the body “by many infallible proofs.” Fasting was intermitted (Const. Ap. v. 33), and the pravers of the Church were offered, not in a kneeling position, but erect (Concil. Nic. can. 20), as symbolizing the jubilant attitude of the Church during her Lord's passage from the grave to the glory. The entire octave was celebrated in early days, and followed by a week of fasting (Const. Ap. v. 33). The feast was restricted to three days by papal decree, A.D. 745.

Doubts have been cast on the common interpretation of Act 2:1, according to which the Holy Ghost was given to the apostles on the day of Pentecost. Lightfoot contends that the passage ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς Πεντηκοστῆς means, when the day of Pentecost had passed, and considers that this rendering is countenanced by the words of the Vulgate, “cum complerentur dies Pentecostes.” He supposes that Pentecost fell that year on the Sabbath, and that it was on the ensuing Lord's day that ησαν ἃπαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (Exercit. in Act., ii. 1). Hitzig, on the other hand (Ostern un Pfingsten, Heidelberg, 1837), would render the words, “As the day of Pentecost was approaching its fulfillment.” Neander has replied to the latter, and has maintained the common interpretation (Planting of the Christian Church 1:5, Bohn's ed.).

The question on what day of the week this Pentecost fell must of course be determined by the mode in which the doubt is solved regarding the day on which the Last Supper was eaten. SEE PASSOVER. If it were the last Paschal supper, on the 14th of Nisan, and the Sabbath during which our Lord lay in the grave was the day of the omer, Pentecost must have followed on the Sabbath. But if the supper were eaten on the 13th, and he was crucified on the 14th, the Sunday of the Resurrection must have been the day of the omer, and Pentecost must have occurred on the first day of the week.

For monographs on this subject, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 72, 120. SEE BAPTISM OF FIRE.

## Pentecostals[[@Headword:Pentecostals]]

             a contribution or oblation made by every house or family to the cathedral church at Pentecost, in consideration of a general absolution then pronounced. The Pentecostals are sometimes called Whitsun-farthings.

## Pentecostarion[[@Headword:Pentecostarion]]

             one of the service-books of the Greek Church, containing the office of the Church from Easter-day till the eighth day after Pentecost, which they called the Sunday of All-Saints.

## Penton, Stephen[[@Headword:Penton, Stephen]]

             an English clergyman and educator, was born in the first half of the 17th century, and was educated at Oxford University. In 1675 he became principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford; afterwards rector of Glympton. He died near the close of the 17th century. He published Apparatus ad theo. logiam, in usum Academiarnum: (1) Generalis; (2) Specialis (Lond. 1688, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. vol. ii, s.v.

## Pentz (Pencz Or Pens), Georg[[@Headword:Pentz (Pencz Or Pens), Georg]]

             a celebrated German painter and engraver, was born at Nuremberg about 1500. He was first the pupil of Albrecht Durer, and afterwards went to Italy, and studied the works of Raffaelle at Rome, probably after the death of that great master. Pentz died about 1560. Little is known of his works as a painter. A few of them are in the Imperial Gallery at Vienna, and these are greatly admired. His prints are numerous and highly esteemed. His drawing is correct, and there is none of that stiffness and formality which characterize the productions of his contemporaries. While in Italy he engraved, in conjunction with Marc' Antonio, several plates after the works of Raffaelle. The Bible subjects from his own designs are: Two small prints, Job Tempted and Esther before Ahauerus; two, Judith in the Tent of Holofernes and Judith with his Head; two, the Judgment of Solomon and Solomon's Idolatry; two, Lot and his Dautghters and Susanna and the Elders; four of the History of Joseph (1544); seven of the History of Tobit (1543), considered among his best; two of the Merciful Samaritan and the Conversion of St. Paul (1545); The Four Evangelists. The seven works of Mercy are circular; twenty-five plates of the life and miracles of Christ are very fine.

## Penuel[[@Headword:Penuel]]

             In the place of this name, SEE PENIEL. The name Penuel (Heb. Penuel', פְּנוּאֵלface of God; Sept. Φανουήλ) occurs also as the name of two men.

1. First named of two sons of Hur, son of Judah. He was the father of Gedor (1Ch 4:4). B.C. post 1658.

2. Last named of eleven sons of Shashak, son of Beriah; a man of the tribe of Benjamin who dwelt in the city of Jerusalem (1Ch 8:25). B.C, post 1612.

## Peor[[@Headword:Peor]]

             (Heb. Peor i', פְּעוֹר, cleft, always with the art. when speaking of the mountain, but without it of the idol; Sept. Φογώρ), the name of a hill and of a heathen deity; perhaps also of a town.

1. A mountain on the plateau of Moab, to the top of which Balak led Balaam that he might see the whole host of Israel and curse them (Num 23:28). It appears to have been one of the ancient high places of Moab dedicated to the service of Baal (Num 22:41; Num 23:13; Num 23:27). Its position is described as “looking to the face of Jeshimon;” that is, the wilderness on either side of the Dead Sea. SEE DESERT.

If it were in sight of the Arabah of Moab, on the east bank of the Jordan, where the Israelites were then encamped, it must have been one of those peaks on the western brow of the plateau which are seen between Heshbon and the banks of the Arnon (comp. Josephus, Ant. 4:6,4). Two other incidental notices of the sacred writers tend to fix its position. There can be little doubt that it was connected with the town of Beth-Peor, which is described as “over against” the site of the Israelitish camp (Deu 3:29; comp. 34:6). SEE BETH-PEOR.

Josephus says it was sixty stadia distant from the camp (Ant. 4:6, 4); Eusebius states that it lay above Livias (the ancient Beth-aran), six miles distant from it, and opposite Jericho; and Jerome mentions Mount Phogor as situated between Livias and Heshbon (Onomast. s.v. Fogor and Araboth Moab). It would seem, therefore, that this mountain was one of those peaks on the south side of Wady Heshbon commanding the Jordan valley. A place named Fuichatr(h is mentioned in the list of towns south of Es-Salt in the appendix to the first edition of Dr. Robinson's Bib. Res. (vol. iii, Append. p. 169), and this is placed by Van de Velde at the head of the Wady Eshteh, eight miles north-east of Hesban. Professor Paine, however, recently contends that it is one of the summits of the present Jebel Neba. SEE PISGAH.

2. “The matter of Peor” (דבר פ8) mentioned in Num 25:18; Num 31:16; and the “iniquity of Peor” (עין פ8), spoken of by Joshua (Jos 22:17), refer to the Midianitish deity Baal-peor, and not to the mountain. By following the counsels of Balaam, the Midianites seduced the Israelites to take part in their worship, and the licentious revels by which it appears to have been accompanied; and thus they brought upon them the divine vengeance (Num 31:16; Num 25:1 sq.). The temple or shrine of Baal-peor probably stood on the top of the mountain; and the town of Beth-peor may have been situated at its base. Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1119 a) gives it as his opinion that Baal-peor derived its name from the mountain, not the mountain from him. SEE BAAL-PEOR.

3. A Peor, under its Greek garb of Φαγώρ, appears among the eleven names added by the Sept. to the list of the allotment to Judah, between Bethlehem and Aitan (Etham). It was known to Eusebius and Jerome, and is mentioned by the latter in his translation of the Onomasticon as Phaoa. It probably still exists under the name of Beit Faghur or Kirbet Faghur, five miles south-west of Bethlehem, barely a mile to the left of the road from Hebron (Reland, Palaest. p. 643; Robinson, Bib. Res. 3:275; Tobler, Dritte Wanderung, p. 92).

## Pepin[[@Headword:Pepin]]

             is the name of several distinguished members of the Carlovingian line of French kings. The first of them in order was PEPIN THE OLD, or “Pepin de Landen,” who flourished in the first half of the 7th century. The only one, however, whose history concerns us especially here is the third of the Pepins, whose name was PEPIN LE BREF, i.e. “Pepin the Short,” and who was really the first king of France. He was the younger son of Charles Martel, who, on the death of his father in 741, received Neustria and Burgundy; Austrasia, Thuringia, and Suabia being the heritage of his elder brother Carloman. Aquitaine was nominally a part of Pepin's dominions, though really independent under its own duke, whom Pepin made several ineffectual attempts to subdue. The farce of governing the country in the name and as the chief minister, or, as he was called, “Mayor of the Palace,” of the Merovingian sovereign, which had begun under Pepin of Heristal, was still kept up, though Pepin was eagerly longing for an opportunity to assume the crown, but the opportune moment did not come until 747, when Carloman bade adieu to power, and retired into a convent, leaving his government to his sons. Pepin immediately dispossessed them. After  crushing a rebellion of Saxons and Bavarians, Pepin determined to effectually establish his royal power by dispossessing the Merovingian dynasty of even the semblance of authority, and of originating in person a new royal dynasty.

To gain his point he flattered the clergy, then the most influential body in France; and as they had been despoiled by Charles Martel for the behoof of his warriors, a moderate degree of kindness and generosity on the part of Pepin contrasted him so favorably with his father that the clergy at once became his partisans. So did the pope (Zacharias), who felt the importance of securing the aid of the powerful Frankish chief against the Lombards, who were then masters of Italy, and to stop the progress of the Saacens, who now spread as far as the south of France. He therefore released the Franks from their oath of fidelity to Childeric, the Merovingian monarch; which intelligence, when brought to Pepin, at once caused him to complete the dethronement of Childeric by having his long hair shaved off, which was an essential characteristic of royalty with the Merovingian kings, and to confine him in a monastery, where he died in 755, and had himself elected king by the assembly of estates at Soissons, and consecrated by the bishop of Mayence in March, 752. In 754 the pope himself (Stephen II) appeared for Pepin, and gave his sanction to the election and consecration; and, in order to give further effect to Pepin's authority, consecrated him anew to his high dignity in the church of St. Denis at Paris. Apparently the action had significance only for Pepin's subjects. It soon proved, however, that these solemn ceremonies had put the crown under great obligations to the Church, or, better, the papacy; and that, though at this time the pope came to favor the king, and to ask for help to maintain his temporal sovereignty, the day came when the clergy claimed to have secured political rank in the state by Pepin's coronation at their hands. SEE INVESTITURES; SEE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPE.

Pepin accompanied the pontiff to Italy at the head of a large army, to establish firmly, in turn, the papal authority. He waged war against Astolphus, the Lombard king, obliged him to raise the siege of Rome, and not only compelled him to. abandon all pretensions to the city and the exarchate of Ravenna, but took from a him several cities which had formerly belonged to the, Greeks, and handed them over to the pope. Another expedition was rendered necessary in A.D. 755 by the revolt of Astolphus, who was again subdued by the champion of the Church. He also obtained a signals victory over the Saracens, reunited Aquitaine to his kingdom, and waged successful war against the German princes. Pepin le Bref died in the year 768, and was succeeded by his son Charlemagne. It is  admitted by late historians that this change of dynasty was coincident with the elevation of the eastern Franks, whose fresher energy, guided by the chiefs of the Pepin family, enabled them to push upward to the seat of government, and take the place of their feebler kindred. SEE FRANCE and SEE LOMBARDS for the necessary literature for a correct understanding of the establishment of the Gallic nation.

## Pepin (Or Pepyn), Martin[[@Headword:Pepin (Or Pepyn), Martin]]

             a Flemish painter, was born at Antwerp in 1574, as appears from an inscription on his portrait hereafter mentioned. It is not known under whom he studied at home. After having learned the principles of the art, he went to Italy, where he is said to have so distinguished himself by his grandeur of composition, correctness of design, and vigorous tone of coloring, that Rubens himself regarded Pepin with jealousy, and dreaded his return to Antwerp, fearing his reputation would suffer: from such rivalship. Pepin, however, did not interfere with Rubens, for he resided most of his life at Rome. In Italy Pepin failed to secure much fame. In the church of the hospital at Antwerp are two of his works, which are highly extolled; they are altarpieces, with folding doors, in the style of some of the old Flemish masters; the center picture of one represents the Baptism of St. Augustine, and the laterals on the doors that saint giving alms to the poor and curing the sick; the other is a similar work, representing St. Elizabeth giving Alms to a group of miserable objects who are struggling to approach her. His portrait, by Vandyck, in the private collection of the king of Holland, is described by C. J. Niewvenhuyt (in his Catalogue), who saw several of Pepin's pictures, and says that his talents were but second rate, that his first manner partook of the school of Otho Venius, but that the works he executed in Italy are in a more elevated style. Pepin died at Rome in 1641.

## Peploe, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Peploe, Samuel, D.D]]

             an English divine, flourished in the beginning of the 18th century. He was for a time warden of Manchester. — In 1726 he was made bishop of Chester. He died about 1752. He published, A Sermon on 1Ki 18:21 (1716, 8vo): — God's peculiar Care in the Preservation of our Religion and Liberties; a Sermon on 1Sa 12:7 (1716, 8vo): Sermon, Mat 25:40 (1730, 4to): — Sermon, Mat 10:34 (1733, 4to): — Popish Idolatry a strong Reason why all Protestants  should zealously suppose the present Rebellion; A Sermon on 1Co 10:14 (1745, 4to).

## Pepusch, Joh(an)n Christopher[[@Headword:Pepusch, Joh(an)n Christopher]]

             one of the greatest theoretical musicians of modern times, a contemporary and associate of Handel, was born in 1667 at Berlin, where his father was then minister of a Protestant congregation. At the early age of fourteen he attracted the ndtice of the court, and was given a lucrative position, which he held until his thirtieth year. — The tyranny of his royal master, Frederick I inclined Pepusch to quit the country and seek employment abroad. He visited Holland, but after a year's tarry went over to England. He reached London in 1700, and was engaged as musician at Drury Lane Theatre, where it is thought he assisted in adapting the operas which were performed there. In his private studies he devoted himself principally to the music of the ancients, especially that of the Greeks, which he regarded as far superior to anything that the moderns were capable of producing. In 1710 he was one of the founders of the Academy of Ancient Music, which existed until 1790. In 1712 he, together with Handel, was engaged by the duke of Chandos (Pope's Timon) to compose for the chapel at Cannons. In 1713 the University of Oxford admitted him to the degree of doctor in music. In 1724 he was persuaded by Dr. Berkeley to join in the scheme for establishing a college in the Bermudas; but as the ship was wrecked the project was precipitately abandoned. At the instance of Gay and Rich, he undertook, in 1730, to compose and adapt the music for the “Beggar's Opera.” In 1731 appeared his Treatise on Harmony, which long continued a standard work, and is still studied by artists of the first order. In 1737 he was chosen organist for the Charter-House. Having written a paper on the ancient genera, which was read before the Royal Society, and published in the Philosophical Transactions. in the year 1746, he soon afterwards was elected a fellow of the Royal Society. He died in 1752.

## Pepuzians[[@Headword:Pepuzians]]

             is a name sometimes given to the Montanists (q.v.), because Montanus is said to have taught that a place called Pepuza, in Phrygia, was the chosen spot at which the millennial reign of Christ was destined to begin.

## Pepys, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Pepys, Henry, D.D]]

             an Anglican prelate, the son of Sir William Weller Pepys, was born April 18, 1783. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge,, taking the degree of B.A. in 1804 and M.A. in 1807; became rector of Morton, Essex, in 1822, also of Westmill, Hertfordshire, in 1827, and prebendary of Wells in 1836. In 1840 he was consecrated bishop of Sodor and Man, and was translated to the see of Worcester in 1841. He died at Hartleybury  Castle, Worcestershire, November 13, 1860. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1861, page 706.

## Per Anniilum et Bacilum[[@Headword:Per Anniilum et Bacilum]]

             were those bishoprics given by handing over the ring and staff.

## Per Viam[[@Headword:Per Viam]]

             a technical title of certain forms of ecclesiastical election.

1. PER VIAM COMPROMISSI (by way of conmpromise) was an election of a superior by the sworn delegates of a convent, who retired into a secret chamber, and, after invocation of the Holy Ghost, named the person on whom their choice had fallen.

2. PER VIAM SPIRITUS SANCTI (by way of the Holy Spirit) was a unanimous election by the whole convent, as if by divine inspiration.

3. PER VIAM SCRUTINII (by way of scrutiny) was when each monk voted singly in the chapter-house, in the presence of the bishop.

## Pera (Or Bursa)[[@Headword:Pera (Or Bursa)]]

             is the name of a four-cornered case for the keeping of the corporale, and is of the same material and color as the altar-dress. The oil for the anointing of the sick and the host were carried by the priests in the pera, hung about the neck.

## Peraccini, Guiseppe[[@Headword:Peraccini, Guiseppe]]

             called Il Mirandolese, an Italian painter, was born at Mirandola in the year 1672. According to Crespi, he studied under Marc' Antonio, Franceschini, whose style, he adopted. He executed some works for the churches at Bologna. He must not be confounded with Pietro Paltronieri. called Mirandolese dello prospettiva. He died in 1754.

## Peraea[[@Headword:Peraea]]

             (Περαία, from πέραν, beyond), a name given to a portion of the country beyond Jordan, or on the east side of that river, the ancient possession of the two tribes of Reuben and Gad. According to Josephus (War, 3:3, 3), it was bounded on the west by Jordan, east by Philadelphia, north by Pella, and south by the castle of Machaerus. The country was fruitful, abounding with pines, olive-trees, palm-trees, and other plants, which grew in the fields in great abundance; it was well watered with springs and torrents from the mountains. It corresponds in an enlarged sense to “the region round about Jordan” (ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ι᾿ορδάνου, Mat 3:5; Luk 3:3; the earlier כַּכָּרof Gen 13:10). SEE PALESTINE. The events connected with this region mentioned in the O.T. are noticed under the articles SEE GILEAD and SEE BASHAN. It would seem to have been partially visited by our Lord (Joh 10:14). SEE BETHABARA.

## Peraeans[[@Headword:Peraeans]]

             were the followers of Euphrates of Pera, in Cicilia, who is said to have believed that there are in the Trinity three Fathers, three Sons, and three Holy Ghosts. It has been alleged that in opposition to this class of heretics was framed the clause in the Athanasian creed which says, “So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.”

## Peraga, Bonaventura De[[@Headword:Peraga, Bonaventura De]]

             an Italian cardinal, was born June 12, 1332, in Padua. He entered the Order of St. Augustine while very young, went to study in Paris, and there taught theology. He was a friend of Petrarch, and it was he who pronounced his funeral oration (1374). Three years later he was elected general of his order (1377), When schism entered the Church, Bonaventura declared himself for Urban VI, who rewarded him by giving him a cardinal's hat (1378). His zeal for the court of Rome proved fatal to him: he was killed while passing over the bridge St. Angelo to go to the Vatican, and Francois de Carrara, tyrant, of Padua, is suspected of ordering the deed. But no historian has yet given a proof of this crime, and we are ignorant of the precise date of the year in which it was committed, though it was supposed to be about 1390. The cardinal is none the less made a martyr to the faith, and the continuators of the Actes des Saints have admitted him into their vast collection (vol. 11, June 10). He had composed commentaries on the epistles of St. John and St. James, lives of saints, sermons, etc. See Petrarque, Rerum senilium, lib. xi, ep. 25; Scardeoni, Antiq. Patav. lib. ii; J. Pamphile, Bibl. Augustiniana; Tommasini, Fibl. Patavina, p. 75; Tiraboschi, Storiln della letter. Ital. v. 139-141.

## Perah[[@Headword:Perah]]

             SEE MOLE

## Perambulation[[@Headword:Perambulation]]

             is the term applied to the English practice of walking round a parish in order to ascertain its boundaries. This perambulation was, and still is, usually performed on Ascension day (q.v.). Dr. Hooke says: “Perambulations for ascertaining the boundaries of parishes are to be made by the minister, churchwardens, and parishioners, by going round the same once a year, in or about Ascension week. The parishioners may justify going over any man's land in their perambulations according to usage; and, it is said, may abate all nuisances in their way.” There is a small homily, constituting the fourth part of the “Homily for Rogation Week,” which is appointed to be read on the above occasion. Perambulation is now known as beating the parish bounds, as the marks are struck with a stick.

This ancient custom had a twofold object. It was designed to supplicate the divine blessing on the fruits of the earth, and to preserve in all classes of  the community a correct knowledge of and due respect for the bounds of parochial and individual property. It appears to have been derived from a still older custom among the ancient Romans. called Terminalia, and Ambarvalia, which were festivals in honor of the god Terminus and the goddess Ceres. On its becoming a Christian custom the heathen rites and ceremonies were of course discarded, and those of Christianity substituted. It was appointed to be observed on one of the Rogation (q.v.) days, which were the three days next before Ascension day. “Before the Reformation, parochial perambulations were conducted with great ceremony. The lord of the manor, with a large banner, priests in surplices and with crosses, and other persons with hand-bells, banners, and staves, followed by most of the parishioners, walked in procession round the parish, stopping at crosses, forming crosses on the ground, ‘saying or singing gospels to the corn,' and allowing ‘drinkings and good cheer' (Grindal's Remains, p. 141, 241, and note; Whitgift's Workz, 3:266, 267; Tindal's Works, 3:62, 234, Parker Society's edition), which was remarkable, as the Rogation days were appointed fasts. From the different practices observed on the occasion the custom received the various names of processioning, rogationing, perambulating, and ganging the boundaries; and the week in which it was observed was called Rogation week; Cross week, because crosses were borne in the processions; and Grass week, because the Rogation days being fasts, vegetables formed the chief portion of diet. At the Reformation, the ceremonies and practices deemed objectionable were abolished, and only ‘the useful and harmless part of the custom retained.' Yet its observance was considered so desirable that a homily was prepared for the occasion, and injunctions were issued requiring that for ‘the perambulation of the circuits of parishes the people should once in the year, at the time accustomed, with the rector, vicar, or curate, and the substantial men of the parish, walk about the parishes, as they were accustomed, and at their return to the church make their common prayer. And the curate, in their said common perambulations, was at certain convenient places to admonish the people to give thanks to God (while beholding of his benefits), and for the increase and abundance of his fruits upon the face of the earth, with the saying of the 103d Psalm. At which time also the said minister was required to inculcate these, or such like sentences: Cursed be he which translateth the bounds and doles of his neighbor; or such other order of prayers as should be lawfully appointed' (Burns, Ecclesiastical Law, 3:61; Grindal, Remains, p. 168). Those engaged in the processions usually had refreshments provided for them at certain parts of the parish, which, from  the extent of the circuit of some parishes, was necessary; yet the cost of such refreshment was not to be defrayed by the parish, nor could such refreshment be claimed as a custom from any particular house or family. But small annuities were often bequeathed to provide such refreshments.

In the parish of Edgcott, Buckinghamshire, there was about an acre of land, let at £3 a year, called ‘Gang Monday Land,' which was left to the parish officers to provide cakes and beer for those who took part in the annual perambulation of the parish. To this day questions of disputed boundary between parishes are invariably settled by the evidence afforded by these perambulations; for in such questions immemorial custom is conclusive. And so far are they recognized in law that the parishioners on such occasions are entitled to trespass on lands, and even to enter private houses if these stand on the boundary line. In Scotland, where the parochial principle has never been developed as in England, there seem to be few traces of a similar practice. But as between neighboring landowners, a brieve of perambulation is the technical remedy for setting right a dispute as to boundaries or marches; and perambulating or ‘riding' the bounds of boroughs is a common practice. The necessity or determination to perambulate along the old track often occasioned curious incidents. If a canal had been cut through the boundary of a parish, it was deemed necessary that some of the parishioners should pass through the water. Where a river formed part of the boundary line, the procession either passed along it in boats, or some of the party stripped and swam along it, or boys were thrown into it at customary places. If a house had been erected on the boundary line, the procession claimed the right to pass through it. A house in Buckinghamshire, still existing, has an oven passing over the boundary line. It was customary in the perambulations to put a boy into this recess to preserve the integrity of the boundary line. At various parts of the parish boundaries, two or three of the village boys were ‘bumped' — that is, a certain part of the person was swung against a stone wall, a tree, a post, or any other hard object which happened to be near the parish boundary. This, it will scarcely be doubted, was an effectual method of recording the boundaries in the memory of these battering- rams, and of those who witnessed this curious mode of registration. The custom of perambulating parishes continued in some parts of the kingdom to a late period, but the religious portion of it was generally, if not universally, omitted. The custom has, however, of late years been revived in its integrity in many parishes.”

## Peranda, Santo[[@Headword:Peranda, Santo]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Venice in 1566. According to Ridolfi, he first studied under the younger Palma, and afterwards with Leonardo Corona, of Murano. In his first performance he followed the prompt and hasty manner of Palma; but he afterwards went to Rome, where, by diligently studying the antique and the works of the great masters, he formed a style of his own, more finished and correct. On his return to Venice he improved his coloring by contemplating the works of Titian, Tintoretto, and Veronese, so that he became as accomplished in coloring as he was before in design. He executed many works for the churches and public edifices, and was employed in decorating the ducal palaces at Venice, Mirandola, and Modena with various subjects from history. “His usual manner,” says Lanzi, “very much resembles Palma, while in the large histories which he produced at Venice and Mirandola he appears in a more practical character of his own. Yet he was of a more slow and reflective turn, and more studious of art — qualities which, in the decline of age, led him to adopt a very delicate and labored manner. He was not ambitious of equalling his contemporaries in the number of his works, but his aim was to surpass them in correctness; nor did he anywhere succeed better in his object than in his Christ taken down from the Cross, in the church of San Procolo at Venice.” He had several disciples, among whom was Matteo Ponzone. He died at Venice in 1638.

## Perard-Castel, Francis[[@Headword:Perard-Castel, Francis]]

             a French canonist, was born at Vire in 1647. Admitted to the bar in Paris, he entered into a business relating to benefices, under the direction of his uncle, banker to the court of Rome, to whom he soon succeeded. He afterwards became a lawyer to the grand council, and, exhausted by labor and too close application, he died at Paris in 1687. We have of his works, Paraphase sur le Commentaire de Dumoulin ad Regulas Cancellarice (Paris, 1683 or 1685, fol.): — Remarques sur les Definitions du droit Cunonique (de Desmaisons) (ibid. 1700, fol.), “a work which is of more value,” says Camus, “than the Definitions themselves;” the first edition, without notes, is 1668, 4to; the second, 1674, 3 small vols. 4to: — Nouveau recueil de plusieurs questions notables sur les matieres  benficiales (ibid. 1689, 2 vols. fol.): — Traite sommaire de Vusage et de la pratique de la coup de Rome pour l'expedition des signatures et provisions des benefices de France (ibid. 1717, 2 vols. 12mo), with remarks by Guill. Nover. Some authors believe that the latter work is by Castel, uncle of Perard, who may have corrected it. See Denys-Simon, Biblioth. Hist. des Auteurs de Droit; Camus, Biblioth. d'un Avocat; Richard et Simon, Biblioth. sacree.

## Peratae[[@Headword:Peratae]]

             were a very obscure Gnostic sect, related to the Ophit (q.v.). They are first named by Clement of Alexandria, and definitely described, i.e. in some detail, by Hippolytus (Refut. v. 124). The latter was followed by Theodoret, but no new information about them was added by him (Haeret. fab. 1:17). This sect appears to have been called Peratae, or Peratici, in the first instance, from the country to which they belonged, Eubcea, i.e. the land beyond (πέραν ) the continent, as Peraea was the district beyond Jordan; and this is the only fact stated about them by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 7:17, ad fin.). But they afterwards gave another meaning to the name, that of “Transcendentalists” (Περᾶσαι), because, through their knowledge of the divine mysteries, they were qualified to “proceed through the pass beyond destruction.” Hippolytus says they originated with Euphrates the Peratic and Celbes the Carystian (the latter being also called Ademes and Acembes the Carystian both by Hippolytus and Theodoret), but no particulars are given about either.

The Peratae appear to have been a local sect, and their peculiar γνῶσις was a recondite philosophy founded on theories associated with the constellations of astronomers, and on serpent-worship. Hippolytus says that they and their doctrine had been very little known until he described them, and that the latter were so intricate that it was difficult to give a compendious notion of them. But, after stating many details of their strange system, he goes on to sum it up in the following terms, which make it evident that their system was only a modification of the general Ophitic notions. They held that the universe is Father, Son, and Matter, each of the three having endless capacities in itself; intermediate between Matter and the Father sits the Son — the Logos, the Serpent — always being in motion towards the unmoving Father and towards moving Matter. At one time the Son is turned towards the Father, and receives powers into his own person; at another time he takes up these powers, and turns towards  Matter. Then Matter, devoid of attribute, and being unfashioned, molds itself into forms from the Son, which the Son molded from the Father. They believed, further, in a Demiurge, who works destruction and death, and that men could be saved from his power only through the Son, who is the Serpent. In addition to this fundamental corruption of Christianity, the Peratee had also many secret mysteries, which Hippolytus says could not be mentioned by him on account of their profanity (Philosoph. v. 7-13; 10:6). See Baxmann, in Illgen's Zeitschr. f. historische Theologie, 1860; Taylor, Hippolytus, p. 84; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1:280-285.

## Perault[[@Headword:Perault]]

             (or, better, Peyraud), Guillaume, a French prelate, was born about 1190 in Peyraud, a village of Vivarais, then in the diocese of Viennia, now in the department of Ardeche. Doctor of the University of Paris, Guillaume entered quite young the Order of St. Dominic, and soon acquired a general esteem by the purity of his manners, by his doctrines, and by his talents in the pulpit. Philip of Savoy, who, without having received orders, was elected in 1246 archbishop of Lyons, chose him for suffragan bishop, and Guillaume, clothed with a title in partibus, performed episcopal duties in the diocese for more than ten years, which has led into error Leandro Alberti, Altamura, and Severt, who have placed him among the archbishops of Lyons. Perault died at Lyons in 1255. We have of his works, Summa de vitiis et virtu. tibus, of which the last edition (Paris, 1663, 4to) is a work much praised by Gerson: — Commentarium de Re. gula Sancti Benedicti (1500, 8vo); printed without name of place, year, or printer, and attributed in a MS. to William of Poitiers: — a treatise, De eruditione religiosorum; often printed at Paris, Lyons, and elsewhere, and which appeared under the name of Imbert, general of the Dominicans: — a collection of sermons De di. versis et de efstis, of which more than twelve editions have been published; the last at Orleans, 1674, 8vo: — a treatise, De eruditione Principium, printed for the first time at Rome, 1570, 8vo. A treatise entitled Virtutum vitiorumque exempla has been wrongly attributed to Guillaume Perault; it is by Nicholas de Hanappes, patriarch of Jerusalem. See Echard, Scriptor. ordin. Prcedicat. 1:132; Touron, hommes illust. de l'ordre de Saint Dominique; Gallia Christ. vol. 5.

## Perault, Raimond[[@Headword:Perault, Raimond]]

             a French cardinal, was born May 28, 1435, at Surgeres (Saintonge). The son of poor artisans, he was first a school-teacher in his own village, then at La Rochelle, and, thanks to some benefactors, he entered as burser the College of Navarre, in Paris. Received as doctor, and appointed prior of Saint-Gilles at Surgeres, he went to Rome, and rendered himself useful to popes Paul II, Sextus IV, and Innocent VIII. The latter sent him in 1487 to Germany to collect the alms designed for the expenses of the war against the Turks, and, although this nunciatory had not gained for himself much honor, Raimond was nevertheless rewarded for his travels and labors by the bishopric of Gurck, in Carinthia. Alexander VI made him a cardinal in September, 1493, on the recommendation of king Charles VIII, and it was he who, in the name of this prince, signed at Rome, Sept. 6, 1494, the act of donation or cession of the empire of Constantinople, made to France by Andreas Paleologus, prince of Roumania, sole heir of the empire. His favorable inclinations towards France, his native land, appeared particularly on the occasion of the war of Naples, when he raised his voice to complain of the intrigues and the odious conduct of Alexander VI on the subject of prince Zizim, son of Mohammed II. Cardinal Perault obtained in 1513 the bishopric of Saintes, where he never resided, and was appointed by Julius II legate of the patrimony of St. Peter. The favor which he enjoyed with the different popes excited jealousy against him; also, certain authors have treated him very ill; others, on the contrary, have bestowed the greatest praises upon his probity and manners. He died at Viterbo, Sept. 5, 1505. He has left, among others, works entitled De dignitate sacerdotali super omnes reges: — De Actis suis Lubeci et in Dania Epistole: — different Harangues. See Gallia Christiana, vol. ii; Huguee du Teurs, Le Clerge de France, vol. ii; Aubery, Hist, des Cardin.; Berthier, Hist. de l'Eglise Gallic. vol. xvii; Briand, Hist. de l'Eglise Santone et Aunisienne, vol. ii.

## Perazim, Mount[[@Headword:Perazim, Mount]]

             [some Pera'zim], MOUNT (Heb. Har Peratsim', הִראּפְּרָצַים. mountain of clefis; Sept. ὄρος ἀσεβῶν [apparently by mistake for רְשָׁעַים]; Vulg. Mons division'im), a place mentioned by the prophet Isaiah, in warning the Israelites of the divine vengeance about to come upon the nation, with which they did not seem sufficiently impressed, referring to instances of God's wrath exhibited in their past history in these words: “The Lord shall rise up as in Mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon”  (Isa 28:21). The commentators almost unanimously take his reference to be to David's victories at Baal-perazim and Gibeon (Gesenius, Strachey), or to the former of these on the one hand, and Joshua's slaughter of the Canaanites at Gibeon and Beth-horon on the other (Eichhorn, Rosenmüller, Michaelis). Hendewerk thinks reference is made to “the breach of Uzzah” (פרוֹ עזה, Perez-Uzzah) described in 2Sa 6:6-8 (Die Deutero-Jesaiaschen Weissag. ad loc.); but that narrative contains no mention of any mount. Ewald supposes the prophet may allude to the slaughter of the Canaanites at Gibeon by Joshua (Die Propheten, ad loc.); though in another place he distinctly states that Mount Perazim is the same place which is called Baal-perazim (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 3:187, note 3). Isaiah in this passage doubtless alludes to David's conquest of the Philistines. “And David came to Baal-perazim, and smote them there, and said, The Lord hath broken forth (פרוֹ) upon mine enemies before me, as the breach of waters (כפרוֹ מים). Therefore he called the name of that place Baal-perazim” (בעל פרצים, 2Sa 5:20). The play upon the word is characteristic. It seems probable, as Ewald states (l.c.), that there was a high-place of Baal upon the top of the mount, and hence the name Baal-perazim. SEE BAAL.

This view is confirmed by the fact that in the second clause of the passage Isaiah mentions another instance of divine wrath in the valley of Gibeon, and in 1 Chronicles 14 the historian connects with the victory at Baal-perazim a second victory of David over the Philistines, in which it is said “they smote the host of the Philistines from Gibeon even to Gaze 2Sa 5:16). The exact locality of Mount Perazim is unknown, but it must have been some of the heights on the borders of the valley of Rephaim (1Ch 14:9; 2Sa 5:18), and consequently not far distant from Jerusalem. In the account of Josephus (Ant. 7:4, 1), David's victory assumes much larger proportions than in Samuel and Chronicles. The attack is made not by the Philistines only, but by “all Syria and Phoenicia, with many other warlike nations besides.” He places the scene of the encounter in the “groves of weeping,” as if alluding to the Baca of Psalms 84. SEE BAAL- PERAZIM.

## Perception[[@Headword:Perception]]

             This word refers to our reception of knowledge through the senses, an operation which to the common understanding seems simple enough; but, viewed philosophically, is attended with much difficulty. Perception,  considered as a source of knowledge, refers exclusively to the outer, or the object world — the world of extended matter and its properties. The names for the act of knowing one's own mind — the feelings and thoughts of the individual are self-consciousness and self-introspection. The word “consciousness” is sometimes improperly limited to this signification. Locke used the term “reflection” for the same meaning; but this is ambiguous, and is now disused. All our knowledge is thus said (by those that deny innate ideas) to spring from two sources — perception and self- consciousness.

Sir William Hamilton (Intel. Pow. essay i, ch. i) notices the following meanings of perception, as applied to different faculties, acts, and objects

1. Perceptio, in its primary philosophical signification, as in the mouths of Cicero and Quintilian, is vaguely equivalent to comprehension, notion, cognition in general.

2. An apprehension, a becoming aware of, consciousness. Perception the Cartesians really identified with idea, and allowed them only a logical distinction; the same representative act being called idea, inasmuch as we regard it as a representation; and perception, inasmuch as we regard it as a consciousness of such representation.

3. Perception is limited to the apprehension of sense alone. This limitation was first formally imposed by Reid, and thereafter by Kant.

4. A still more restricted meaning, through the authority of Reid, is perception (proper), in contrast to sensation (proper). He defines sensitive perception simply as that act of consciousness whereby we apprehend in our body,

(a) certain special affections, whereof, as an animated organism, it is contingently susceptible; and

(b) those general relations of extension under which, as a material organism, it necessarily exists.

Of these perceptions, the former, which is thus conversant about a subject object, is sensation proper; the latter, which is thus conversant about an object-object, is perception proper.

Two great disputes connect themselves with perception, both raised into their full prominence in the philosophical world by bishop Berkeley. The  first is the origin of our judgments of the distances and real magnitudes of visible bodies. In opposition to the common opinion on this subject, Berkeley maintained that these were learned by experience, and not known by the mere act of vision. The second question relates to the grounds we have for asserting the existence of an external and material world, which, in the view of Berkeley, was bound up with the other. Inasmuch as perception is a mental act, and knowledge is something contained in a mind, what reason have we for believing in the existence of objects apart from our minds? or what is the mode of existence of the so-called external world? The following sentences show in what manner Berkeley opened up the question: “That neither our thoughts nor passions nor ideas, formed by the imagination, exist without the mind, is what everybody will allow; and it seems no less evident that the various sensations or ideas imprinted on the sense, however blended or combined together (i.e. whatever objects they compose), cannot exist otherwise than in a mind perceiving them. I think an intuitive knowledge may be obtained of this by any one that shall attend to what is meant by the term exist when applied to sensible things. The table I write on I say exists — i.e. I see and feel it; and if I were out of my study, I should say it existed, meaning thereby that if I was in my study I might perceive it, or that some other spirit actually does perceive it. There was an odor i.e. it was smelled; there was a sound — that is to say, it was heard; a color or figure, and it was perceived by sight or touch. This is all I can understand by these and the like expressions. For as to what is said of the absolute existence of unthinking things, without any relation to their being perceived, that seems perfectly unintelligible. Their esse is percipi, nor is it possible they should have any existence out of the minds or thinking things which perceive them.” SEE BERKELEY.

This doctrine of Berkeley, amounting, it was said, to a denial of the existence of a material world (which is far from a correct view of it), was followed up by Hume, who, on similar reasoning, denied the existence of mind, and resolved the universe into a mere flow of ideas and impressions without any subject to be impressed, acknowledging, nevertheless, that he felt himself unable, practically, to acquiesce in his own unanswerable arguments. There was obviously some great mistake in a mode of reasoning that brought about a dead-lock of this description; and hence it has been the work of metaphysical philosophy since that time to endeavor to put the perception of the world on an admissible footing. Dr. Reid reclaimed against Berkeley and Hume by appealing to common-sense, or unreasoning instinct, as a sufficient foundation for our belief in the  existence of a world apart from our own minds. Sir William Hamilton has expounded the same view with greater clearness and precision. He considers that our consciousness tells us at once that in the act of perceiving there is both a perceiving subject-self, or the mind — and an external reality, in relation with sense, as the object perceived. “Of the existence of both these things,” he says, “I am convinced; because I am conscious of knowing each of them, not mediately in something else, as represented, but immediately in itself, as existing. Of their mutual dependence I am no less convinced, because each is apprehended equally and at once, in the same indivisible energy, the one not preceding or determining, the other not following or determined; and because each is apprehended out of and in direct contrast to the other” (Works, p. 747). Much as Hamilton has labored to elucidate this doctrine in all its bearings, it has not been universally accepted as satisfactory. Many believe that he has regarded as an ultimate fact of our constitution what admits of being still further resolved, and has mistaken an acquisition of the mature mind for a primitive or instinctive revelation. Professor Ferrier, in his Institutes of Metaphysics, has gone through the question with extraordinary minuteness and elaboration. His main position is the inseparability of the subject and the object in perception (a position also maintained by Hamilton in the above extract), which is not reconcilable with the common assumption as to the independent existence of matter. Indeed, he reduces the received dogma of the existence of matter per se to a self- contradiction, and builds up a system in strict conformity with the correlation, or necessary connection, of the mind perceiving with the object perceived. He thus approaches nearer to Berkeley than to Hamilton or to Reid. See Porter, Intellect; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos.; South. Rev. Oct. 1873, art. 8, Westm. Rev. Jan. 1873, p. 119.

## Perceval, Alfred P[[@Headword:Perceval, Alfred P]]

             an English divine of some distinction, was born near the opening of this century, and was educated at Oxford, where he became fellow of All- Soul's College. After taking holy orders, he was in 1824 made rector of East Horsley, and finally chaplain to the queen. He died in 1853. He published, Reasons why I an not a Member of the Bible Society (Lond. 1830, 8vo): — The Roman Schism Illustrated from the Records of the Catholic Church (Lond. 1836, 8vo): — Historical Notices concerning some of the Peculiar Tenets of the Church of Rome (new ed. Lond. 1837, 12mo): — Sermons, preached chiefly at the Chapel Royal, St. James's  (Lond. 1839, 8vo): — An Apologyfor the Doctrine of Apostolical Succession, with an Appendix on the English Orders (Lond. 1841, 2d ed. sm. 8vo): —A Collection of Papers connected with the Theological Movement of 1833 (Lond. 1842, 8vo): — Results of an Ecclesiastical Tour in Holland and Northern Germany (Lond. 1846, 12mo): — Plain Lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians (Lond. 1846).

## Perche, Napoleon Joseph[[@Headword:Perche, Napoleon Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Angers, France, January 10, 1805. He was educated for the Church, and was ordained a. priest September 19, 1829. In 1837, when bishop Flaget went to Europe in the interests of his diocese, father Perche offered his services as a missionary, which were accepted, and on his arrival in America he began his labors in Kentucky and founded a church in Portland. In 1842 he was transferred to New Orleans and appointed chaplain of the Ursuline convent, which office he held until April, 1870. Father Perche founded at New Orleans the Propagateur Catholique, of which he was principal editor. On May 1, 1870, he was consecrated bishop coadjutor of New Orleans, and on the death of Odin, May 25,1870, he became the archbishop of the diocese. He died there, December 27, 1883. He was. a man of great energy, far-seeing judgment, and great eloquence, and his many charitable acts endeared him to the people, among whom he labored with zeal and fidelity.

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

             an English physician, eminent as a writer on philosophic and general social topics, was born at Warrington, in Lancashire, in 1740. After studying at Edinburgh and Leyden, he settled at Manchester, and there founded a literary and philosophical society, of which he was chosen president. He devoted a considerable portion of his time during the later period of his life to the study of moral philosophy, and he published several popular works on this subject. In his religious tenets he was a strict dissenter from the Church of England, but was very temperate and unobtrusive in his opinions. He died, universally respected by the inhabitants of Manchester, August 30, 1804. Dr. Percival's earlier medical and philosophical papers were collected and published in one volume (Lond. 1767, 8vo). To this two other volumes were afterwards added, one in 1773, and the other in 1778. These essays went through several editions, and acquired for the author considerable reputation. Besides the Essays, we may mention some: — Moral and Literary Dissertations (Warrington, 1784, 8vo): — A Father's Instructions, consisting of Moral Tales, Fables, and Reflections, designed to Promote the Love of Virtue (Lond. 1788, 8vo). All his works were collected and published together after his death by his son, in four vols. 8vo (Lond. 1807). To this edition is prefixed a memoir of his life and writings, and a selection from his literary correspondence.

## Percligia[[@Headword:Percligia]]

             a Turkish visionary, who excited a commotion in Natolia, and was put to death, declaring himself an apostle of God, in 1418.

## Perclose[[@Headword:Perclose]]

             a railing or other enclosure separating a tomb or chapel from the rest of a church.

## Percoto, Gian-Maria[[@Headword:Percoto, Gian-Maria]]

             an Italian missionary, was born at Udine in 1729. A member of the Congregation of the Paulists, he was appointed bishop of Maxula. Charged with the direction of the missions in India, he made numerous proselytes in Pegu and Ava. He translated into Burmese several books of the fathers of the Church, and composed a Latin-Burmese dictionary and grammar. We owe to him the translation into Italian of several Jainas; very curious, on the history of India. The manuscripts are deposited in the library of the Propaganda of Rome. Percoto died at Ava in 1776. See A. Griffini, Vie de Percoto (Udine, 1782, 4to); Lefttes edifiantes et curieuses des missions etrang. vol. 17.

## Percy, Hugh, D.D[[@Headword:Percy, Hugh, D.D]]

             an Anglican prelate, was born in London, January 19, 1784, being a son of the first earl of Beverley. He was consecrated bishop of Rochester in June, 1827, and was transferred to the see of Carlisle in the following September. He was also chancellor of Salisbury and prebendary of St. Paul's. He died suddenly at Rose Castle, near Carlisle, February 12, 1856. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1856, page 145..

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

             D.D., a noted English scholar, and a prelate of the Irish Church, was the son of a grocer at Bridgenorth, in Shropshire, where he was born, April 13. 1728. He affected to be considered of the noble house of Percy, or it has been affected for him; but his better and surer honor is that he was the maker of his own fortunes, and by his valuable writings and the honorable discharge of his episcopal duties reared for himself a high and permanent reputation. He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, and early in life obtained the vicarage of Easton Mauduit, on which he resided, and the rectory of Wilby. In 1769 he became chaplain to the king; in 1778 dean of Carlisle; and in 1782 was elevated to the bishopric of Dromore, in Ireland. Long before this he had begun his literary career by the publication of what purports to be a translation from the Chinese of a novel, together with other matters connected with the poetry and literature of that people. This is a translation by him from a Portuguese manuscript. It was soon followed by another work, entitled Miscellaneous Pieces relating to the Chinese. He next published translations from the Icelandic of five pieces of Runic poetry. These appeared in 1761, 1762, and 1763. In 1764 he published A New Version of Solomon's Song, with a Commentary and Notes — an elegant version and useful commentary, in which the Song of Songs is considered chiefly as a celebration of the earthly loves of Solomon: the book has become exceedingly scarce. In 1765 he published a Key to the New Testament, which has been reprinted several times. In the same year, 1765, appeared the work by which he is, however, best known, and which is indeed one of the most elegant and pleasing works in the whole range of English literature, to which he gave the title of Reliques of Ancient English  Poetry.

It contains some of the best of the old English ballads, many very beautiful lyrical pieces by the poets of the Elizabethan period and the age immediately succeeding, a few extracts from the larger writings of the poets of those periods, and a few lyrical pieces by modern writers. Each piece is well illustrated. It has been many times reprinted. From the time of this publication dates the revival of a genuine feeling for true poetry among the English people. To Percy himself it secured the successive promotions which he enjoyed in the Church. In 1770 he printed the Northumberland Household Book, and a poem, the subject of which is connected with the history of the Percy family, called The Hermit of Warkworth. In the same year appeared his translation, with notes, of The Northern Antiquities, by M. Mallet. The assistance which he gave to other authors is often acknowledged by them, and especially by Mr. Nichols, in several of his works. When Percy became a bishop he thought it his duty to devote himself entirely to his diocese. He resided from that time almost constantly at the palace of Dromore, where he lived greatly respected and beloved. After a life in the main prosperous and happy, he tasted of some of the afflictions of mortality. In 1782 he lost an only son. His eyesight failed him, and he became at length totally blind. He died at the palace of Dromore September 30, 1811. The memory of bishop Percy has been honored by the foundation of a literary association called the Percy Society.

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

             D.D., a somewhat noted Episcopal clergyman, was born in Warwickshire, England, in 1744; was educated at Edmund Hall, Oxford, and after having taken holy orders in 1767, filled a number of ecclesiastical posts in the Church of England until 1816, when he came to America, and was made rector of St. Paul's Church, Radcliffeborough, South Carolina. In 1819 he returned to England, and died at London. He published, An Apology for the Episcopal Church, in a series of letters on the nature, ground, and foundation of the Episcopacy: — The Clergyman's and People's Remembrancer. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vol. Episcopalians, p. 293-96.

## Perdiccas[[@Headword:Perdiccas]]

             (Περδίκκας) flourished as a prothonotary at Ephesus in the 14th century (1347), and is the author of a poem which was inserted in a compilation of Allatius, entitled Συμμικτά (published at Amsterdam in 1653). The subject  is the miraculous events connected with Christ's history, principally those of which Jerusalem was the theater. But besides Jerusalem, he visits Bethany, Bethpage, and Bethlehem. In this poem (which consists of 260 verses of that kind termed politici) he writes as if from personal inspection, but, if this were really the case, he is wanting in clearness and distinctness of delineation. While some of the details are curious, his geography is singularly inaccurate. Thus he places Galilee on the northern skirts of the Mount of Olives. If we may trust a conjecture hazarded by Fabricius, he attended a synod held at Constantinople A.D. 1347, at which were present two of the same name, Theodorus and Georgius Perdiccas (Allatius, l.c.; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, 4:663; 8:99).

## Perdition[[@Headword:Perdition]]

             This word is never used in the Old Testament and but rarely in the New, but the idea which it conveys runs through the whole of Scripture. Various Hebrew words, and especially the word אָבִד, “to destroy,” are translated by the Greek words ἀπώλεια and ὄλεθρος, and the primary meaning in most cases is waste, loss, disappearance, or physical dissolution; sometimes, however, the meaning appears to be sorrow, shame, or degradation.

I. Let us examine in what sense nations and cities have been subjected to perdition. God it. the ruler of the nations of the world, and if they provoke him to anger they are threatened with destruction. Thus God determines to destroy man (Gen 6:7) for his wickedness, and only Noah and his family are saved. Sodom and the neighboring cities are destroyed (Genesis 19), and only Lot and his daughters are permitted to escape. In these cases apparently supernatural means are taken for carrying out God's purpose, but in other cases man is made the instrument of destruction, as in the case of the Canaanitish nations. Sometimes the prevalent idea is the desolation of the country when the people have left it (Eze 6:14; Jer 48:3). Often it has reference to great national calamities and reverses (Oba 1:13; Est 8:6; Isa 47:11); and occasionally it expresses the extinction of a single family (1Ki 13:34). Sometimes the nations who have been thus “destroyed” rise up again, and sometimes they seem to come to an end altogether.

II. We now pass to the case of individuals; and here we have to distinguish several kinds of destruction or perdition.

1. There is present perdition, or the lost state of the soul until it partakes of a present salvation. The Son of Man came to seek that which was lost (Luk 19:10). The idea here presented is that of a soul which has fallen from its high estate and has become a wreck, but it is capable of renovation and restoration by the power of Jesus Christ; and the idea is well illustrated by the story of the son who “was lost and is found,” and by the parables of the lost sheep and the lost piece of money.

2. Temporal calamity and death are often included under the term destruction (Pro 1:27; Pro 11:10; Rom 9:22; and perhaps 1Co 15:18). But when we read of the destruction coming on the wicked (Psa 145:20), and that they are “reserved unto the day of destruction” (Job 21:30), we perceive that there must be a third meaning given to the word before us. We read in four passages of “Hades and destruction,” as if this involved something beyond death (Job 26:6; Job 28:22; Pro 15:12; Pro 27:20). We find that some are to be destroyed “forever” (Psa 52:5); he read of him who after death can “destroy both soul and body in hell” (Mat 10:28), and that men may gain the whole world and lose their own souls, and he rejected or cast away. We find that there is a broad road leading to destruction and trod by many, which however may be avoided; this cannot be mere physical death, for no man can avoid that. It must thereto e be something beyond death, and must be the end of a misspent existence, and so we read of some that their “end is destruction” (Php 3:19), and that while some men are σωζόμενοι, or in the way to be saved, others are ἀπολλύμενοι, or in the way to be destroyed (1Co 1:18; 2Co 2:15; 2Co 4:3). The author of this final destruction is God (Jam 4:12); whereas the two kinds of perdition previously named seem connected with the power of Satan, who is called Abaddon or Apollyon. Final destruction is the alternative to salvation, and appears to be especially set forth in the New Testament as the lot of those who deliberately reject or recede from the Gospel (Php 1:28; Heb 10:39; 2 Peter 2), and it will be awarded in the time of judgment (2Pe 3:7).

III. Taking it then as proved that perdition is the final destiny of certain persons, it remains for us to consider the passages which give us hints as to the nature of this terrible judgment. First, is it annihilation? The word which looks most like annihilation in the Old Testament is בִּלָּהָה, “nothingness,” and its cognate forms, used by the prophet Ezekiel with  reference to Rabbath-ammon, Tyre, and other cities (Eze 25:7; Eze 26:21; Eze 27:36; Eze 28:19). Yet even in these extreme cases the exact and philosophical meaning of the word can hardly be pressed. For in truth the nature of destruction will vary according to the nature of the object to be destroyed, and it is not necessarily that utter extinction to which we give the name “annihilation,” if indeed there be such a thing. There is a physical destruction, to which the material buildings of great cities were doomed, as Tyre and Jerusalem; but in all such cases there are ruins, or stones, or fragments enough left, to show that the idea intended to be conveyed is that of a wreck rather than that of non-existence. There is a corporate destruction of nationalities and of families, yet even from these ruins there have been some that have escaped, and who have been merged into other nations. There is individual destruction — death and something more — and no doubt in these cases the man thus destroyed is in one sense no longer the same man, with the same powers and faculties which he had before his final doom came upon him, yet there may be sufficient remaining to him to enable him still to preserve an identity and to recognize the justice of his doom. The only passage in the New Testament which at all favors the idea of annihilation or absolute extinction is Rev 20:14, where we are told that “death and hades were cast into the lake of fire.” Now it might be argued that we cannot suppose that death and hades suffered eternal punishment, and that as being “cast into the lake” means extinction in their case, so it is to be understood in the case of the reprobate. But the argument cuts both ways, for as death and hades are here personified, so their end is personified; but as they are not really persons, so their end will not really be the same as the end of personal human beings who would not come unto Christ that they might have life. Whether annihilation is a conceivable idea in relation to a being in whom God has breathed the breath of life we cannot tell; nor do we know whether it would be a just recompense for the rejection of Christ as Lord and Savior; but we may rest assured that if it were in accordance with God's character and design it would have been so ordered.

Proceeding with our investigation, we note that perdition is set forth in the New Testament as involving the final ruin of the spirit. This may be inferred from 1Co 5:5, where we are told that the spirit may be saved hereafter at the cost of the destruction of the flesh here, which implies that otherwise the spirit would be unsaved or lost. Again, St. Paul tells us that perdition is the drowning of the soul, following from the love  of money or erroneous belief (1Ti 6:9), and St. Peter uses the word in reference to the fate of Simon Magus, who was in the bond of iniquity (Act 8:20). In two passages which bring the subject before us (1Th 5:3; 2Th 1:9), the primary reference is to the fate of the enemies of Christ who shall be destroyed at his coming — an event which seems to be portrayed in figurative language at the end of Revelation 19. Perhaps we are not warranted in drawing any direct inference as to the fate of all the ungodly from these passages. But in whatever light we regard them, they evidently form part of the great revelation of God's wrath against sin, which we find fully confirmed by the words of our Lord himself. For if we take the one word Gehenna, the scene or abode of perdition (Mat 10:28), as used by Christ, we gather that it is to be the fate of the angry and revengeful (Mat 5:22), of the carn Mat 5:29-30), of hypocrites and persecutors (Mat 23:33); and from several of the parables we see that punishments described in almost similar terms are to be inflicted upon faithless and unprofitable members of Christ's Church. Perdition is described as “the second death” in Rev 21:8, and a terrible list is given setting forth the real character of those who shall share it; and this list is almost the same as that which St. Paul set before his Galatian converts more than once, as marking the characteristics of those who are finally excluded from the kingdom of God (Gal 5:19-21; comp. 1Co 6:9-10).

Another idea connected with perdition is that of corruption. The body of the saint is sown in corruption, but it springs up and the harvest is incorruption. But it is not so with those who are treasuring up wrath against the day of wrath. Their harvest is corruption — ten times more corruptible than that which takes place at the first death (Gal 6:8). St. Peter tells us of some who have turned from the truth that they have become “servants of corruption,” and in that state they enter the world to come (2Pe 2:19). If we try to comprehend the nature of final spiritual corruption, we find it impossible to say more than that it implies the utmost degradation and loathsomeness of which the human spirit is capable, and that it probably will be wrought out by natural laws in God's spiritual kingdom, as in the case with physical corruption now.

Gathering up into one view a few other solemn statements about the ruin of the unbelieving, which we find in Scripture — and apart from Scripture we know absolutely nothing of the matter, as we know neither the nature  nor the results of sin — we see that there are persons who “die in their sins” (Joh 8:24), who “have no forgiveness” (Mat 12:31), “God's wrath abideth on them” (Joh 3:36), they rise to “the resurrection of damnation” (Joh 6:29), they “depart” from Christ (Mat 7:23), “into outer darkness” (Mat 8:12), and into a “furnace of fire” (Mat 13:50). There they reap the fruit of their actions done here, being accursed and utterly degraded. We know nothing about the nature of their sufferings, and we have no right to indulge in exaggerated and glowing descriptions of their future misery. All such attempts are based upon the supposition that their physical constitution will be the same then as now. But this is a most unsafe hypothesis. Physical pain now depends on the exquisite sensitiveness of the nervous system, which is devised for man's benefit. Man suffers more than other animals because he has perverted his nature which was constituted for him to enjoy more. The accursed will “rise with their bodies,” but the constitution of those bodies may be far less sensitive. They are described as “carcasses” in Isa 66:24, and the word (פֶּגֶר) literally means that which is faint or exhausted, and so excludes the idea of strong nervous sensibility. They are in “outer darkness” — this seems to shut them out from spiritual and physical light and knowledge. They are “bound hand and foot,” which appears to exclude the idea of any physical activity. In fact their punishment should be represented as the extreme of degradation rather than the height of suffering, though it is true that they suffer the bitterness of remorse, described as “weeping and gnashing of teeth,” and that “the smoke of their torment” will be a lasting memorial of God's wrath against man's pride and ingratitude. Though we know so little about perdition, one thing is clear, that not a gleam of hope is given in Scripture to those on whom this awful sentence shall be pronounced. Their condition is represented as one from which there can be no recovery. It is sometimes argued that God's threats are eternally conditional, and that the destiny of no man even in the world to come is hopeless. Attempts have been made to defend this hypothesis by reference to God's temporal threatenings, the accomplishment of which has been modified by the repentance of the persons threatened. But before this idea can be entertained it must be shown, first, that the finally lost are even capable of repentance or of any good thought; secondly, that God will set a way of return-another sacrifice for sin — before them; thirdly, that any indications can be found in Scripture that any or all of those who shall be cast into Gehenna shall be restored to favor; and, lastly, those passages must be explained, or  explained away, which reveal the perdition of the lost as eternal. SEE PUNISHMENT.

## Perdition, Son Of[[@Headword:Perdition, Son Of]]

             (ὑιὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας). It was common among the Jews to express a man's character by calling him “the son of” some abstract quality. Thus we read in the New Testament of the sons of the kingdom, the sons of light, the sons of God, the sons of the devil, the sons of this age, the sons of disobedience, the sons of thunder; the children (τέκνα) of wisdom, of the promise, of wrath, of obedience, of a curse. So in the Sept. we read of a son of death (1Sa 20:30), a son of strength (2Sa 13:28), sons of the captivity, a son of a hundred years, sons of the bow (Lam 3:13), sons of wisdom (Sir 4:12); children of unrighteousness (Hos 10:9), and children of perdition (Isa 57:4). By this last expression we understand that perdition marks both the character and destiny of the persons spoken of. Our Lord calls Judas Iscariot “the son of perdition,” and refers to his end as the fulfillment of Scripture (Joh 17:12). The best commentary on this statement is that afforded by St. Peter (Act 1:20), who refers directly to Psalms 69 as predicting the fate of the betrayer of the Lord. SEE BEN-.

But it may be gathered from 2Th 2:3, that another son of perdition is to be revealed, and he is identified as the Man of Sin, the great opponent of the Christian religion, who shall set himself up in the place of God. He is afterwards called “the lawless one,” and his miraculous impostures are described, but he is to be destroyed at Christ's appearing. He appears to be the final incarnation of irreligion, and his character is drawn in the book of Revelation as the great deceiver and tormenter of nations, who, after becoming the instrument of the destruction of the mystic Babylon, aims at universal despotism, forbids all worship of the true God, and defies the power of Christ; but he is to be destroyed and cast into the lake of fire. The terms in which this “son of perdition” is described seem to imply that he will be a real person; but arguing from the very figurative character of prophecy many writers have been led to an opposite conclusion. SEE ANTICHRIST.

## Perdoite[[@Headword:Perdoite]]

             an ancient Slavonic deity worshipped by mariners and fishermen, who believed that he presided over the sea.

## Pere[[@Headword:Pere]]

             SEE ASS.

## Pere la Chaise[[@Headword:Pere la Chaise]]

             SEE LA CHAISE.

## Perea[[@Headword:Perea]]

             SEE PEREA.

## Pered[[@Headword:Pered]]

             SEE MULE.

## Pereda, Antonio[[@Headword:Pereda, Antonio]]

             an eminent Spanish painter, was born at Valladolid in 1599. He studied under Pedro de has Cuevas, and showed so much ability that he was taken under the protection of Don Francisco de Texada, who sent him to Madrid, where he had an opportunity of studying the works of the great masters in the royal collections. At the age of eighteen he produced a picture of the Immaculate Conception, in which the Virgin appeared on a throne of clouds, supported by angels, executed so admirably that no one could believe it the work of so young an artist. The reputation he acquired by this performance induced the due de Olivarez, who had the direction of the works going on in the palace of the Retiro, to employ him, and place him among the artists of the highest rank. Pere da performed his part to the satisfaction of his patron, and was munificently rewarded. He acquired great reputation, and is said to have executed many works for the churches at Madrid, Toledo, Alcala, Cuenca, and Valladolid. He also painted much for individuals, and no collection was considered complete without a specimen of Pereda. It is also said he was a universal artist — painting history, familiar life, vases, tapestry, musical instruments, and other objects of still life. His pictures were well designed, his drawing correct, and his coloring rich and glowing, in the Venetian style, with an admirable impasto. Few of his works are known to be extant at the present day. There are two in the Royal Gallery at Madrid, one of which represents St. Jerome Meditating on the Last Judgment; one of Christ asleep on the Cross, with flowers and skulls, in the collection of marshal Soult; one of St. Anthony and Christ, in the Esterhazy Gallery in Vienna, and three or four in the gallery at Munich. Pereda died at Madrid in 1699.

## Perefixe, Hardouin Beaumont De[[@Headword:Perefixe, Hardouin Beaumont De]]

             a noted French prelate, was born in 1605. After having finished his education, he attracted the notice of cardinal Richelieu, who became his protector. Perefixe obtained the high office of tutor to Louis XIV in 1644. Four years later his services to the court received recognition by his promotion to the bishopric of Rodez. He became a member of the French Academy in 1654, and was appointed archbishop of Paris in 1662. In this last responsible position he enforced among the Jansenists compliance with the formulary of pope Alexander VII. He died in 1670. Perefixe was a man of great scholarship, and possessed remarkable talents. He was born to rule and to teach. Unfortunately, however, he was more of a politician than an ecclesiastic, and did everything rather to please hisking than to honor his God. He was truly a timeserver. In the Jansenistic controversy he had it in his power to influence the king favorably, but he failed to embrace the opportunity, and was obliged to obey when he might have led. SEE PAVILLON; SEE PORT-ROYAL. His Life of Henry IV is considered a classical work (Histoire du Roy Henry le Grand [Amst. 1661, 12mo]). An English translation was published (Lond. 1663, 8vo; also 1672 and 1785). See Jervis, History of the Church of France, 1:454 sq., 461 sq.; D'Avrigny, Memoires Chronol. 2:444 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Peregrini Da Cesena, Or Pellegrini Da Cesio[[@Headword:Peregrini Da Cesena, Or Pellegrini Da Cesio]]

             an Italian goldsmith, engraver, and worker in niello, flourished in the latter part of the 15th and first part of the 16th centuries. He is one of those artists about whom and whose works there is very little known with certainty. Bartsch gives a descriptive account of ten prints by him (Peintre- Graveur, tom. 13). Duchesne discovered Peregrini's name on some admirable works by him in niello, which he describes (Essai sur les Nielles). Ottley describes ten prints which he supposes to be by this artist. Nagler, from these and various other authorities, gives a list of sixty-four pieces which he attributes to him, among them the following:

1. Abraham loading an ass for his journey to Mt. Moriah;

2. Abraham, Isaac, and two servants on their way to the Mount;

3. Abraham and Isaac on the Mount, the servants sitting below;

4. Abraham with a knife and torch, Isaac bearing a bundle of wood;

5. Abraham, about to immolate Isaac, is prevented by an Angel: the head of a ram is seen at the right-hand corner;

6. David conquering Goliath: a very fine plate;

7. Judith with the head of Holiness in her left hand;

8. The Holy Virgin with the Infant on a throne, attended by St. Paul and St. Francis d'Assisi;

9. The Baptism of Christ: in the foreground, to the right and left, are St. Stephen and St. Francis;

10. The Resurrection of Christ:

11. The Annunciation, in two small medallions;

12. John the Baptist with the Cross, on which is a medallion with the Lamb, and the words “Ecce Agnus;”

13. St. Sebastian standing by a Tree, his hands tied above his head;

14. St. Jerome kneeling before a Crucifix, the lion behind him;

15. St. Roch: on the right hand the first person of the Trinity is blessing him;

16. St. Margaret seated on a large winged Dragon, holding in one hand a cornucopia, and in the other a cake. Bartsch calls this subject Providence.

## Peregrino, Bonaventura[[@Headword:Peregrino, Bonaventura]]

             (originally SERACH YOM TOB, or SALOMO NAVARRA), a convert from Judaism, was born about 1643 at Casale, not far from the famous Spanish monastery at Montferrat. He was baptized at Bologna Jan. 18, 1665, on which occasion he took the name under which he was afterwards known. According to the spirit of his age, Peregrino endeavored to demonstrate the mysteries of Christianity from the letters of the Old Testament according to the rules of the Cabala (q.v.), and wrote in Italian Pretioso Giqjello sopra ii nome di Dio Tetragrammaton, which, however, has never been published. See Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:360 sq.; 3:247; Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirche, p. 80.

## Peregrinus, Proteus[[@Headword:Peregrinus, Proteus]]

             a cynic philosopher, who was a native of Parium on the Hellespont, and flourished in the reign of the Antonines. After a youth spent in debauchery and crime, he visited Palestine, where he embraced Christianity, and by dint of hypocrisy attained to some authority in the Church. In order to gratify his morbid appetite for notoriety, he contrived to be imprisoned; but the Roman governor, perceiving the object, disappointed Peregrinus by setting him free. He now assumed the cynic garb and returned to his native town,  where, to obliterate the memory of his crimes, he divided his inheritance among the populace. He again set out on his travels, relying on the Christians for his support; but being discovered profaning the ceremony of the Lord's Supper, he was excommunicated. He then went to Egypt, where in the garb of a mendicant cynic he made himself notorious by the open perpetration of the most disgusting obscenity. Thence he proceeded to Rome, and endeavored to attract attention by his ribaldry and abuse, for which he was expelled by the praefectus urbis. His next visit was to Elis, where he tried to incite the people against the Romans. Having exhausted all the methods of making himself conspicuous, he at length resolved to procure himself an immortal name by submitting to voluntary death, in imitation of Hercules. He went to the Olympian games, and in the presence of a vast concourse of spectators raised a funeral pile, and there carried his mad resolution into effect, in the 236th Olympiad, A.D. 165. The Parians raised a statue to his memory, which was reputed to be oracular (Anaxagoras, quoted by Valois, Ad. Anmm. Marcell.). Lucian, who knew Peregrinus in his youth, and who was present at his strange self- immolation, has perhaps overcharged the narrative of his life (Lucian, De Morate Peregrini, Amm. Marcell. 29:1; Philostratus, Vit. Sophist. 2:13; Gellius, Noct. Aft. 12:11; Eusebius, Chron. 01. p. 236). See Brucker, Historia Critica Philosophiae (see Index); Enlfield, History of Philosophy, p. 356, 357.

## Pereira, Antonio, De Ficueiredo[[@Headword:Pereira, Antonio, De Ficueiredo]]

             a learned Portuguese litterateur, was born Feb. 14, 1725, in the borough of Macao. After having completed his studies in the college of the Jesuits at Villa-Vicosa, he refused to remain among them, and, as he had a taste for Inusic, he accepted the situation of organist in the monastery of the Holy Cross at Coimbra. Several months later he took the religious habit in the Congregation of the Oratorio of Lisbon (1744), and was afterwards employed to teach grammar (1752), rhetoric (1755), and theology (1761). The publication of his first articles upon the teaching of the Latin and Portuguese languages, written with much clearness, drew upon him passionate attacks on the part of the Jesuits, who were then the elementary instructors. Then the differences arose between the court of Rome and Portugal, his great reputation induced the marquis de Pombal to intrust to him the care of opposing the ultramontane doctrines, and he proved with great superiority, in his Tentativa Theologica, that the bishops have the right to grant all dispensations, and to provide for all the wants of the  national Church without the aid of the holy chair. This discussion, which attracted towards Pereira as many praises as invectives, procured for him the employments of deputy to the tribunal of censure (1768), and of interpreting secretary to the minister of war (1769). Obliged to live in the world, he left the dress of the Oratorio, and aided, with all the activity and penetration with which he was gifted, the prime minister in his plans of reform. About 1774 he became a member of the Royal Academy of Lisbon, which conferred upon him in 1792 the title of dean. “He attained,” says a writer, “great favor, which his talents doubtless merited; yet he was careful to preserve it by the most pompous praises lavished either upon the king or his minister. His vast erudition rendered his conversation as agreeable as instructive. In his career his manners have been above reproach; but sensible people, while admiring his talents, could never pardon him for the forgetfulness of his first vows, his animosity towards the same monks who had been his first teachers, and his too great condescension to the court. He died at Lisbon Aug. 14, 1797. He composed a very large number of theological theses and writings, dissertations and memoirs, the enumeration of which would occupy too much space. Below are his principal works: Exercicios da lingua Latina e Portugueza (Lisb. 1751, 8vo), in Latin and Portuguese: — Novo methodo de grammatica Latina (ibid. 1752-1753, 8vo, pt. ii), followed by a Defensa (1754), under the name of Francisco Sanches: — Apparato critico para a correcaao do Diccionario intitulado Prosodia” (ibid. 1755, 4to): — Breve Diccionario da Latinidade pura e impura (ibid. 1760, 8vo): — Rerum Lusitanarum ephemerides usque ad Jesuitarum expulsionem (ibid. 1761, 4to), translated into Portuguese in 1766: — Principios da historia ecclesiastica em forma de dialogo (ibid. 1765, 2 vols. 8vo); the author promised two other volumes, which were never printed: — Doctrina veteris Ecclesiae de suprema regun etiam in clericos potestate (ibid. 1765, fol.); these famous theses, printed in the Collectio thesium (1768, 1774, 8vo), have been translated into French, Traite du pouvoir des eveq-s (Par. 1772, 8vo): — Tentativa Theologica (ibid. 1766, 1,69, 4to), translated into Latin by the author (1769), into French, Italian, German, and Spanish, and followed by an Appendix (1768, 4to): — Demonstratio Theologica (ibid. 1769, 4to): — Deductio Chronologica et Analytica (ibid. 1771): — Testamento Novo e Velho em Portuguez (ibid. 1778, 1790, 23 vols. 8vo); this translation, accompanied by notes, prefaces, and various readings, was reprinted in 1794 for the third time, 4to size: — Compendio das epocas, etc. (ibid. 1782, 8vo): — Eogios dos r ys de Portugal (ibid. 1785, 4to). See Summario da Bibl.  Lusitana, vol. i; Figaniere, Bibliogroaca hist. Portlgueza; Le Monziteur univ. ann. 12; English Review, 8:106, 113.

## Pereira, Bento[[@Headword:Pereira, Bento]]

             (1), a learned Spaniard, was born at Valencia in 1535. Admitted into the Society of Jesus in 1552, he finished his studies in Sicily and at Rome, and rendered himself very skillful in the sciences and philosophy, which he taught with honor. He died at Rome March 6, 1616. His principal writings are, Physicorum lib. xv (Rome, 1562, 4to) — Commentariae in Danielem (ibid. 1586, 4to): — Commentaria in Gene, sim (ibid. 1589-1598, 4 vols. 4to): — De magia et dimvi natione astrologica (Ingolstadt, 1591, 8vo): — Selectae disputationes in sacram Scripturam (ibid. 1601-1610, 5 vols. 4to). All these works have frequently been reprinted. See Fabricius, Hist. Bibl. 1:265; Grasse, Literat. 3:832 sq.; Simon, Hist. Crit. du Vieux Test. p. 423.

## Pereira, Bento (2)[[@Headword:Pereira, Bento (2)]]

             (2), a Portuguese Jesuit, was born in 1605 at Borba, in Alemtejo. He taught belleslettres at Evora, and published several works of poetry, of morals, and of theology. He died in 1681. We quote of his works, Prosodia (Evora, 1634, fol.), in Latin, Spanish, and Portuguese, several editions: Thesaurus linguae Lusitanae (ibid. 1643, fol.): — Promptuarium theologicum (ibid. 1671-1676, 2 vols. fol.). See Possevin, Apparatus sacer; Sotwel, De Script. Soc. Jesu; Antonio, Bibl. Hispana Nova.

## Peremayanoftschins[[@Headword:Peremayanoftschins]]

             (i.e. Re-Anointers), is the name of a Russian sect which separated from the Russo-Greek Church about the year 1770 at Vetka. They agree in almost every respect with the Starobredsi, or “Old Ceremonialists,” except that they re-anoint those who join them with their holy chrism. They also re- ordain those popes or priests who secede to them from the Establishment. The Peremayanoftschins are really a branch of the Popoftschins (q.v.).

## Peres[[@Headword:Peres]]

             SEE EAGLE.

## Peresh[[@Headword:Peresh]]

             (Heb. id. פֶּרֶשׁ, excrement; Sept. Φαρές), the first named of the two sons of Machir the Manassite by his wife Maachah (1Ch 7:16). B.C. cir. 1658.

## Pereyra, Abraham Israel[[@Headword:Pereyra, Abraham Israel]]

             a Jewish litterateur of some note, was of Portuguese origin, but born in Amsterdam, where he flourished in the middle of the 17th century. He was one of the students of the rablinical college of that city, and was highly esteemed ,for his literary talents;. He wrote in Spanish, Espejo della Vanidad del Mundo, “the Mirror of Worldly Vanity” (Amsterd. 1671): — La Certezza del Camino, “the Sure Path” (ibid. 1666), an ethical work in twelve sections, treating, 1, on divine Providence; 2, on the vanity of the world; 3, on love and fear of God; 4, on vices and virtues; 5, on recompense and punishment, etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:77; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, p. 369; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10:227; De Castro, Biblioteca Espanola, 1:595; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 259 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:59; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 3:233, 238. (B.P.)

## Pereyra, Diego[[@Headword:Pereyra, Diego]]

             a Portuguese painter, was born about the year 1570. Very little is known concerning his life. He died in the year 1640, in the house of a nobleman where he spent his last days. Pereyra had a rare talent for painting conflagration and infernal scenes. He often painted the Burning of Troy and the Overthrow of Sodom, but in each case in a different manner. He excelled in painting pictures of fruit and flowers; also rural scenes illuminated by the radiance of torches or the lightning's flash. His landscapes are painted in a spirited style, ornamented with small figures in excellent taste.

## Pereyra, Manuel[[@Headword:Pereyra, Manuel]]

             a Portuguese sculptor, was born in 1614. He settled at Madrid, where he attained great distinction, and is regarded as one of the ablest artists that Portugal has produced. He was commissioned to execute a great-number of works. His masterpiece is a large statue of the Savior in the church of the Rosario at Madrid. It is said that in his old age, having become blind,  he made the model of a statue of St. John, and directed its execution. This statue is one of his finest works. He died in 1667.

## Perez[[@Headword:Perez]]

             (1Ch 27:3). SEE PHAREZ.

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

             a name common to many Jewish literati, of whom we mention the following:

1. BEN-ELIJA, also called Raph (ר, also מהר), a pupil of R. Jechiel of Paris, lived at Corbeil, and died about 1300. He wrote many Tosafoth or additamenta to the Talmud, viz. to the treatises Beza, Nazir, Nedarim, Sanhedrim, Maccoth, and Meila, reprinted in the editions of the Talmud. He also wrote additamenta to the treatise Baba Kama (בבא קמא), which was published, according to a recension of one of his pupils, by Abr. Venano (Livorno, 1819). His Tosafoth to Zebachim (מ8 זְבָחַים) is reprinted in Pietosi's כפרה מזמח(ibid. 1810). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:77; Zunz, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur, p. 38, 41, 46, 52, 59, 119, 193, 205, 565. (B.P.)

2. BEN-ISAAC HA-COHEN, a jurist of high repute, a great cabalist, and a celebrated physician, was born about 1241 at Gerona. He wrote a highly esteemed work, מִעֲרֶכֶת הָאֶלָהוּת, “the Dispositions of the Divinity,” which treats in fifteen sections of the system of Cabala. It was first planted at Ferrara in 1558, and often since; lastly at Zolkiew in 1779. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:77; De Rossi, Dizimonrio storico deenli autori Ebrei, p 260 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); LindoI Hist. of the Jews in Spain and Portugal, p. 81; Zunz, Z r Geschichle u. Literatur, p. 480. (B. P.)

3. JEHUDA LEON BEN-JOSEPH, who lived at the beginning of the 18th century, was rabbi at Venice and Amsterdam. He wrote, עשרת הדברים, the Decalogue, in a poetical Aramaico-Arabic paraphrase, etc. (Amsterdam, 1737): — Fundamento solilo, a compendium of Jewish theology, which treats, in twelve chapters, of the fundamental principles of the Jewish religion — God, cosmology, faith, legislature, the thirteen articles of faith, asceticism, ethics, providence, etc.; it was written in Spanish, and published in 1729: — שירי רחמים, mystical and cabalistic  treatises (Venice, 1716): — פֶּרִח לבָנוֹן, excerpts of discourses delivered at Venice, which bear upon the Pentateuch (Berlin, 1712). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:77 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 259 sq. (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 3:315 sq. (B. P.)

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

             one of the first Portuguese missionaries in Cochin China, was born about 1665. He joined the French missionaries, and was charged by the bishop of Berynthe to go to Bengarin and Jonsalam to make conversions. He arrived about 1671. and from those places wrote letters to the prelate who had sent him, in which were found interesting observations upon the country and its inhabitants. He died towards the close of the 17th century. See Relation des Missions des eveques Francais, p. 70.

## Perez, Andres[[@Headword:Perez, Andres]]

             a Spanish painter, was born at Seville in 1660. He painted historical subjects; also flower-pieces, in which he was more successful. Among his principal works are three on sacred subjects in the sanctuary of S. Lucia at Seville, signed “Andres Perez, 1707;” and in the sacristy of the Capuchins of the same city is a picture by him of the Last Judgment, dated 1713. He died in 1727.

## Perez, Antonio[[@Headword:Perez, Antonio]]

             a learned Spanish prelate, was born in 1559 at Saint-Dominica of Silos. He belonged to the Benedictine Order, which chose him for vicar-general, and he helped to revive among his brethren a taste for learning. He occupied successively the bishoprics of Urgel, Lerida, and Tarragona.. He died at Madrid May 1, 1637. His principal works are, Apuntamientos quadragesimales (Barcelona, 1608,. 3 vols. 4to): — Pentateuchum fidei (Madrid, 1620, fol.); some passages relative to the authority of the pope caused the work to be tacitly suppressed, and it has; become very rare: — Commentaria in regulam S. Benedicti (Lyons, 1624, 2 vols. 4to). See N. Antonioi, Bibloth. Hispana Nova; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generaler 39:580; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 12:942.

## Perez, Bartolome[[@Headword:Perez, Bartolome]]

             a distinguished Spanish painter, was born at Madrid in 1634. He studied in the school of Don Juan de Arellano, and attained great excellence in flower painting. His pictures of this kind are composed in a tasteful and delicate style, with a brilliancy and harmony of coloring deserving of high praise. He also succeeded in the figure, following the style of Don Juan de Carreno. There were many of his pieces at the Retiro, which were subsequently removed to the Rosario; and one of his best productions is mentioned, which combines his talents in both branches of the art, representing St. Rosa of Lima kneeling before the Virgin and infant Jesus, with two Angels, one of whom is crowning the Savior, while the other is presenting him with a vase of flowers. Perez was also distinguished for the excellence of his theatrical decorations. The duke of Monteleone commissioned him to paint a grand ceiling in fresco in his place at Madrid, but while occupied upon it he unfortunately fell from the scaffold and was killed, in 1693.

## Perez, Father Andre[[@Headword:Perez, Father Andre]]

             a Spanish theologian and romance writer, a native of the kingdom of Leon, lived in the early part of the 17th century. He entered the Dominican Order, and attained to the dignity of superior of the convent of the Dominicans in Madrid. His Sermons and his Vie de St. Raymond de I'enafort are forgotten, but inquiries are still made, from motives of curiosity, after his romance of La Picara Justina, which he published under the pseudonym of Francois Ubeda, Toledan (Medina-del-Campo, 1605, 4to). It is a weak imitation of Guzman de Alfarache, destitute of invention, and written in an affected style. It is remarkable only for some licentious incidents, strange enough for the superior of a convent. The best edition is that of Mayans y Siscar (Madrid, 1735, 4to). See Richard, Scriptores ordinis Preedicaforum; Ticknor, History of Spanish Literature, 3:61.

## Perez, Francisco, De Pineda[[@Headword:Perez, Francisco, De Pineda]]

             a Spanish painter who flourished at Seville about 1660. He studied under Murillo, and followed his style with considerable success. Among other works, he painted several pictures for the churches and convents at Seville, which show that he was an able disciple of that great master. Perez was a member of the society of professors who established the Academy of Fine Arts at Seville.

## Perez-Uzza[[@Headword:Perez-Uzza]]

             (Heb. Pe'rets Uzza', פֶּרֶוֹ עֻזָּא, 1Ch 13:11), or Pe'rez-Uz'zah (Heb. Pe'rets UzzoAh'. פֶּרֶוֹ עֻזָּה, breach of Uzzah, 2Sa 6:8; Sept. Διασκοπὴ Ο᾿ζ), the name which David conferred on the threshing- floor of Nachon, or Chidon, in commemoration of the sudden death of Uzzah: “And David was wroth because Jehovah had broken this breach on Uzzah, and he called the place ‘Uzzah's breaking' unto this day.” The word perez was a favorite with David on such occasions. He employed it to commemorate his having “broken up” the Philistine force in the valley of Rephaim (2Sa 5:20). SEE BAALPERA-ZIM. He also used it in a subsequent reference to Uzzah's destruction in 1Ch 15:13. It is remarkable that the statement of the continued existence of the name should be found not only in Samuel and Chronicles, but also in Josephus, who says (Ant. 7:4, 2), as if from his own observation, “the place where he died is even now (ἔτι νῦν) called ‘the cleaving of Oza.”' About a mile and a half or two miles from the site of Kirjath-jearim, on the hill immediately above Chesla, the ancient Chesalon, on the road thence towards Jerusalem, is a small village still called Khirbet el- Uz, or “the ruins of Uzzah.” It is given by Prof. Robinson among the names of places west of Jerusalem as Khirbet el-Lauz, or, as it should be written, Khirbet el-Auz. This seems to be Perez-Uzzah. The position, on the road to Jerusalem, near the site of Obed-edom's house, and not far from the site of Kirjath-jearim, all correspond. David, Ibeing afraid, it is said, to proceed with the ark towards Jerusalem, “carried it aside into the house of Obed-edom the Gittite.” It seems therefore that the house of Obed-edom must have been near or in the immediate neighborhood of Perez-Uzzah. SEE OBEDEDOM.

## Perfect, The[[@Headword:Perfect, The]]

             an appellation frequently applied in the early Christian Church to those who had been baptized, and thereby been admitted to the full privileges of Christians, having a right to partake of the Lord's Supper.

## Perfecti[[@Headword:Perfecti]]

             (Perfect) is the name assumed by the stricter Cathari (q.v.) of the 12th and 13th centuries. Rainerius, who had himself been a Catharist, and who speaks of a census of the sect taken by themselves, says that there were only 4000 of these, although the “Credentes,” or general body of the Catharists, were innumerable. These “perfect” Catharists were analogous to the Manichbean “elect,” professing to live an extremely strict life, in imitation of Christ and his apostles. From among them were taken their bishops, “Filius major,” “Filius minor,” and deacon, some of whom were brought up from their childhood on a rigid fish and vegetable diet. The  Perfecti also called themselves Consolati and Boni Homines. See Reiner, Contr. Waldens. in Bibl. Max. 25:266, 269.

## Perfection[[@Headword:Perfection]]

             (Lat. perfectum, “made out,” complete) is applied to that which wants nothing. According to some, it is divided into physical or natural, whereby a thing has all its powers and faculties; moral, or an eminent degree of goodness and piety; and metaphysical or transcendent in the possession of all the essential attributes or parts necessary to the integrity of a substance; or, in general, it is that whereby a thing has or is provided with everything belonging to its nature. Perfection is relative or absolute. A being possessed of all the qualities belonging to its species in the highest degree may be called perfect in a relative sense. But absolute perfection can only be ascribed to the Supreme Being. We have the idea of a Being infinitely perfect — and from this Descartes reasoned that such a Being really exists.

The PERFECTIONS OF GOD are those qualities which he has communicated to his rational creatures, and which are in him in an infinitely perfect degree. They have been distinguished as natural and moral — the former belonging to Deity as the great first cause such as independent and necessary existence — the latter as manifested in the creation and government of the universe — such as goodness, justice, etc. But they are all natural in the sense of being essential. It has been proposed to call the former attributes and the latter perfections. But this distinctive use of the terms has not prevailed; indeed it is not well founded. In God there are nothing but attributes — because in him everything is absolute and involved in the substance and unity of a perfect being. SEE ATTRIBUTES.

## Perfection, Christian[[@Headword:Perfection, Christian]]

             The word “perfect,” in the moral sense, is usually the translation of the Heb. תָּםand the Greek τέλειος, which both essentially mean complete. The term perfection, says Witsius, is not always used in the same sense in the Scriptures.

1. There is a perfection of sincerity, whereby a man serves God without hypocrisy (Job 1:1; Isa 38:3).

2. There is a perfection of parts, subjeciive with respect to the whole man (1Th 5:23), and objective with respect to the whole law,  when all the duties prescribed by God are observed (Psa 119:128; Luk 1:6).

3. There is a comparative perfection ascribed to those who are advanced in knowledge, faith, and sanctification, in comparison of those who are still infants and untaught († Joh 2:13; 1Co 2:6; Php 3:15).

4. There is an evangelical perfection. The righteousness of Christ being imputed to the believer, it is complete in him, and accepted of God as perfect through Christ (Col 2:10; Eph 5:27; 2Co 5:21).

5. There is also a perfection of degrees, by which a person performs all the commands of God, with the full exertion of all his powers, Without the least defect. This is what the law of God requires, but what the saints cannot attain to in this life, though we willingly allow them all the other kinds above mentioned (Rom 7:24; Php 3:12; 1Jn 1:8) (Witsius, (Economic Fiderum Dei, lib. iii, cap. 12, § 124). The ancient worthies, in the simplicity of their faith, were “perfect in their generation” (Gen 6:9; Job 1:1); “they followed the Lord fully” (Num 14:24). As the term “perfect” is frequently applied to different individuals in the Scriptures, and the possession of the character so frequently enjoined, there can be no doubt, among those who know the Scriptures and the power of God, that perfection, in the scriptural sense of the term, ought to be an object of more anxious solicitude among Christians than it usually is (Gen 17:1; Luk 6:40; Heb 6:1). We are exhorted to acquire the perfection of Christianity both in theory and practice. We are to be thoroughly instructed and experienced in divine principles; to be adults and not children in Christian knowledge (1Co 2:6; 1Co 14:20; 2Co 13:9; Eph 4:13; Php 3:15; Heb 5:14). We are to press onward to the attainment of the perfection of Christian life by submission to the reign of the Holy Spirit, which brings the entire man into complete subjection to the divine will (Rom 8:12). In this sense the faithful may be said to “stand perfect and complete in all the will of God” (Col 2:10; Col 4:12). The Savior says to his disciples, “Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect” (Mat 5:48). Not that we can ever attain to an equality; but taking him as the only pattern of perfection, we can advance towards a consimilarity. Just as it is said in the  parallel passage, “Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful” (Luk 6:40), so we are to be holy in the same manner, though in the same degree it is utterly impossible, as we are but finite creatures, while he is the Infinite and Eternal. As creatures, we cannot reach any state that precludes the possibility of further improvement; inasmuch as we may love God supremely, yet that love may become stronger, and that delight increase forever. The perfection of a Christian, considered in relation to that of his heavenly Father, may be likened to one of those mathematical lines that may draw nearer and nearer to another for all eternity, still remaining as infinite in their mutual distance as they are endless in their mutual approach, and everlasting in their asymptotic relation to one another. Our continual advancement towards him may be illustrated by the recurring decimal fraction. Though we add figure after figure, in a continuing and never-ending series, and every additional figure brings it nearer to a certain value, yet there is no possibility of its ever reaching that value. So the happy and the holy may continue to grow more like God, without the most distant possibility of attaining his glorious perfections. Nay, he may grow more like God throughout eternity, and throughout eternity remain at an infinite distance from the absolutely perfect object which he thus increasingly resembles (Php 3:12-16). See Bates, Works, p. 557, etc.; Burgh, Dignity of Human Nature; Doddridge, Lectures, lect. 181; Channing, Works; Irving, Orations and Arguments; Engl. Rev 2:20; Presb. Theol. Rev. Oct. 1868; Christ. Examiner (1874), p. 183; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. July, 1876; Meth. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1874. SEE SANCTIFICATION.

That such perfection is attainable in this life is held by the Franciscans, Jesuits, and Molinists in the Church of Rome, but is denied by the Dominicans and Jansenists. In advocating the doctrine, its Roman Catholic supporters generally rest much on the distinction between mortal and venial sins. SEE SIN. “Christian Perfection” is pre-eminently a doctrine of Methodists of nearly all classes. It is not a perfection of justification, but a perfection of sanctification; which John Wesley, in a sermon on Christian perfection, from the text Heb 6:1, “Let us go on to perfection,” earnestly contends for as attainable in this life by believers, by arguments founded chiefly on the commandments and promises of Scripture concerning sanctification; guarding his doctrine, however, by saying that it is neither an angelic nor an Adamic perfection, and does not exclude ignorance and error of judgment with consequent wrong affections, such as  “needless fear or ill-grounded hope, unreasonable love or unreasonable aversion.” He admits, also, that even in this sense it is a rare attainment, but asserts that “several persons have enjoyed this blessing, without interruption, for many years, several enjoy it at this day, and not a few have enjoyed it unto their death, as they have declared with their latest breath, calmly witnessing that God had saved them from all sin, till their spirit returned to God.” Paul and John he deemed sufficient authorities for the use of an epithet which he knew, however, would be liable to the cavils of criticism. The Christian world had also largely recognized the term in the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, Macarius, Kempis, Fenelon, Lucas, and other writers, Papal and Protestant. Besides incessant allusions to the doctrine in his general writings, Wesley has left an elaborate treatise on it.

Fletcher of Madeley, an example as well as an authority of the doctrine, published an essay on it, proving it to be scriptural as well as sanctioned by the best theological writers. Wesley's theory of the doctrine is precise and intelligible, though often distorted into perplexing difficulties by both its advocates and opponents. As above observed, he taught not absolute, nor angelic, nor Adamic, but “Christian perfection.” Each sphere of being has its own normal limits; God alone has absolute perfection; the angels have a perfection of their own above that of humanity, at least of the humanity of our sphere; unfallen man, represented by Adam, occupied a peculiar sphere in the divine economy, with its own relations to the divine government, its own “perfection,” called by Wesley Adamic perfection; fallen, but regenerated man, has also his peculiar sphere as a subject of the mediatorial economy, and the highest practicable virtue (whatever it may be) in that sphere is its “perfection.” is Christian perfection. Admitting such a theory of perfection, the most important question has respect to its practical limit. When can it be said of a Christian man that he is thus perfect? Wesley taught that perfect Christians “‘are not free from ignorance, no, nor from mistake. We are no more to expect any man to be infallible than to be omniscient... From infirmities none are perfectly freed till their spirits return to God; neither can we expect, till then, to be wholly freed from temptation; for ‘the servant is not above his Master.' Neither in this sense is there any absolute perfection on earth.

There is no perfection of degrees, none which does not admit of a continual increase. . . The proposition which I will hold is this: ‘Any person may be cleansed from all sinful tempers, and yet need the atoning blood.' For what? for ‘negligences and ignorances;' for both words and actions (as well as omissions), which are, in a sense, transgressions of the perfect law. And I believe no one is clear  of these till he lays down this corruptible body.” Perfection, as defined by Wesley, is not then perfection according to the absolute moral law: it is perfection according to the special remedial economy introduced by the Atonement, in which the heart, being sanctified, fulfills the law by love (Rom 12:8; Rom 12:10), and its involuntary imperfections are provided for, by that economy, without the imputation of guilt, as in the case of infancy and all irresponsible persons. The only question, then, can be, Is it possible for good men so to love God that all their conduct, inward and outward, shall be swayed by love? that even their involuntary defects shall be swayed by it? Is there such a thing as the inspired writer calls the “perfect love” which “casteth out fear?” (1Jn 4:18). Wesley believed that there is; that it is the privilege of all saints; and that it is to be attained by faith. “I want you to be all love,” he wrote. “This is the perfection I believe and teach; and this perfection is consistent with a thousand nervous disorders, which that highstrained perfection is not. Indeed, my judgment is that (in this case particularly) to overdo is to undo; and that to set perfection too high is the most effectual way of driving it out of the world.” “Man,” he says, “in his present state, can no more attain Adamic than angelic perfection. The perfection of which man is capable, while he dwells in a corruptible body, is the complying with that kind command, in ‘My son, give me thy heart!' It is loving the Lord his God with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his mind.” Such is his much misrepresented doctrine of Christian perfection. Wesley taught that this sanctification is usually gradual, but may be instantaneous (Stevens, Centenary of Methodism p. 133). See Wesley, Plain Account of Christian Perfection; Fletcher, Christian Perfection; Merritt, Christian's Manual; Peck, Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection; Foster, Christian Purity. SEE METHODISM.

## Perfectionism[[@Headword:Perfectionism]]

             This doctrine is often confounded with two others, from which, however, it is philosophically distinguishable. One of these is the doctrine of the simplicity of moral action, the most powerful advocate of which is the theological school at Oberlin, Ohio. According to this theory, it is impossible that sin and virtue should co-exist in the human heart at the same time; all moral action is single and indivisible; the soul is either wholly consecrated to Christ, or it has none of his spirit. These two states may alternate: the man may be a Christian at one moment and a sinner the next, but he cannot be at any one moment a sinful or imperfect Christian. The  advocates of this view, however, deny that any one can claim to be a perfect Christian under this theory, because he does not remember any conscious failure, since “even present failure is not always a matter of distinct consciousness, and the past belongs to memory, and not to consciousness.” SEE OBERLIN THEOLOGY.

The other view, which is sometimes confounded with perfectionism, is that entitled by its advocates the doctrine of “perfect sanctification,” or sometimes the “higher life.” This is, in brief, the doctrine that Jesus Christ is a present Savior from sin; that he is able to keep those that trust in him from falling into any sin whatever; and that if the soul trusted him completely it would be preserved from all deliberate sin, and its unintentional wrong-doing — errors rather than sins — would not be imputed to it. It is true that some of the advocates of this view claim to have so lived in the presence of Christ as to have been for weeks and months unconscious of any sin; but more generally those who hold this view of the present redeeming power of Christ, while they insist that it is possible to live so near to him as to be kept by him “without sin,” also confess that they occasionally fail to keep up a complete and undeviating trust in Christ, and so do, in fact, in some degree, temporarily fall away from that condition in which they maintain it to be their privilege to walk. It should be added that this doctrine of the “higher life” is one of experience rather than philosophy, and it is difficult to afford a clear and concise definition of it that will be free from every objection, or intelligible to those of an unspiritual state of mind. SEE PERFECTION, CHRISTIAN.

## Perfectionists[[@Headword:Perfectionists]]

             a controversial term, applied in an odious sense to those who lay claim to absolute Christian perfection, or maintain its possibility. They may be divided into several classes, as they rest their claims on different grounds.

1. There are the advocates of imputed perfection. These are perfect, not in their own righteousness, but in the imputed righteousness of Christ. The individual who fancies himself in possession of all Christ's righteousness holds usually, not only that he does not, but that he cannot sin. What would be sin in others is no sin in him. But moral character is not transferable property. It adheres to its possessor, and to him alone, and can never become the character of any other being. SEE IMPUTATION.

2. The second class are those who claim what they call an evangelical perfection. They do not profess to obey perfectly the divine law, or think that this is at all necessary. The moral law has been superseded by the law of faith. To this theory it is sufficient to reply that the moral law as not been superseded or annulled, but is in full force now throughout the universe. Our Savior came to vindicate and honor the law, not to annul it. SEE ANTINOMIANS.

3. The third class are those who profess to fulfill perfectly the law of God. They admit that the moral law — the great law of love — stands in unabated force; that it is binding on themselves; and insist that they can and do completely fulfill it. This they claim in such an absolute sense as to imply perfect sinlessness, and to require no further need of penitence and forgiveness. This view is not held by any one sect, nor confined to any one denomination; but is avowed more or less distinctly by some persons in different churches, chiefly in the Methodist and the Congregational denominations, though not accepted by the great body of believers in any of them. Such views have occasionally characterized mystical individuals in every age, SEE MYSTICS, and are also held, under some modification or other, by several bodies of communists in this country. See Theol. Rev. 1:554; Meth. Quar. Rev. 1841, p. 307; 1848, p. 293. SEE LAW

(MORAL).

## Perfume[[@Headword:Perfume]]

             (קַטֵּר, kitter, קְטֹרֶת, ketoreth). The strong and offensive exhalations of animal bodies in a hot climate must be regarded as the original cause of the high value (Pro 27:9) ascribed to perfumery, and its generally extended use ( SEE ANOINT; SEE OIL; and comp. Plut. De Iside, ch. 80), although luxury and self-indulgence had much to do with its extension and refinement. It is still customary in the Orient, as it was of old, to perfume thoroughly not only rooms, clothing, etc. (comp. Son 3:6), but in the houses of chief persons to sprinkle perfumes on the persons of guests, at their arrival or departure (comp. Maundl ell, Trav. p. 40 sq.; Harmer, Obs. 2:83 sq.; Rosenmüller, Morgenland, 4:157). On anointing the beard, SEE BEARD.

Perfumed fans were carried (Curt. 8:9, 23) before princes; and at their public entry into cities altars of incense were erected on the streets (Herodian, 4:8, 19; Rosenmüller, Morgenland, 4:195). Such attestation of honor and means of enjoyment were at an early period transferred also to the gods, in the belief that they inhaled with pleasure the odors offered them (Deu 33:10), and this burning of incense is  hence very often alluded to among the ceremonies of heathen religions (1Ki 11:8; 2Ki 22:17; 2Ki 23:5; Jer 1:16; Jer 7:9; Jer 44:3 sq.; Hos 2:13; Hos 11:2; Isa 65:3; 2Ch 25:14; 2Ch 28:3; Eze 6:13; Eze 23:41; 1Ma 2:15. Comp. Iliad, 6:269 sq.; Virg. AEn. 1:420 sq.; Ovid, Fasti, 1:839 sq.; 2:573; Aristoph. Vesp. 94 sq.; Lucian, Jup. Tranced. 45; Pliny, 13:1). Some deities were worshipped with no other offerings than incense and perfumes (Buhr, Symbol. 1:478), but their use was also included in the instituted worship of Jehovah (Deu 33:10), for the Israelites were required to add sacred incense to many of their sacrifices, which was burned with them on the altar (Lev 2:1 sq.; Lev 16:6; Lev 16:15); and daily, morning and evening, in trimming and lighting their lamps, an especial incense-offering was made upon its own separate altar over against the ark of the covenant (Exo 40:27; Exo 30:7 sq. Comp. Luk 1:9). No doubt the incense was useful in destroying the damp vapors in the confined space of the sanctuary, as well as the exhalations from the animals burned as sacrifices (Rosenmüller on Exo 30:7), but the purpose of the incense seems to have been religious. Thus the seer of the Apocalypse represents the angel in the heavenly sanctuary as burning incense after the type of the earthly. But it does not follow, because incense and prayer are often united (Jer 1:16; Psa 141:2; Bahr's other citations are irrelevant), that in the Jewish sanctuary the incense-offering had sensualized prayer (comp. Hofmann, Weissag. 1:144 sq.). Still less can we adopt Bihr's view (Symbol. 1:462 sq.) that incense is a symbol of God's name invoked in prayer. Besides the ingredients of this incense enumerated in Exo 30:38, the Talmud adds seven other components, and hence calls the whole the eleven orders (עשר סממנין אחד, Midrash Shir Hashir, 12:4; 21:3; and R. Abr. ben-David, Comm. de svffitu ex Shilte Hangibor. in Ugolini Thesaur. xi). According to the Talmud, half a pound of this incense was to be burned morning and evening (Gem. Shebuoth, 10:2. See esp. Lightfoot, Her. Hebr. p. 715). Exaggerated accounts are given as to the distance from Jerusalem at which the incense could be smelled (Mishna, Tamid, 3:8). The most important incense-offering was that which the highpriest made before the ark of the covenant on the great day of atonement (Lev 16:12 sq.). The management of the daily incense in the second Temple is detailed in the Mishna (Tamid, 5, 6). One priest carried incense in a vessel (כִּ), another burning coals from the altar of burnt-offering in a golden censer (q.v.), and, passing into the holy place, the latter scattered the coals upon the altar of incense, and the former spread the incense upon them (Tamid,  1:2 sq.). These priestly duties, like the others of the office (1Sa 2:28; 2Ch 26:18), were daily distributed by lot (comp. Luk 1:9). But, according to the Mishna (Tamid, 5:2; Yoma, 2:4), those priests who had once performed the office were afterwards shut out from the lot, on the ground that, as the Gemara says that this duty enriches with divine blessings (Deu 33:10 sq.), this advantage might thus be as widely distributed as possible. (On these later Jewish superstitions, see G. Michaelis, Observat. Sacr. p. 71 sq.) It is possible that the distinction which this office gave the priest, bringing him into the nearest relation with the Deity of all the duties of the sanctuary, rendered such an arrangement proper. Perhaps also the belief that the special revelations of God would be made first to the priest thus officiating, may have contributed to cause this duty to be equally divided. (Comp. Joseph. Ant. 13:10, 3; Luk 1:11, and Wetstein, ad loc.) During the burning of incense in the sanctuary the people stood praying in the court (Luk 1:10), and, after the fulfillment of his office, they received from the priest his blessing (Reland, Antiq. Sacr. 2:5, 5). The burning of incense to the honor of Jehovah out of the national sanctuary, on high places, or in cities, was accounted illegal after David's time (1Ki 3:3; 1Ki 22:44; 2Ki 12:3; 2Ki 15:4; 2Ki 16:4. Comp. 2Ch 32:12; 1Ma 1:58). In the idolatries of the ten tribes of Israel, arranged by Jeroboam, the rning of incense found a place (1Ki 13:1; 2Ki 17:11). See Carpzov, Appar. p. 275 sq.; Braun. Selecta Sacr. p. 225 sq.; Schlichter, De suffitu sacr. Hebr. (Hal. 1754). SEE INCENSE.

In secular life also, as above observed, the free use of perfumes was peculiarly grateful to the Orientals (Pro 27:9), whose olfactory nerves are more than usually sensitive to the offensive smells engendered by the heat of their climate (Burckhardt, Travels, 2:85). The Hebrews manufactured their perfumes chiefly from spices imported from Arabia, though to a certain extent also from aromatic plants growing in their own country. SEE SPICES. The modes in which they applied them were various: occasionally a bunch of the plant itself was worn about the person as a nosegay, or enclosed in a bag (Son 1:13); or the plant was reduced to a powder and used in the way of fumigation (Son 3:6); or, again, the aromatic qualities were extracted by some process of boiling, and were then mixed with oil, so as to be applied to the person in the way of ointment (Joh 12:3); or, lastly, the scent was carried about in smelling-bottles (בָּתֵּי הִנֶּפֶשׁ, houses of the soul)  suspended from the girdle (Isa 3:20). Perfumes entered largely into the Temple service, in the two forms of incense and ointment (Exo 30:22; Exo 30:38). Nor were they less used in private life: not only were they applied to the person, but to garments (Psa 45:8; Son 4:11), and to articles of furniture, such as beds (Pro 7:17). On the arrival of a guest the same compliments were probably paid in ancient as in modern times; the rooms were fumigated; the person of the guest was sprinkled with rose-water; and then the incense was applied to his face and beard (Dan 2:46; Lane, Mod. Eg 2:14). When a royal rersonage went abroad in his litter, attendants threw up “pillars of smoke” about his path (Son 3:6). Nor is it improbable that “other practices, such as scenting the breath by chewing frankincense (Lane, 1:246), and the skiny washing in rosewater (Burckhardt, 1:52), were also adopted in early times. The use of perfumes was omitted in times of mourning, whence the allusion in Isa 3:24, “Instead of sweet smell there shall be stink.” The preparation of perfumes in the form either of ointment or incense was a recognized profession (רֹקֵח; A.V. apothecary) among the Jews (Exo 30:25; Exo 30:35; Ecc 10:1). SEE OINTMENT.

## Perga[[@Headword:Perga]]

             (Πέργη), an ancient and important city of Pamphylia, in Asia Minor, situated on the river Cestrus, at a distance of sixty stadia from its mouth (Strab. 14:667; Cic. Verr. 1:20; Plin. v. 26; Mela, 1:14; Ptol. v. 5, § 7). It was celebrated in antiquity for the worship of Artemis (Diaina), whose temple stood on a hill outside the town, and in whose honor annual festivals were celebrated (Callim. Hymn. in Dian. 187; Scylax, p. 39; Dion. Per. 854). The goddess and the temple are represented on the coins of Perga. Alexander the Great occupied Perga with a part of his army after quitting Phasaelis, between which two towns the road is described as long and difficult (Arrian, Anab. 1:26; comp. Polyb. v. 72; 22:25; Livy, 38:37). The Cestrus was navigable to Perga, and St. Paul landed here on his voyage from Paphos (Act 13:13). He visited the city a second time on his return from the interior of Pamphylia, and preached the Gospel there (Act 14:25). Perga was originally the capital of Pamphylia; but when that province was divided into two, Side became the chief town of the first, and Perga of the second Pamphylia. In the ecclesiastical notices, and in  Hierocles (p. 679), Perga appears as the metropolis of Pamphylia (Stephlen of Byzant. s.v.; Eckhel, Docir. Num 1:3, p. 12). There are still extensive remains of Perga at a spot called by the Turks Eski-Kilesi (Leake, Asia Minor, p. 182; Fellows, Asia Minor, p. 190; Texier, Asie Minere, pl. 19; Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 1:160). SEE PAMPHYLIA.

## Pergamos[[@Headword:Pergamos]]

             properly PERGAMUS (Πέργαμος), or PERGAMUM (Πέργαμον, as usually in classical writers), a town of the Great Mysia, the capital of a kingdom of the same name, and afterwards of the Roman province of Asia Propria. It was an ancient city, in a most beautiful district of Teuthrania, in Asia Minor, north of the river Caicus. Near the point where the city was located, two other rivers, the Selinus and Cetius, emptied themselves into the Caicus; the Selinus flowed through the city itself, while the Cetius washed its walls (Strab. 13:619; Plin. v. 33; Pausan. 6:16, § 1; Livy, 37:18). Its distance from the sea was one hundred and twenty stadia, but communication with the sea was effected by the navigable river Caicus. The name was originally given to a remarkable hill, presenting a conical appearance when viewed from the plain. The local legends attached a sacred character to this place. Upon it the Cabiri were said to have been witnesses of the birth of Zeus, and the whole of .the land belonging to the city of the same name which afterwards grew up around the original Pergamos appertained to these deities. The city itself, which is first mentioned by Xenophon (Anab. 7:8, § 8), was originally a fortress of considerable natural strength, being situated on the summit of the hill, round the foot of which there were at that time no houses. Sublsequently, however, a city arose at the foot of the hill, and the latter then became the Acropolis. We have no further information as to the foundation of the original town on the hill, but the Pergamenians believed themselves to be the descendants of Arcadians who had migrated to Asia under the leadership of the Heraclid Telephus (Pausan. 1:4, § 5). 1 hey derived the name of their town from Pergamus, a son of Pyrrhus, who was believed to have arrived there with his mother Andromache, and, after a successful combat with Arius, the ruler of Teuthrania, to have established himself there (Pausan. 1:11, § 2).

Another tradition stated that Asclepius, with a colony from Epidaurus, proceeded to Pergamos. At all events, the place seems to have been inhabited by many Greeks at the time when Xenophon  visited it. Still, however, Pergamos remained a place of not much importance until the time of Lysimachus, one of the generals of Alexander the Great. The sacred character of the locality, combined with its natural strength, seems to have made it. like some others of the ancient temples, a bank for chiefs who desired to accumulate a large amount of specie. Hence this lysimachus chose Pergamos as a place of security for the reception and preservation of his treasures, which amounted to 9000 talents. The care and superintendence of this treasure in as entrusted to Philetrerus of Tium, a eunuch from his infancy, and a person in whom Lysimachus placed the greatest confidence. For a time Philetaerus answered the expectations of Lysimachus, but having been ill-treated by Arsinoe, the wife of his master, he withdrew his allegiance, and declared himself independent. B.C. 283. As Lysimachus was prevented by domestic calamities from punishing the offender, Philetuerus remained in undisturbed possession of the town and treasures for twenty years, contriving by dexterous management to maintain peace with his neighbors. He transmitted his principality to a nephew of the name of Eumenes, who increased the territory he had inherited, and even gained a victory over Antiochus, the son of Seleucus, in the neighborhood of Sardis. After a reign of twenty-two years, from B.C. 263 to 241, he was succeeded by his cousin Attalus, who, after a great victory over the Galatians, assumed the title of king, and distinguished himself by his great talents and sound policy (Strabo, 13:623, 624; Polyb. 18:21; Livy, 33:21). He espoused the interests of Rome against Philip of Macedonia, and in conjunction with the Rhodian fleet rendered important service to the Romans. It was mainly this Attalus that amassed the wealth for which his name became proverbial. He died at an advanced age, in B.C. 197, and was succeeded by his son Eumenes II, from B.C. 197 to 159.

He continued his father's friendship for the Romans, and assisted them against Antiochus the Great and Perseus of Macedonia. After the defeat of Antiochus, the Romans rewarded his services by giving him all the countries in Asia Minor west of Mount Taurus. Pergamos, the territory of which had hitherto not extended beyond the gulfs of Elea and Adramyttium, now became a large and powerful kingdom (Strabo, l.c.; Livy, 38:39). Eumenes II was nearly killed at Delphi by assassins said to have been hired by Perseus; yet at a later period he favored the cause of the Macedonian king, and thereby incurred the ill-will of the Romans. Pergamos was mainly indebted to Eumenes II for its embellishment and extension. He was a liberal patron of the arts and sciences; he decorated the temple of Zeus Nicephorus, which had been built by Attalus outside the  city, with walks and plantations, and erected himself many other public buildings; but the greatest monument of his liberality was the great library which he founded, and which yielded only to that of Alexandria in extent and value (Strabo, l.c.; Athen. 1:3). He was succeeded by his son Attalus II; but the government was carried on by the late king's brother, Attalus, surnamed Philadelphus, from B.C. 159 to 138. During this period the Pergamenians again assisted the Romans against the pseudo-Philip. Attalus also defeated Diegylus, king of the Thracian Cseni, and overthrew Prusias of Bithynia. On his death, his ward and nephew, Attalus III. surnamed Philometer, undertook the reins of government, from B.C. 138 to 133, and on his death bequeathed his kingdom to the Romans. Soon after Aristonicus, a natural son of Eumenes II, revolted, and claimed the kingdom of Pergamos for himself; but in B.C. 130 he was vanquished and taken prisoner, and the kingdom of Pergamios became a Roman province under the name of Asia (Strabo, 14:646.) The city of Pergamos, however, continued to flourish and prosper under the Roman dominion, so that Pliny (l.c.) could still call it “longe clarissimum Asiae Pergamum:” it remained the center of jurisdiction for the district, and of commerce, as all the main roads of Western Asia converged there. Pergamos was one of the seven churches mentioned in the book of Revelation (Rev 2:12).

Under the Byzantine emperors the greatness and prosperity of the city declined; but it still exists under the name of Bergamo, and presents to the visitor numerous ruins and extensive remains of its ancient magnificence. It lies on the north bank of the Caicus, at the base and on the declivity of two high and steep mountains, on one of which now stands a dilapidated castle. A wall facing the south-east of the Acropolis, of hewn granite, is at least one hundred feet deep, and engrafted into the rock; above it a course of large instructions form a spacious area, upon which once rose a temple unlivalled in sublimity of situation, being visible from the vast plain and the AEgean Sea. The ruins of this temple show that it was built in the noblest style. Besides this, there are ruins of an ancient temple of AEsculapius, which, like the Nicephorion, was outside the city (Tacit. Ann. 3:63; Pausan. 13, § 2); of 4 royal palace, which was surrounded by a wall, and connected with the Caicus by an aqueduct; of a prytaneum, a theater, a gymnasium, a stadium, an amphitheatre, and other public buildings. All these remains attest the unusual splendor of the ancient city, and all travelers speak with admiration of their stupendous greatness. The numerous coins which we possess of Pergamos attest that Olympian games were celebrated there; a vase found there represents a torchrace on horseback; and Pliny (10:25)  relates that public cock-fights took place there every year. Pergamos was celebrated for the manufacture of ointments (Athen. 15:689), pottery (Pliny, 35:46), and parchment, which derives its name (charta Perzamena) from the city.

The library of Pergamos, which is said to have consisted of no less than 200,000 volumes, remained at Pergamnos after the kingdom of the Attali had lost its independence, until Antony removed it to Egypt, and presented it to queen Cleopatra. (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 3:2' Plutarch, Anton.). The valuable tapestries, called in Latin aulva, from having dorned the hall of king Attis, were also wrought in this town. Even now it is a place of considerable importance containing a population estimated at 14,000, of whom about 3000 are Greeks, 300, Armenians, and the rest Turks (Macfarlane's Visit). The writer just cited says, “The approach to this ancient and decaved city was as impressive as well might be. After crossing the Caicus, I saw, looking over three vast tumuli, or sepulchral barrows, similar to those of the plains of Troy, the present Turkish city, with its tall minarets and taller cypresses, situated on the lower declivities and at the foot of the Acropolis, whose bold gray brow was crowned by the rugged walls of a barbarous castle, the usurper of the site of a magnificent Greek temple.” The town consists for the most part of small and mean wooden houses, among which appear the remains of early Christian churches, showing “like large fortresses amid vast barracks of wood.” None of these churches have any scriptural or apocalyptic interest connected with them, having been erected “several centuries after the ministry of the apostles, and when Christianity was not a humble and despised creed, but the adopted religion of an immense empire.” The pagan temples have fared worse than these Christian churches. “The fanes of Jupiter and Diana, of AEsculapius and Venus, are prostrate in the dust; and where they have not been carried away by the Turks, to cut up into tombstones or to pound into mortar, the Corinthian and Ionic columns, the splendid capitals, the cornices and pediments, all in the highest ornament, are thrown into unsightly heaps.”

As above noted, in Pergamos was one of the seven churches of Asia, to which the Apocalypse is addressed. This church is commended for its fidelity and firmness in the midst of persecutions, and in a city so eminently addicted to idolatry. “I know,” it is said, “thy works and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is” (Rev 2:13). Now there was at Pergamos a celebrated and much frequented temple of AEsculapius, who  probably there, as in other places, was worshipped; n the form of a living serpent, fed in the temple, and considered as its divinity. Hence AEsculapius was called the god of Pergamos, and on the coins struck by the town AEsculapius often appears with a rod encircled by a serpent (Berger, Thesaur. 1:492). As the sacred writer mentions the great dragon and the old serpent. (Rev 12:9), there is reason to conclude that when he says in the above passage that the Church of Pergamos dwelt “where Satan's seat is,” he alludes in the worship of the serpent as there practiced.

The great wealth which accrued to Eumenes II from his large accession of territory he employed in laying out a magnificent residential city, and adorning it with temples and other public buildings. His passion, and that of his successor, for literature and the fine arts, led them to form a library which rivaled that of Alexandria; and the impulse given to the art of preparing sheepskins for the purpose of transcription, to gratify the taste of the royal dilettanti, has left its record in the name parchment. Eumenes's successor, Attalus II, is said to have bid six hundred thousand sestercs for a picture by the painter Aristides, at the sale of the plunder of Corinth; and by so doing to have attracted the attention of the Roman general Mummius to it, who sent it off at once to Rome, where no foreign artist's work had then been seen. For another picture by the same artist he paid one hundred talents. But the great glory of the city was the so-called Nicephorium, a grove of extreme beauty, laid out as a thank-offering, for a victory over Antiochus, in which was an assemblage of temples, probably of all the deities, Zeus, Athena, Apollo, AEsculapius, Dionysus, and Aphrodite. The temple of the last was of a most elaborate character. Its facade was perhaps inlaid after the manner of pietradura work; for Philip of Macedonia, who was repulsed in an attempt to surprise Pergamos during the reign of Attalus I , vented his spite in cutting down the trees of the grove, and not only destroying the Aphrodisium, but injuring the stones in such a way as to prevent their being used again. At the conclusion of peace it was made a special stipulation that this damage should be made good. The immense wealth which was directly or indirectly derived from the legacy of his dominions by Attalus III to the Romans contributed perhaps even more than the spoils of Carthage and Corinth to the demoralization of Roman statesmen. The sumptuousness of the Attalic princes had raised Pergamos to the rank of the first city in Asia as regards splendor, and Pliny speaks of it as without a rival in the province. Its prominence, however, was not that of a commercial town, like Ephesus or Corinth, but arose from its peculiar features. It was a solt of union of a pagan cathedral city, a university town,  and a royal residence, embellished during a succession of years by kings who all had a passion for expenditure and ample means of gratifying it.

Two smaller streams, which flowed from the north, embracing the town between them, and then fell into the Caicus, afforded ample means of storing water, without which, in those latitudes, ornamental cultivation (or indeed cultivation of any kind) is out of the question. The larger of these streams — the Bergama-tchai, or Cetius of antiquity — has a fall of more than 150 feet between the hills to the north of Pergamos and its junction with the Caicus, and it brings down a very considerable body of water. Both the Nicephorium, which has been spoken of above, and the Grove of AEsculapius, which became yet more celebrated in the time of the Roman empire, doubtless owed their existence to the means of irrigation thus available; and furnished the appliances for those licentious rituals of pagan antiquity which flourished wherever there were groves and hill-altars. Under the Attalic kings, Pergamos became a city of temples, devoted to a sensuous worship; and being in its origin, according to pagan notions, a sacred place, might not unnaturally be viewed by Jews and Jewish Christians as one “where was the throne of Satan” (ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Σατανᾶ, Rev 2:13). After the extinction of its independence, the sacred character of Pergamos seems to have been put even more prominently forward. Coins and inscriptions constantly describe the Pergamenes as νεωκόροι or νεωκόροι πρῶτοι τῆς Α᾿σίας. This title always indicates the duty of maintaining a religious worship of some kind (which indeed naturally goes together with the usufruct of religious property). What the deities were to which the title has reference especially it is difficult to say. In the time of Martial, however, AEsculapius had acquired so much prominence that he is called Pergameus deus. His grove was recognized by the Roman senate in the reign of Tiberius as possessing the rights of sanctuary. Pausanias, too, in the course of his work, refers more than once to the Esculapian ritual at Pergamos as a sort of standard. From the circumstance of this notoriety of the Pergamene AEsculapius, from the title Σωτήρ being given to him, from the serpent (which Judaical Christians would regard as a symbol of evil) being his characteristic emblem, and from the fact that the medical practice of antiquity included charms and incantations among its agencies, it has been supposed that the expressions ὁ θρόνος τοῦ Σατανᾶ οπου ὁ Σατανᾶς κατοικεῖ have an especial reference to this one pagan deity, and not to the whole city as a sort of focus of idolatrous worship. But although undoubtedly the AEsculapius worship of Pergamos was the most famous, and in later times  became continually more predominant from the fact of its being combined with an excellent medical school (which among others produced the celebrated Galen), yet an inscription of the time of Marcus Antoninus distinctly puts Zeus, Athena, Dionysus, and AEsculapius in a coordinate rank, as all being special tutelary deities of Pergamos.

It seems unlikely, therefore, that the expressions above quoted should be so interpreted as to isolate one of them from the rest. It may be added that the charge against a portion of the Pergamene Church that some among them were of the school of Balaam, whose policy was “to put a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, by inducing them φαγεῖν εἰδωλύθυτα καὶ πορνεῦσαι (Rev 2:14), is in both its particulars very inappropriate to the AEsculapian ritual. It points rather to the Dionysus and Aphrodite worship; and the sin of the Nicolaitans, which is condemned, seems to have consisted in a participation in this, arising out of a social amalgamation of themselves with the native population. Now, from the time of the war with Antiochus at least, it is certain that there was a considerable Jewish population in Pergamene territory. The decree of the Pergamenes quoted by Josephus (Ant. 14:10, 22) seems to indicate that the Jews had farmed the tolls in some of the harbors of their territory, and likewise were holders of land. They are, in accordance with the expressed desire of the Roman senate, allowed to levy port-dues upon all vessels except those belonging to king Ptolemy. The growth of a large and wealthy class naturally leads to its obtaining a share in political rights, and the only bar to the admission of Jews to privileges of citizenship in Pergamos would be their unwillingness to take any part in the religious ceremonies, which were an essential part of every relation of life in pagan times. The more lax, however, might regard such a proceeding as a purely formal act of civil obedience, and reconcile themselves to it as Naaman did to “bowing himself in the house of Rimmon” when in attendance upon his sovereign. It is perhaps worth noticing, with reference to this point, that a Pergamene inscription published by Bockh mentions by two names (licostratus, who is also called Tryppho) an individual who served the office of gymnasiarch. Of these two names, the latter, a foreign one, is likely to have been borne by him among some special body to which he belonged, and the former to have been adopted when, by accepting the position of an official, he merged himself in the general Greek population.

See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.; Spon and Wheler, Voy. 1:260, etc.; Choiseul-Gouffier, Voyage Pittoresque, 2:25, etc.; Arundell, Seven Churches, p. 281, etc.; Dallaway, Constantinople, Ancient and Modern, p. 303; Leake, Asia Minor, p. 266; Fellows, Asia Minor, p. 34, etc.; Richter, Wall'fihrten, p. 488, etc.; Eckhel, Doctr. Numbers 4:448; Capelle, Commentat. de Regibus et Antiquit. Pergamen is (Amst. 1842, 8vo); Rosenmiiller, Bibl. Geog. 3:13 17: Macfarlane, Visit to the Seven Apocalyptic Churches, 1832; Schubert, Reise ins Morgenland; Missionary Herald for 1839, p. 228 230; Bockh, Inscript. Nos. 3538, 3550, 3553; Philostratus, De Vit. Soph. p. 45, 106; Tchihatcheff, Asie Mineure, p. 230. SEE MYSIA.

## Pergamos, Council Of[[@Headword:Pergamos, Council Of]]

             was held at that place in 152 (?) against the Colarbasians.

## Pergolese, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Pergolese, Giovanni Battista]]

             was an eminent musician of the Neapolitan school. Evidence regarding the date and place of his birth is conflicting; probably the correct account is that of the Marchese di Villarosa, his latest biographer, who states that he was born at Jesi, near Ancona, on Jan. 3, 1710. In 1717 he was admitted into the Conservatorio dei Poveri di Gesu Cristo at Naples, where he studied the violin under Domenico di Matteis, and musical composition under Gaetano Greco and Durante. Under the conviction that melody and taste were sacrificed to learning by most of the masters of his time, he abandoned the style of Scurlatti and Greco for that of Vinci and Hasse. His first great work was the oratorio of San Cug'ielo d'Aquitania, composed in 1731. In that and the following year appeared his operas of La Serva Padrona, II Prigionicr Superbo, and Lo Frate Innamorato; in 1734, Ad)iano in Siria; in 1735, II Flaminio and L'Olimpiade. In 1734 lhe received the appointment of maestro di capella of the church of Loretto. In consequence of delicate health he removed to Pozzuoli, where he composed the cantata of Orfeo, and his pathetic Stubat Mater. He died there of consumption in 1736. Besides the above-mentioned works, Pergolese composed a number of pieces for the Church, which were better appreciated during his lifetime than his secular compositions, also a violin concerto, and thirty trios for violin, violoncello, and harpsichord. His  works are all characterized by sweetness and freedom of style. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Pergolesi[[@Headword:Pergolesi]]

             SEE PERGOLESE.

## Pergubrios[[@Headword:Pergubrios]]

             an ancient Slavonian deity who was believed to preside over the fruits. An annual festival was celebrated in his honor on the 22d of March.

## Peri[[@Headword:Peri]]

             (Fairy), according to the mythical lore of the East, a being begotten by fallen spirits, which spends its life in all imaginable delights, is immortal, but is forever excluded from the joys of Paradise. It takes an intermediate place between angels and demons and is either male or female. So far from there being only female Peris, as is supposed by some, and these the wives of the Devs, the Peris live, on the contrary, in constant warfare with these Devs. Otherwise they are of the most innocuous character to mankind, and, exactly as the fairies, with whom our own popular mythology has made us familiar, are, when female, of surpassing beauty. One of the finest compliments to be paid to a Persian lady is to speak of her as Perizadeh (born of a Peri; Greek, Parisatis). They belong to the great family of genii, or Jin: a belief in whom is enjoined in the Koran, and for whose conversion, as well as for that of man, Mohammed was sent (comp. Koran, ch. 55, 72, and 74).

## Periamma[[@Headword:Periamma]]

             a cross of gold that hung from the neck, and was a distinctive ornament of a bishop's dress. SEE BISHOP.

## Periammata [[@Headword:Periammata ]]

             SEE PHYLACTERY.

## Peribolaeon [[@Headword:Peribolaeon ]]

             SEE PALLIUM.

## Peribolon[[@Headword:Peribolon]]

             (περίβολον), the outer enclosure of ancient Christian churches, being the utmost bounds allowed for refuge or sanctuary. SEE ASYLUM.

## Peribolos[[@Headword:Peribolos]]

             SEE PERIBOLON.

## Pericopae[[@Headword:Pericopae]]

             the lessons or divisions of Scripture read in the early Church, after the style of the Jewish par ‘shioth. It is doubtful when the custom originated, but the necessity of it pleads for its antiquity.

## Pericope[[@Headword:Pericope]]

             (περικοπή) is the title of those sections of Holy Scripture which were appointed to be read inthe services of the Church. The synagogue, with its parashioth (q.v.) and haphtaras (q.v.), no doubt furnished the pattern which in the different sections of the Church took a different shape. Little of this process has been recorded: it belongs to what Basil calls: the ἀγραφατῆς ἐκκλησίας μυστήρια.

The oldest documents which speak of reading the Scriptures in the church belong to the Greek Church, and they are the more important since the Greek Church is the mother of all the Oriental churches, and thus the origin, not only of their liturgies, but also of their lectionaries. The sources at our disposal show the remarkable wealth of the Greek Church in this respect; for not only do the Sundays, the prominent days of Christ's history, and the many saints' days, have their regular gospel and epistolary lessons, but such are also assigned to every day in the week. Thus for the period between Easter and Pentecost, as Chrysostom already states, the Acts and the gospel of John were read continuously. For the rest of the Church year, three separate and independent series of lessons are employed — one series for the Sundays, beginning with the second' after Pentecost; one series for the Sabbaths, beginning in the Pentecost week; and one series for the five weekdays between the Sunday and Sabbath. All three series select both from gospels and epistles, following the order of the books and chapters in the New Test. History explains this strange phenomenon. It is very evident that the Greek Church at first introduced lessons for the Sundays, later for the Sabbaths, and still later for the weekdays.

Next in importance is the Armenian system, which has only become known by professor Petermann's translation from the Armenian Church Almanac, published at Venice in 1782, and in German translation found in Alt's Kirchenjahr, 2:136, 225. Scripture reading is a most important part of the Armenian church-service more so than in the Greek Church, and lessons from both the Old and New Tests. are employed. Among the Syrians we find for the most part the Greek reading-system, while the Nestorian system of Bible-lessons contains for the first time a series of lectiones selectae, which in some respects deserves to be placed at the side of the Romish pericope system.  The documents with reference to the reading-system of the Jacobite Christians are quite ample; a list of the New-Test. pericopes of the Jacobites is found in the edition of the Syriac New Test. published by Widtmanstadt (Vienna, 1855). The Maronites have virtually the same plan of Scripture-reading as the Jacobites. While the lectionary plan adopted by the Alexandrian churches was only a branch of the Greek, that of the Coptic churches was entirely distinct, and is a portion of the Coptic liturgy of St. Basilius. A Latin translation is found in Renaudot's Collection, 1:137 sq., from which it is evident that, in every chief service, the Copts read from four different parts of the New Test. Virtually identical with the Coptic is the Ethiopic system. See Renaudot, 1:499, 507 sq.

A proper transition from the eastern to the western systems would be the North-African lectionaries, if we were in possession of such. With the exception of the Mozarabic, prevalent among the African and Spanish Christians in the 13th century, no list has been preserved.

In the Occidental Church we have, in reference to the public reading of Scriptures, a phenomenon similar to that observed in the Church of the East. As, here, the Byzantine system was most predominant, so, in the West, the Roman system gradually supplanted all the rest. A difference between the two consists in this, that the non-Byzantine systems of the East were mostly followed by bodies that stood opposed to the Byzantine Church, while the non-Roman system found a home in bodies on doctrinal and fraternal footing with the Roman Church.

To the reading-systems no more extant belongs the Capulan. Of its existence we have ample proof in the Cod. Fuldensis; corrected in the year 545 by bishop Victor, himself of Capua. That the Christians of Gaul once pursued a peculiar plan in the public reading of the Scriptures is manifest from a letter of the missionary Augustine to Gregory the Great. Besides, there are other scattered evidences from Hilary (354), Sidonius (472), Salvianus (440). See Mabillon, De Liturag. Gallicana, page 29 sq. Then we have a capitular of Charlemagne, abolishing the Gallic liturgy in favor of the Romish. Under the title, Missa Ambrosiana, the very ancient liturgy and reading-system of the Milan Church is still preserved. Its original form cannot be definitely determined, as the different printed texts do not agree among themselves. Concerning the Mozarabian liturgy, comp. the art. s.v. Of the Old British and Irish systems not a single trace remains, the Roman having entirely supplanted them. The Roman system of Scriptural reading,  like the whole Roman liturgy, has passed through three stages — that of its origin and development, down to the time of the Carlovinians, that of supremacy in the Middle Ages, and that of fixed and formal codification by the Council of Trent.

The oldest traces of it are found in the 5th century, about the time of Jerome, to whom Berno and later writers ascribe its origin. It consists of a double listone of the epistle, and the other of gospel selections partly chosen freely, and partly with partiality for certain books.

In the second period, this system made its greatest conquests; in France supplanting the Gallic, in Germany entering with Christianity. It also experienced some internal changes during this time, especially on account of the many saints' days and the introduction of the Corpus Christi festival in 1264.

Finally, the Council of Trent declared the papal system the only legitimate one for the Roman Church, only allowing those churches the use of any other. which could prove that the latter had been in constant use there for the past two hundred years.

With the reformation effected by Luther and his German Bible, the traditional character of church services necessarily had to change also. The Bible was read, studied, and explained. The most complete system of Bible-lessons was introduced in England, to some extent, also, in Germany and Switzerland. This whole subject is treated by Ranke, Fortbestand des herkommlichen Perikopenkreises (Gotha, 1859).

The old pericope system has a peculiar history within the section of the Protestant Church that has retained it. In England, Cranmer, in composing the prayer-book, simply took the epistles and gospels as found in the missal of the English bishoprics, omitting only those intended for days not celebrated by Protestants. This latter was also done in Germany; but some other changes were made here, especially at the close of the Epiphany and Trinity Sundays. In the pre-reformatory system there were no lessons for the sixth Sunday after Epiphany, nor for the twenty-sixth and twenty- seventh Sundays after Trinity. This defect was remedied successfully during the 16th century by an unknown master in liturgics, and the present arrangement is the result.

The subordinate services, such as the matins, vespers, as also services during the week, prayer-meetings, and the like, found great favor in the  eyes of the Reformers. Luther, in 1526, the Zurich order of worship for 1535, and the Geneva liturgy, gave directions for the use of lessons in such services. The Church of England pursued its own plan in arranging the daily lessons. Not, content, as the Continental reformers were, with selecting only certain sections of Scripture to be read, Cranmer arranged for morning and evening services such a course of lessons that in every year the entire Old Test., with the exception of the Psalter and the purely ritual sections of the Pentateuch, was read through once, the New Test. three times, and the Psalter twelve times, i.e., was to be chanted through once a month. In Germany, the services during the week in course of time became almost extinct.

The public Scriptural reading, thus reduced to the regular gospel and epistolary lessons for the different Sundays, could not long satisfy the Church. Already Spener advocated an enlarged pericope system; and since 1769, when the movement was started by the elector George of Hanover, the evangelical authorities in the various provinces of Germany have sought to remedy this defect, especially by the adoption of new series of pericopes; See Suckow, Die kirchl. Perikopen (1830); — Matthaus, Die evang. Perikopen des Kirchenjahres (Anspach, 1844-45, 2 volumes); F. Strauss, Das evangelische Kirchenjahr (Berlin, 1850); Piper, Der verbesserte evangel. Kalender (1850); Bobertag, Das evang. Kirchenjahr (2d ed. Berlin, 1857); Grimmert, Tabelldrisckie Uebersicht der gewaohldichen neuen Perikopein reihen (Zerbst, 1874); Nebe, Die evangq. und epist. Perikopen des Kirchenjahrs (Wiesbaden, 1875, 8 volumes); Sommer, Die evang. u. epist. Perikopen (Erlangen, 1875, 2 volumes); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. SEE LESSON. (B.P.)

## Perida[[@Headword:Perida]]

             (Neh 7:57). SEE PERUDA.

## Perier, Marguerite[[@Headword:Perier, Marguerite]]

             a French inmate of Port Royal, noted for a pretended miraculous cure upon her person, which has been the subject of much controversy in the Church, was the daughter of M. Perier, magistrate at Clermont, and niece of Blaise and Jacqueline Pascal. She was born about 1645. When about eight years old she was afflicted with fistula lachrymalis in the left eye, and the disease was of so virulent a character that when she had attained the age of eleven years the bones of the nose and palate had become carious. Medical treatment proved unavailing; and as the child grew worse it was decided, as a last resource, to apply the cautenry, though with little hope of success. She was at this time a pupil in the convent of Port-Royal at Paris. The sisterhood just then received from a priest named La Poterie a reliquary containing what claimed to be a portion of the crown of thorns which pierced the head of the Redeemer. This was carried in procession to the altar of the convent chapel on March 24, 1656, being Friday of the third week in Lent. The nuns, in turn, kissed the sacred relic; and when the pensionnaires approached for the same purpose, their governess, sister Flavia, desired Mademoiselle Perier to commend herself to God, and apply the reliquary to the diseased eye. She did so, and is claimed to have been conscious of a complete and instantaneous cure. The occurrence was mentioned in the convent next day, but was not generally known till a week afterwards, When the surgeon, M. Dalence, called to see his patient, such  was the change in her appearance that it was only after a most minute and careful examination that he was convinced of her identity and of the reality of the cure, which he declared unaccountable on any other than supernatural grounds. The news spreading through the city, the queen dispatched her own surgeon to Port-Royal to verify the facts. He and other medical witnesses attested the genuineness of the cure, and pronounced it beyond the operation of natural causes. Their testimony was confirmed by the ecclesiastical authorities; and the grand vicars published a formal recognition of the truth of the miracle. Solemn thanksgivings were offered in the church at Port-Royal, and the holy thorn was presented to the convent, where it was exposed every Friday for the veneration of the faithful. ‘This miracle was considered important from the bearing which it had on the Jansenistic controversy then agitating the Romish Church, being thought to be a special indication of God's favor to and his direct interference in behalf of the persecuted Jansenists (q.v.). Demoiselle Marguerite Perier died in 1733. Of course Protestants refuse to give credence to the cure as of miraculous order, and would account for it on psychological principles as the best interpretation of the case. SEE MIRACLES, ECCLESIASTICAL.

## Perignon, Pierre[[@Headword:Perignon, Pierre]]

             a French Benedictine, was born about 1640 at Sainte-Menehould. He belonged to the congregation of Sainte-Vannes. In his capacity of procurator of the abbey of Hautvilliers, he was charged with the care of the vineyards. Gifted with an extreme delicacy of taste, he could distinguish, without ever mistaking, between the grapes coming from the different growths of Champagne. He rendered a great service to this province by showing how. to combine the different kinds to give to its wine that delicacy and strength which have since gained it such a great reputation. But, far. from keeping for himself or for his convent the secret of its manufacture, he was eager to divulge it in his Memoires sur la maniere de choisir les plantes de viqgne convenables au sol, sur la faupon de les provigner, de les tailler, de melansger les raisins, d'en fiire la cueillette et de gouverner les vins. The author was a learned man and of austere manners. He died Sept. 14, 1715, at Hautvilliers, near Epernay. See Histoire de la Congreg. de Sainte Vatnnes.

## Peringer, Gustav[[@Headword:Peringer, Gustav]]

             a Swedish theologian of the 17th century, and professor of Oriental languages at Upsala, is the author of Historia Linguae et l'Eruditionis Arabuna; and translated into Latin the Talmudic treatises Aboda Sarlah and Tamnid, both published at Altdorf in 1680. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:78. (B.P.)

## Period[[@Headword:Period]]

             a term used in chronology in the same sense as Cycle (q.v.), to denote an interval of time after which the astronomical phenomena to which it refers recur in the same order. It is also employed to signify a cycle of cycles. Various periods have been invented by astronomers, but we can only notice a few of the most important. SEE EPOCH.

1. The Chaldaeans invented the Chaldaic Period, or Period of Eclipses, from observing that, after a certain number of revolutions of the moon around the earth, her eclipses recurred in the same order and of the same magnitude. This period consists of 223 lunations, or 6798.28 days, and corresponds almost exactly to a complete revolution of the moon's node.

2. The Egyptians made use of the Dog-star, Syriacal, or Sothic Period, as it is variously called, to compare their civil year of 365 days with the true or Julian year of 365.25 days. The period consequently consisted of 1460 Julian years, corresponding to 1461 Egyptian years, after the lapse of which the dates in both reckonings coincided. By comparing the solar and lunar years, Meton, an Athenian, invented (B.C. 432) a lunar period of 6940 days, called from him the Metonic Cycle, also the Lunar Cycle. About a century afterwards the cycle of Meton was discovered to be an insufficient approximation to the truth, and as he had made the solar year too long by about death of a day. at the end of 4 Metonic cycles the solar reckoning was in advance of the lunar by about 1 day 6 hours. To remedy this, a new period, called the Calippic Period, was invented by Calippus, and consisted of 4 Metonic cycles less by 1 day, or 27,759 days. But as this period still gave a difference of 6 hours between the solar and lunar reckonings, it was improved by Hipparchus, who invented the Hipparchic Period of 4 Calippic periods less by 1 day, or 111,035 days, or about 304 Julian years, which is an exceedingly close approximation, being only 61 minutes too long, when measured by the tropical year; and too short by an almost inappreciable quantity, when measured by the Synodic Month.

3. The period of the Heliacal or Solar Cycle, after which the same day of the month falls upon the same day of the week, consists of 28 Julian years. If the year had regularly consisted of 365 days, that is, one day more than an exact number of weeks, it is evident that at the end of seven years the days of the month and week would again correspond; but the introduction of an intercalary day into every fourth year causes this coincidence to recur  at irregular periods of 6, 11, 6, and 5 years successively. However, by choosing a period such as will preserve the leap-years in the same relative position to the other years, and at the same time consist of an exact number of weeks (both of which objects are effected by using the number 28, which is the least common multiple of 4 and 7), we insure the regular recurrence of the coincidence between the days of the week and of the month. The solar cycle is supposed to have been invented about the time of the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), but it is arranged so that the first year of the first cycle corresponds to B.C. 9. In calculating the position of any year in the solar cycle, care must be taken to allow for the omission of the intercalary day at the beginning of each century, and its insertion in the first year of every fourth century.

4. The Julian Period is a cycle of cycles, and consists of 7980 (= 28 x 19 x 15) years, after the lapse of which the solar cycle, lunar cycle, and the Indiction (q.v.) commence together. The period of its commencement has been arranged so that it will expire at the same time as the other three periods from which it has been derived. The year 4713 B.C. is taken as the first year of the first period, consequently A.D. 1 was the 4714th.

## Periodentae[[@Headword:Periodentae]]

             a name given to itinerating or visiting presbyters decreed by the Council of Laodicea, A.D. 360, to supersede the Chorepiscopi (q.v.) in the country villages.

## Perion, Joachim[[@Headword:Perion, Joachim]]

             a learned Frenchman, was born about 1499 at Cormery (Touraine). In 1517 he took the religious habit of the Benedictines in the abbey of Cormery; came to Paris in 1527, and was there received as doctor of theology in 1542. He sometimes gave himself the honorary title of interpreter to the king. He possessed the talents for it, if he did not do the work; for he made the study of ancient languages the occupation of his whole life. He professed a superstitious admiration for Cicero, and he regarded Aristotle as the oracle of the school; he also delivered against Ramus, who did not share in his fondness, three harangues full of invectives. Perion died at Cormery in 1559; or, according to Dom Liron, in 1561. We have of his works, De fabularum, ludorum, theatrorum antiqua consuetudine (Paris, 1540, 4to): — Topicorum theologicorum lib. ii (ibid. 1549, 8vo); he supports the Catholic doctrine by well-chosen extracts from  Scripture and from the fathers: — De vitis et rebus yestis apostolorum (ibid. 1551, 16mo), translated into French in 1552: — De vita rebusque gestis J. C., Maricn Virgin's, et Johannis Basptistoe (ibid. 1553, 16mo): — De oigine linguae Gallicae et ejus cum Graecat cognatione dialogorum lib. iv (ibid. 1555, 8vo); this treatise, divided into four parts, falls below criticism, but is not so bad as La Monnoye pretends, and contains some curious particulars: — De sanctorum virorum qui patriarchce ab ecclesia appellantur rebus gestis ac vitis (ibid. 1555, 4to), translated into French: — De magistraibus Romanonrum ac Graecorum (ibid. 1560, 4to), and in the Antiq. Gr. of Gronovius. The numerous Latin versions of Domn Perion are more elegant than faithful, and derive their principal merit from the time in which they appeared. We cite only those from Aristotle (1540-59, 7 vols.); from the Traite des Heresies of John of Damascus (1548, fol.); from the (Euvres of Saint Justin (1554, fol.), and from Saint Denis the Areopagite (1556, fol.), etc. See Scevole de Sainte- Marthe, Elogia, lib. i; Teissier, Eloges; Hilarion de Coste, Vie de Francois Le Picard, p. 335; La Monnoye, Notes sur “la Biblioth. de La Croix du Mainze;” Essais de Litterature, Nov. 1702; Niceron, — Memoires, vol. 36.

## Peripatetic Philosophy[[@Headword:Peripatetic Philosophy]]

             SEE PERIPATETICS.

## Peripatetics[[@Headword:Peripatetics]]

             was the name of a sect of philosophers at Athens who were the disciples of Aristotle. It is doubtful whether they received this name from the place where they were taught, called Peripaton, in the Lyceum, or because they received the philosopher's lectures as they walked (περιπατοῦντες). The Peripatetics acknowledged the dignity of human nature, and placed their summum bonum not in the pleasures of passive sensation, but in the due exercise of the moral and intellectual faculties. The habit of this exercise, when guided by reason, constituted the highest excellence of man. The philosopher contended that our own happiness chiefly depends upon ourselves; and while he did not require in his followers that self-command to which others pretended, lie allowed a moderate degree of perturbation as becoming human nature; and he considered a certain sensibility of passion quite necessary, as by resentment we are enabled to repel injuries, and the smart which past calamities have inflicted renders us careful to  avoid the repetition. See Philo Judaeus, Opera, 4:423 sq.; Lewes, Hist. of Philos. vol. ii; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. 1:180 sq.; Grote, Life of Aristotle. SEE ARISTOTLE.

## Perirrhanteria[[@Headword:Perirrhanteria]]

             (περιῤῥαντήρια), fonts placed at the entrance of the ancient heathen temples, that those who entered the sanctuary to pray or to offer sacrifice might first purify themselves.

## Perisin (Persinus) Or Perrisim, Jacques[[@Headword:Perisin (Persinus) Or Perrisim, Jacques]]

             a French engraver, was born, according to Nagler, in 1530. In concert with Jean Tortorel, he designed and engraved, partly on wood and partly on copper, a set of twenty-four large prints to illustrate a History of the Wars of the Huguenots, 1559 to 1570. This book is exceedingly rare. The copper plates are etched in a coarse and incorrect style; the wooden cuts are executed with more attention. When Perisin and Tortorel engraved in concert, they marked their prints with the second monogram. When Perisin engraved alone, he used the first monogram. Malpe attributes to the latter a series of Tritons and marine monsters, small pieces lengthways, marked with his monogram reversed.

## Peristerion[[@Headword:Peristerion]]

             (περιστερή, a dove), the place over the altar where hung the silver dove, the emblem of the Holy Ghost. SEE DOVE.

## Peristia[[@Headword:Peristia]]

             a name for the victims sacrificed in a lustration among the ancient heathens.

## Peristiarch[[@Headword:Peristiarch]]

             the officiating priest in a lustration or purification among the ancient Greeks, when they wished to purify the place where a public assembly was held. He received this name because he went before the lustral victims as they were carried around the boundary of the place. SEE LUSTRATION.

## Peristyle[[@Headword:Peristyle]]

             (περίστυλον) is the name applied to a court, square, or cloister, in Greek and Roman buildings, with a colonnade around it; also the colonnade itself  surrounding such a space. In mediaeval Latin it is called the Quadraporticus, and was the usual arrangement in Italy in front of the churches as well as in front of houses. The nearest approach to it in England is the Cloister (q.v.).

## Peritzol[[@Headword:Peritzol]]

             SEE FARISSOL.

## Perizonius[[@Headword:Perizonius]]

             (the Latinized form of Voolrbrook), JAMES, a learned Dutch scholar, was born at Dam, in Holland, in 1651. He studied at Deventer, and afterwards at Utrecht, under the learned Graevius, and was successively made master of the Latin school at Delft, and professor of eloquence and history at Franeker. In 1693 he was appointed professor of eloquence, history, and Greek at Leyden, where he died in 1715. He was a man of extensive erudition, great application, and sound judgment. He edited several of the classics, and greatly enriched the classical lore of his age. He also published Origines Babylonicae et Egypticae (Leyden, 1711, 2 vols. 8vo), a work in which he treats of the Egyptian chronology and antiquities. Of course ore recent researches have wholly superseded his writings in this line, but his industry should not be ignored. Other works of his worthy of notice here are the treatise De mnoate Judae et verbo ἀπάγχεσθαι, etc. (1702): — De origine, significatione, et usu vocum Prcetoris et Prcetorii, veroque sensu loci ad Php 1:13 (1687). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Perizzite[[@Headword:Perizzite]]

             (Heb. Perizzi', פְרַזַּי, always in the sing. and with the article; Sept. Φερεζαῖος, in Ezra Φερεσθεί), a Canaanitish tribe, already known in the time of Abraham, inhabiting a mountainous region (Gen 13:7; comp. 15:20), which they eventually yielded to Ephraim and Judah (Jos 11:3; Jos 17:15; Jdg 1:4-5). They were kindred to the Canaanites strictly so called (Exo 23:23; Judges 1:45): sometimes Canaanites and Perizzites are put for all the other tribes of Canaan (Gen 13:7; Gen 34:30); while in other places the Perizzites are enumerated with various other tribes of the same stock (Gen 15:20; Exo 3:8; Exo 3:17; Deu 7:1, etc.). They are not named in the catalogue of Genesis 10; so that their origin, like that of other small tribes,  such as the Avites, and the similarly named Gerizzites, is left in obscurity. They are continually mentioned in the formula so frequently occurring to express the Promised Land (Gen 15:20; Exo 3:8; Exo 3:17; Exo 23:23; Exo 33:2; Exo 34:11; Deu 7:1; Deu 20:17; Jos 3:10; Jos 9:1; Jos 24:11; Jdg 3:5; Ezr 9:1; Neh 9:8). They appear, however, with somewhat greater distinctness on several occasions. On Abram's first entrance into the land it is said to have been occupied by “the Canaanite and the Perizzite” (Gen 13:7). As the separation of Abram and Lot, there recorded, took place at Bethel, we may infer that the Perizzites were then in that vicinity. Jacob also, after the massacre of the Shechemites, uses the same expression, complaining that his sons had “made him to stink among the inhabitants of the land, among the Canaanite and the Perizzite” (Gen 34:30). This seems to locate the Perizzites near Shechem. So also in the detailed records of the conquest given in the opening of the book of Judges (evidently from a distinct source from those in Joshua), Judah and Simeon are said to have found their territory occupied by “the Canaanite and the Perizzite” (Jdg 1:4-5), with Bezek (a place not yet discovered, but apparently not far from Jerusalem, and hence probably on the south-western boundary of Ephraim) as their stronghold, and Adoni-bezek their most noted chief. Thus too a late tradition, preserved in 2Es 1:21, mentions only “the Canaanites, the Pheresites,-and the Philistines,” as the original ten ants of the country. The notice just cited from the. book of Judges locates them in the southern part of the Holy Land. Another independent and equally remarkable fragment of the history of the conquest seems to speak of them as occupying, with the Rephaim, or giants, the “forest country” on the western flanks of Mount Carmel (Jos 17:15-18). Here again the Canaanites only are named with them. As a tribe of mountaineers, they are enumerated in company with the Amorites, Hittites, and Jebusites in Jos 11:3; Jos 12:8; and they are catalogued among the remnants of the old population whom Solomon reduced to bondage, both in 1Ki 9:20 and 2Ch 8:7. Not only had they not been exterminated, but they even intermarried with the Israelites (Jdg 3:5-6; Ezr 9:1). By Josephus the Perizzites do not appear to be mentioned.

The signification of the name is not by any means clear. It possibly meant rustics, dwellers in open, unwalled villages, which are denoted by a similar word (פְּרָזוֹת, Eze 38:11; Est 9:19). So also Copher hap- perazi, A.V. “country villages” (1Sa 6:18); Arey hap-perazi,  “unwalled towns” (Deu 3:5). In both these passages the Sept. understands the Perizzites to be alluded to, and translates accordingly. In Jos 16:10 it adds the Perizzites to the Canaanites as inhabitants of Gezer. Ewald (Geschichte, 1:317) inclines to believe that they were the same people with the Hittites. But against this there is the fact that both they and the Hittites appear in the same lists; and that not only in mere general formulas, but in the records of the conquest, as above. Redslob has examined the whole of these names with some care (in his Attestam. Namen den Israeliten-Staaten, Hamb. 1846), and his conclusion (p. 103) is that, while the Chavvofh were villages of tribes engaged in the care of cattle, the Perazoth were inhabited by peasants engaged in agriculture, like the Fellahs of the Arabs. This view, however, although acquiesced in by Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1120; Hengstenberg, Beitrdge, p. 186; Keil, on Jos 3:10; and Kalisch, on Genesis 13, appears to be opposed to the Biblical narrative, which everywhere classes them as a distinct branch of the Canaanites (see Reland, Palaest. p. 139; Kurtz, in Rudelloch's Zeitschr. 1845, 3:53; Jour. Sac. Lit. Oct. 1853, p. 166). SEE CANAANITE.

## Perjury[[@Headword:Perjury]]

             is the willful taking of an oath in order to tell or to confirm anything known to be false. This is evidently a very heinous crime, as it is treating the Almighty with irreverence; denying, or at least disregarding his omniscience; profaning his name, and violating truth. By the Mosaic law, perjury was strictly prohibited as a most heinous sin against God; to whom the punishment of it is left, and who in Exo 20:7 expressly promises that he will inflict it, without ordaining the infliction of any punishment by the temporal magistrate; except only in the case of a man falsely charging another with a crime, in which case the false witness was liable to the same punishment which would have been inflicted on the accused party if he had been found guilty; but this not, indeed, as the punishment of perjury against God, but of false testimony. Perjury, therefore (שְׁבֻעִת שֶׁקֶר, “false swearing”), was prohibited by the Hebrews in a religious point of view (Exo 20:7; Lev 19:12; comp. Matthew 7:33; Zec 8:17), but in the law only two sorts of perjury are noticed: 1, false testimony in judicial proceedings; 2, a false assurance, confirmed by an oath, that one has not received or found a piece of property in question (Lev 5:1; Lev 6:2 sq.; Pro 29:24). A sin-offering is provided  for both (comp. Plaut. Rud. 5:3, 21), and in the latter case satisfaction for the injury, with increase (comp. Hebenstreit, De sacrifcio a perjuro ojn- endo, Lips. 1739). Among the ancient Romans, also, the punishment of perjury was left with the gods (Cic. Leg. 2:9), and no official public notice was taken of the perjured man, save by the censor (Gen 7:18; comp. Cic. Off. 3:31; Rein, Rom. Criminalrecht, p. 795 sq.). On the contrary, the Talmud not only notices the subject at greater length, but ordains more severe penalties for perjury: scourging and full reparation when any serious injury has been done (Mishna, Maccoth, 2:3 sq.; Shebuoth, 8:3). It also determines in special cases the value of the sin-offering to be presented (Shebuoth, 4:2; v. 1; comp. further Zenge and Stemler, De jurejur. sec. discipl. Hebr. p. 57 sq.). SEE OATH.

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

             in Christian law is. the crime committed by one who, when affirming anything by oath, makes statements which he knows to be false. This is, from the Biblical standpoint, a double crime, including both falsehood and profanity; and in a social point of view it is one of the gravest offenses against human law. It has always been esteemed a very detestable thing, and those who have been proved guilty of it have been looked upon as the pests of society. In order to make the giving of the false evidence liable to punishment under the civil law, it must have been not only false to the knowledge of the witness but the matter must have been material to the issue raised. If the falsehood occurred as to some trifling or immaterial fact, no crime is committed. Moreover, it is necessary, in proving the crime, that at least two persons should be able to testify to the falsehood of the matter, so that there might be a majority of oaths on the matter — there being then two oaths to one. But this rule is satisfied though both witnesses do not testify to one point. The perjury must also have taken place before some court or tribunal which had power to administer the oath. SEE OATH. Though in some courts affirmations are allowed instead of oaths, yet the punishment for false affirmation is made precisely the same as for false swearing. The punishment for perjury was, before the Conquest, sometimes death or cutting out the tongue; but latterly it was confined to fine and imprisonment, and at present the latter is the only punishment, with the addition of hard labor. The crime of subornation of perjury, i.e. the persuading or procuring a person to give false evidence, is also punishable as a distinct offense.

## Perkins, Aaron, D.D[[@Headword:Perkins, Aaron, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Bridgewater, Massachusetts, May 5, 1792. He was converted in 1811, and ordained June 8, 1813, pastor at  Lattentown, N.Y., where he remained twelve years. Twice he was pastor of churches in the city of New York. He died in October, 1881, at Red Bank, N.J. He was remarkably successful in his ministerial labors. See The Christian at Work, October 20, 1881. (J.C.S.)

## Perkins, Col. Thomas Handasyd[[@Headword:Perkins, Col. Thomas Handasyd]]

             an American merchant, noted for his philanthropic labors, was born in Boston Dec. 15, 1764. He began his commercial life in partnership with his elder brother James, who was a resident of St. Domingo when the insurrection of the blacks occurred, and was compelled to flee for his life. In 1789 he went as supercargo to Batavia and Canton, and obtained a thorough acquaintance with the Oriental trade. The brothers afterwards embarked in the trade to the north-west coast, Canton, and Calcutta, in which they acquired great wealth. Soon after the death of James, in 1822, Colossians Perkins retired from active business. The Perkins family gave over $60,000 to the Boston Athenaeum. He took a prominent part in the  erection of the Bunker-hill Monument, and gave his estate in Pearl Street, valued at $40,000, for the use of the Asylum for the Blind. He was also in 1827 the projector of the Quincy Railway, the first in the United States. Subsequently he was much interested in urging forward the completion of the Washington Monument; and was also the largest contributor to the Mercantile Library Association. For many years he represented Boston in both branches of the state legislature. See Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biog. s.v. Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Perkins, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Perkins, Henry, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Vergennes, Vermont, February 9, 1796. He graduated from Union College in 1817, and spent two years thereafter at Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1820 he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Allentown, N.J., where he labored faithfully for forty-three years. He retired from active service, and died at Allentown, June 30, 1880. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol Sem. 1880, page 25.

## Perkins, Justin[[@Headword:Perkins, Justin]]

             D.D., a celebrated American missionary, labored among the Nestorians of Persia, and has not unaptly been called the “Apostle of Persia.” He was born at West Springfield, Mass., March 12, 1805. He passed his youth on ‘his father's farm, and when ready for higher studies went to Amherst College, where he graduated in 1829. He studied theology at Andover, and after graduation there became a tutor at Amherst. In the year 1827 that erratic adventurer, Dr. Joseph Wolf, made a flying visit to the Nestorians while traveling in Persia. His mention of them met the eye of Dr. Anderson, secretary of the American Board, and he conceived the idea of sending a mission to that extraordinary people. Justin Perkins and wife were selected as the proper persons for this field, and they set out from Boston Sept. 21, 1833. Reaching Constantinople Dec. 21, without the knowledge of a word of the language, they were welcomed by Messrs. Goodell, Dwight. and Schauffler, but recently established there. In the spring of the following year, Perkins and his wife proceeded towards their final destination. They reached the city of Tabruz Aug. 23, 1834. There Mrs. Perkins stopped, while Mr. Perkins went on farther to Urumiah, where the mission was at once established, with the assistance of Mrs. Perkins, and Dr. and Mrs. Grant, who joined them in the fall of 1835. Then followed the great labors of his life; schools for boys and schools for girls were established which have grown into noble seminaries of learning. Besides those that may be called higher seminaries, some seventy primary schools have been established, 3000 Scripture readers have, been educated in them, and an army trained up to preach the Gospel to their countrymen. Perkins's greatest work, however, was his translation of the Scriptures into the Nestorian dialect of the Syrian. In 1841 the doctor came home to visit his friends, and to stir up an interest in this missionary enterprise. He was accompanied by Mar Yohannan, the Nestorian bishop, and the two awakened a thrilling enthusiasm wherever they went. Dr. Perkins took back with him the sainted Stoddard (q.v.), and other missionaries, and from that time faithfully and most successfully prosecuted his work, until the fall of 1869, when he came home exhausted, and on the last day of the year he yielded up his spirit into the hands of his Lord, who doubtless said to him, “Well done, good and faithful servant.” Dr. Perkins published in this country, Residence of Eight Years in Persia (Andover, 1843, 8vo), reviewed in Christian Examiner, 34:100; Christian Review, 8:138: — Missionary Life in Persia (Boston, 1861). He was also a contributor to the  Bibliotheca Sacra, and to the Journal of the “American Oriental Society.” See Anderson, Oriental Missions; The Observer, N. Y. Jan. 13, 1870; Drake, Dict. Amer. Biog. s.v.

## Perkins, Nathan[[@Headword:Perkins, Nathan]]

             (1), D.D., a Congregational minister, was born May 12, 1748, in Lisbon, Conn. He graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1770, and was ordained pastor at West Hartford Oct. 14, 1772, where he labored until his death, Jan. 18, 1838. He published Four Letters, showing the History and Origin of the Anabaptists (1793): — Tweny-four Discourses on some of the Important and Interesting Truths, Duties, and Institutions of the Gospel, and the generatl Excellency of the Christian Religion; calcrlnated for the People of God of every Communion, particularly for the Benefit of Pious Families, and the Instruction of all in the Things which concern their Salvation (1795, 8vo); and several occasional sermons. See Sprague, Annals, 2:1.

## Perkins, Nathan (2)[[@Headword:Perkins, Nathan (2)]]

             (2), son of the preceding, was born in 1772, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1795. He was then minister of the Second Congregational Church, Amherst, from 1810 to his death, March, 1842.

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

             a minister of the Free-will Baptist denomination, was born in Haverhill, Mass., Feb. 22, 1783. His family removed to New Hampton, N. H., when he was thirteen years of age, and there he ever afterwards lived. At seventeen he was converted, and united with the first Free-will Baptist Church in New Hampton, then but recently organized. By the advice both of lay brethren and the ministry, he held public meetings in 1808, and, after repeated urgings, consented to receive license. He was set apart to the work of the ministry, by the imposition of hands, in February, 1816, and immediately devoted himself to preaching the Word, and building up the churches of his denomination, which was then new; and the Macedonian cry, which he so often heard at that day, incited him to the utmost activity and faithfulness in the cause of the Master. He preached, baptized, attended funerals, and performed other pastoral duties in some twenty towns in the vicinity of New Hampton. His own words are, “I have preached nearly every Sabbath for more than fifty years, and have traveled  thousands of miles on business to which I had been appointed by the quarterly and yearly meetings; yet I never had a salary, neither have I received half-day wages, besides the use of my horse and carriage. And yet the Lord has blessed me abundantly, both temporally and spiritually, so that I do not regret any sacrifice I have made for the cause.” Though he depended largely upon his own resources for the support of himself and family, he was ever ready to help the various causes of benevolence. He attended nearly all the quarterly and annual sessions of the Free-will Baptists in New Hampshire for sixty-five years. He was six times chosen a member of the American Free-will Baptist General Conference, and for twelve years was one of the corporators of the Printing Establishment. Nor did he serve the Church alone. He always had more or less probate business on his hands, defending the rights of the widow and orphan. He also represented his town in the legislature of his state eleven consecutive years. Honest in business, far-seeing in judgment, kind and judicious in counsel, he was consulted with confidence, and his opinion was received as just and safe. It is difficult to describe his sermons, for their completeness allowed of no peculiar characteristics. They were studied, but not written — logical, compact, and vigorous. He may have been called a doctrinal preacher, though he gave no undue prominence to any dogma, and was practical as well. When he rose to speak, his portly form, large head, and open countenance were imposing, and the hearer felt himself in the presence of a man before a word was spoken. If such was his life, what need be said of his death? It was what might have been expected-peaceful, resigned, trustfully waiting the will of the Lord. January 18, 1876, the summons came, and the venerable man, the faithful servant of God, was taken to his rest. See Free-will Baptist Quar. v. 120 sq. (W. H. W.)

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

             (1), an eminent divine of the Church of England, noted as one of the best exponents of Calvinism, was born at Warton, in Warwickshire England, in 1558. He was educated in Christ College, Cambridge. In his early life he gave proofs of great genius and philosophic research, but in his habits was exceedingly wild and profligate. After his conversion he was distinguished for his tender sympathy and skill in opening the human heart, so that he became the instrument of salvation to many. At the age of twenty-four he was chosen fellow of Christ College, and obtained high reputation as a tutor. He finally entered into holy orders, and began his ministry by preaching to the prisoners in Cambtridge Jail, where in all his efforts he displayed a mind admirably adapted to his station. So far was he from considering his field of effort circumscribed that he improved every opportunity to do good. On one occasion, perceiving a young man who was about to ascend the ladder to be executed exceedingly distressed, he endeavored to console him, but to no effect. He then said, “Man, what is the matter with thee? art thou afraid of death?” “Ah! no,” said the malefactor; “but of a worse thing.” “Then come down,” said Mr. Perkins, “and thou shalt see what the grace of God can do to strengthen thee.” Mr. Perkins then took him by the hand, and, kneeling down with him at the foot of the ladder, so fervently acknowledged sin, its aggravations, and its terrible desert, that the poor culprit burst into tears of contrition. He then proceeded to set forth the Lord Jesus Christ as the Savior of every believing penitent, which he was enabled to do with such success that the poor creature continued indeed to shed tears; but they were now tears of love, gratitude, and joy, flowing from a persuasion that his sins were canceled by the Savior's blood. He afterwards ascended the ladder with composure, while the spectators lifted up their hands and praised God for such a glorious display of his sovereign grace. About 1585 Perkins was chosen rector of St. Andrew's parish, in Cambridge, and in this position he  remained until his death in 1602. As a preacher Perkins was very greatly admired.

While his discourses were suited to the capacity of the common people, the pious scholar could not but appreciate them. They were said to be “all law and all gospel,” so well did he unite the characters of a Boanerges and a Barnabas. He was an able casuist, and was resorted to by afflicted consciences far and near. Bishop Hall says of Perkins that “he excelled in distinct judgment, a rare dexterity in clearing the obscure subtleties of the schools, and an easy explication of perplexed subjects.” “The science of morals, according to Mosheim, or rather of casuistry, which Calvin had left in a rude and imperfect state, is confessed to have been first reduced into some kind of form, and explained with some accuracy and precision, by Perkins” (Hallam, Lit. Hist. of Europe, 1:161; see also 2:508). He was the author of Expositions of the Creed; of the Lord's Prayer; of chap. 1-5, (completed by Rodolfe Cudworthe) of the Epistle to the Galatians; of St. Matthew 5-7; of Romans 1-3 : — Commentary on Hebrews and Cases of Conscience; and many doctrinal. practical, and controversial treatises. Several of his works were translated into Latin, French, Dutch, and Spanish; and their popularity at home is evinced by the number of collective editions of them, each in 3 vols. fol., issued shortly after his death, between 1605 and 1635. We notice, Works newly corrected according to his own Copies (Lond. 3 vols. fol.: 1:1616; 2:1617; 3:1618). The last dates which we find are 1626, 1631, and 1635. Opera, Latin (Geneva, 1611). It is not a little remarkable that, in this day of the exhumation of so much buried theology, Perkins's works have not been republished. Yet few writers have been more commended. “The works of Perkins,” says Orme, “are distinguished for their piety, learning, extensive knowledge of the Scriptures, and strong Calvinistic argumentation... . They were highly esteemed by Job Orton, though he was far from being a thorough Calvinist himself” (Bibl. Bib. s.v.). Orton says of him: “Perkins's works are judicious, clear, full of matter and a deep Christian experience. I could wish ministers, especially young ones, would read him, as they would find large materials for composition.” “For his time,” says Dr. E. Williams, “his style is remarkably pure and neat: he had a clear head, and excelled in defining and analyzing subjects. His method is highly Calvinistic; but he carried the idea of reprobation too far... His commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians is equally sound as Luther's, but more methodical and comprehensive.” “His works,” says Bickersteth, “have been too much undervalued; they are learned, spiritual, Calvinistic,  and practical; . . . holy and evangelical” (Christian Student, ed. 1844, p. 414, 444).

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

             (2), a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Goochland County, Va., Aug. 2, 1800, and, in his own words, was “born again” Aug. 30, 1825. He was licensed to preach in 1828, serving the Church in a local relation with great acceptability for twenty-five years. He was ordained deacon, March 3, 1833, at Petersburg, Va., by bishop Hedding; ordained elder, Oct. 6, 1839, at Fayette, Mo., by bishop Morris. At the session of 1853 he entered the itinerancy as a member of the Missouri Conference, and continued in this connection until he ceased at once to work and live, Jan. 31, 1871. He filled various appointments on districts, stations, and circuits until the fall of 1870, when he was superannuated. “Brother Perkins, as a preacher, was too well known to require panegyric. He was able and faithful — a man of culture and extensive research, which, however, he never obtruded in his pulpit ministrations. There he was the simple, earnest ‘messenger of God,' whose trumpet gave no uncertain sound. He was a gifted and useful minister of the New Testament, delighting and glorying in the cross of Christ. All the time during his last illness he was in a very happy frame of mind, exhorting all his friends to increased faithfulness in the service of God” (Minutes of the Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, South, 1871, p. 606, 607).

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

             a Jewish savant, was born about 1773. He holds a prominent position in Jewish history and literature as propagator of the modern school system among the Jews in Austro-Galicia. He gave time and money for the foundation of a higher school for the Jews at Tarnopol, which afterwards became famous, and of which he was the president until his death, Oct. 1, 1839. He not only aimed at a correction of the educational and school system, but also fought against the Chasidaic obscurantism, which tried to suppress every new movement that aimed at the amelioration of the condition of the Jews. For this purpose he wrote, מגלה טמירין, 151 epistles written after the fashion of the Epistolae obscurorum virorum (Vienna, 1819): — דברי צהיקַים, against the Chasidimn and their rabbins (ibid. 1830): — בוחן צדיק, a kind of criticism of his Epistolae, also against the Chasidim (ibid. 1838). See Ftirst, Bibl. Jud. 3:78; Gratz,  Geschichte der Juden, 11:487 sq.; Jost, Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten, 3:185, 343; Mannheimer, Leichenrede (Vienna, 1840); Rappaport, in Kerem Chemed, 4:45-57; 5:163 sq.; Busch, Jahrbuch, 1846, 1847; Zunz, Monatstage (Engl. transi. by Rev. B. Pick, in Jewish Messenger, New York, 1874). (B. P.)

## Perla, Francesco[[@Headword:Perla, Francesco]]

             a painter of Mantua, supposed by Volta to have studied under Giulio Romano. There were two fine frescos in the dome of the chapel of S. Lorenzo in that city attributed to him. Little besides is known of this artist. He flourished about the middle of the 16th century.

## Permaneder, Michael, D.D.[[@Headword:Permaneder, Michael, D.D.]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Munich in the year 1794. In 1818 he was ordained to holy orders. In the following year he was appointed teacher at the pro-gymnasium; in 1822, professor at the gymnasium. In 1834 he was appointed to fill the chair of canon law and Church history at the lyceum in Freising, which position he held until the year 1847, when he was called to Munich for the same work. He suddenly died at Regensburg, Oct. 10, 1862. Of his writings we mention, Handbuch des gemeingiiltigen katholischen Kirchenrechts (3d ed. Landshut, 1856; 4th ed. 1865): — Bibliotheca patristica, 2 vols.; vol. 1 contains a Patrologia generalis, and the second, which is unfinished, the beginning of a Patrologia specialis. See Literarischer Handweiser fur daq katholische Deutschland, 1862, p. 235, 282; 1865, p. 77. (B. P.)

## Permian Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Permian Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Permian is a sister dialect of the Syrjenian and Wotjak, and the three peoples who live in the north-east of European, Russia, in the Perm, Wjatka, and Archangel governments, belong to a common race. Mr. Schiefner estimates the number of the Permians at 50,000, the Syrjenians 70,000, and the Wotjaks 200,000. From the annual report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1880, we learn that the gospel of Matthew, prepared for prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte by P. A. Popou, has been revised and translated into the Russ character by the academician Wiedemann, and published by the above society. From the report for 1882 we learn that the Holy Synod have sanctioned the publication of the gospel of Matthew, long delayed by the celsorial authorities, and that the portion will now be circulated throughout the government of Perm, among the population of about 50,000 souls. (B.P.)

## Pernoctalians[[@Headword:Pernoctalians]]

             (watching all night) is a term that represents what was long a custom with the more pious Christians, especially before the greater festivals. SEE VIGIL.

## Perola, Juan And Francisco[[@Headword:Perola, Juan And Francisco]]

             two brothers, Spanish painters, sculptors, and architects, were natives of Almagro, and flourished about 1600. They visited Italy, studied under Michael Angelo, and finished their artistic education in Spain under Gasparo Becerra. After leaving that master they gained considerable distinction, and were commissioned by the marquis de Santa Cluz to erect his palace at Vico. Of their works in sculpture, the Biographie Universelle  mentions the busts decorating the above-mentioned palace, and the mausoleum of the marquis of Santa Cruz in the church of the Franciscans at Vico. They also painted the grand altar-piece in the same church, and, in concert with Mohedano, they painted several frescos in the sanctuary of Cordova and the convent of Seville.

There was an architect named ESTEBAN PEROLA, a native of Almagro, and contemporary with the preceding. He designed and probably erected the convent of S. Francisco at Seville, commenced in 1623.

## Peroni, Giuseppe[[@Headword:Peroni, Giuseppe]]

             an Italian painter, born at Parma about 1700. According to the Abate Affo, he first studied under Felice Torelli at Bologna; next with Donati Creti; and afterwards went to Rome, where he became the pupil of Agostino Masucci. According to Lanzi, he designed much in the style of Carlo Maratti, but his coloring partakes largely of the verds and other false coloring of Conca and Giaquinto, who were then very popular at Rome. Such are his pictures of St. Philip, in the church of S. Satiro at Milan, and the Conception, in the possession of the Padri dell' Oratorio at Turin. Lanzi says, also, that his best works are his frescos in the church of S. Antonio Abate at Parma, which rank him among the good painters of his age. There he also painted an altar-piece of the Crucifixion, in competition with Pompeo Battoni. He executed several other works for the churches of his native city; adorned its academy, and wrought much for the collections. He died at Parma in 1776, at an advanced age. Lanzi calls him the Abate Giuseppe Peroni, a title probably conferring some favor upon him.

## Perotti, Nicolas[[@Headword:Perotti, Nicolas]]

             an Italian prelate and philologist, was born at Sassoferrato, in Umbria, in 1430. He became professor in the University of Bologna, where he was educated. His translation of the first five books of Polybius, the only ones then known, recommended him to the protection of pope Nicolas V. Shortly after he went to Rome, and was appointed apostolic vicar. In 1458 he obtained the archbishopric of Siponto or Manfredonia; but he continued to reside at Rome. The duties of governor of Umbria, to which he was appointed in 1465, and those of governor of Perugia in 1474, did not cause him to neglect literary labors. He died Dec. 13, 1480. Perotti was one of the contributors to the Renaissance. His principal works, very useful in the 15th century and now quite curious, are a Latin Grammar, Rudimenta  Grammatices (Rome, 1473, fol.), and a commentary upon Martial, which forms a kind of argumentative Lexicon of the Latin language, Cornucopia, sive Commentaria linguae Latinae (Venice, 1489, 1499, 1513, 1526, fol.). We have also a treatise from Perotti, De Generibus Metrorum (ibid. 1497, 4to), and an edition of the Historia Nafturalis of Pliny. The works of Perotti are counted among the most ancient monuments of printing. Some fables from Phedra were published after one of his manuscripts, and critics have even regarded him as the author of the whole collection which bears the name of this poet; but it is a hypothesis without probability, and favored by none of the mediocre Latin verses which remain of Perotti. See Paul Jove, Elogia; Niceron, Memoires, vol. 9; Bayle, Dictionaire; Tiraboschi, Storia de la Letteratura Italiana, 6:11, 408; Apostolo Zeno, Dissertaz. Tossiane, vol. i; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39, 623.

## Peroxino, Giovanni[[@Headword:Peroxino, Giovanni]]

             a Piedmontese painter who flourished about 1517. According to DellaValle, he was a good artist; and Lanzi says “he was well known for the pictures he left in the church of the Conventuals at Alba.”

## Perpendicular[[@Headword:Perpendicular]]

             STYLE, the name given to the style of Gothic architecture in England which succeeded the Decorated style. It prevailed from about the end of the 14th century to the middle of the 16th century, and was thus contemporary with the Flamboyant style in France. These styles have much in common, but they derive their names from the features peculiar to each. Thus the Flamboyant is distinguished by the flowing lines of its tracery; while the Perpendicular is remarkable for its stiff and rectilinear lines. The lines of the window-tracery are chiefly vertical, and the mullions are frequently crossed by horizontal bars. The moldings are usually thin and hard. The same feeling pervades the other features of the style; the buttresses, piers, towers, etc., are all drawn up and attenuated, and present in their shallow recesses and meager lines a great contrast to the deep shadows and bold moldings of the earlier styles. The art of masonry was well understood during the Perpendicular period, and the vaulting was admirably built. Fan- tracery vaulting is peculiar to this style, and is almost invariably covered with paneling, which was also much used, the walls being frequently almost entirely covered with it. The depressed or four-center arch is another of its  peculiar features. This arch, over doorways, has the moldings generally arranged in a square form over the arch, with spandrels containing shields, quatrefoils, etc. The arches are often two-centered, but as frequently four- centered; at the commencement of the style, of good elevation, but subsequently much flattened; in small openings ogee arches are very often used, and a few rare examples of elliptical arches are to be found. The Roofs of this style are often made ornamental, and have the whole of the framing exposed to view. Many of them are of very high pitch, and have a magnificent effect, the spaces between the timbers being filled with tracery, and the beams arched, molded, and ornamented in various ways; and sometimes pendants, figures of angels, and other carvings ale introduced. These roofs are among the peculiar and beautiful features of the architecture of England. The largest roof of this kind is that of Westminster Hall, erected in the reign of Richard II.

The Perpendicular style may be said to have been introduced about the middle of the 14th century in some parts of England, as at Gloucester and Windsor; but the Decorated and Perpendicular styles overlapped each other for a long period, some districts retaining the older style much longer than others. The following are some of the chief dated examples:

York Cathedral-Choir, 1372-1403. Warwick, St. Mary's-Choir, 1370-1391. Lynn, Norfolk-Chapel of St. Nicholas, 1371-1379. Selby Abbey, Yorkshire, 1375. Winchester Cathedral-West front, 1360-1366. Canterbury Cathedral-Nave and western transepts, 1378-1411. Oxford-New College, 1380-1386. Howden, Yorkshire-Chapter-house and tower, 1389 1407. Saltwood Castle, Kent-Gate-house, 1381-1396. Gloucester Cathedral-Cloi.ters, 1381-1412. Winchester College, 1387-1393. Winchester Cathedral — Nave, 1394-1410. Westminister Hall-Roof, 1397-1399. Maidstone-College and Church, 1395.

In the 15th century the Perpendicular is the general style of England for churches, houses, castles, barns, cottages, and buildings of every kind. The universities of Oxford and Cambridge owe many of their colleges to this  period, and there we find vestiges of the style still lingering when in other places it had been lost.

## Perpent-Stone[[@Headword:Perpent-Stone]]

             (Fr. Perpeigne), an architectural term, designates a large stone reaching through a wall so as to appear on both sides of it; the same as what is now usually called a bonder, bond-stone, or through, except that these are often used in rough-walling, while the term perpent-stone appears to have been applied to squared stones, or ashlar; bonders also do not always reach through a wail. The term is still used in some districts; in Gloucestershire, ashlar thick enough to reach entirely through a wall, and show a fair face on both sides, is called Parping ashlar. This name may perhaps also have been sometimes given to a corbel. The term Perpent-wall would signify a wall built of perpent ashlar. Also a pier, buttress, or other support projecting from a wall to sustain a beam, roof, etc. In Lincoln Cathedral the dwarf walls separating the chapels in the transepts are also called perpeyn-walls, although actually they do not sustain a roof.

## Perpetua[[@Headword:Perpetua]]

             ST., a Christian martyr who suffered at Carthage, under the persecution of Severus, at the beginning of the 3d century. She was a lady of high rank, and at the time when she was accused about twenty-two years of age. In her martyrdom she afforded an illustrious example of Christian fortitude. She was married, and had an infant son; she was the favorite child of a pagan father, who importuned her to turn from the Christian faith, and to whom her constancy appeared but absurd obstinacy; every entreaty, every threat was employed; she encountered the terrors of a crowded court, in which certain conviction awaited her; she was scourged and imprisoned; the tenderest feelings of filial and maternal love were appealed to; but in vain. “God's will must be done,” was her language, and she remained immovable. Nor was she less firm in the final scene, when in a crowded amphitheater, together with Felicitas, she was thrown to a mad or wild cow. By this attack she was stunned; but the fatal stroke was left, in the spoliarium — a place where the wounded were dispatched — to an unskillful gladiator, whose trembling hand she herself, with a martyr's courage, guided to her throat. Felicitas suffered with her. (One scene from her life represented in modern art is her farewell to her infant child. There  are, however, many incidents in her story which would be most interesting subjects for the artist, that as yet remain without representation. In her pictures a cow stands by her side or near her. She is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church March 7. See Butler, Lives of the Saints; Hagenbach, Kirchengesch. der ersten drei Johrhunderte, ch. 12; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 1:139; Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 23; Bohringer, Kirchengesch. 1:43; Ruinart, in the Act. Martyr. and the Act. SS. of the Bollandists; Schaff, Church Hist. vol. 1; Jortin, Remarks, 1:352.

## Perpetual Curate[[@Headword:Perpetual Curate]]

             a title of the incumbent of a church, chapel, or district, which is within the boundaries of a rectory or vicarage.

## Perpetual Cure[[@Headword:Perpetual Cure]]

             a form of ecclesiastical benefice which grew out of the abuse of lay impropriation (q.v.), the impropriator appointing a clergyman to discharge the spiritual functions of which he himself was not capable. The substituted clergyman, in ordinary cases, is appointed by the bishop, and called a vicar; the impropriator appoints the clergyman who is called a perpetual curate. The perpetual curate enters on his office without induction or institution, and requires only the bishop's license. Perpetual cures are also created by the erection and endowment of a chapel subject to the -principal church of a parish. Such cures, however, are not benefices unless endowed out of the fund called Queen Anne's Bounty. Churches so endowed are, by 2 and 3 Vict. c. 49, recognized as benefices. The district churches which have been erected under several recent acts are made perpetual cures, and their incumbents are corporations.

## Perpetual Virginity Of Mary[[@Headword:Perpetual Virginity Of Mary]]

             the mother of Christ is a doctrine held by some branches of the Christian Church. As the being who was conceived in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary was of divine origin, and as her virginity had been maintained for the purpose of that miraculous conception, it is thought to be unreasonable and irreverent to imagine that children conceived in sin were afterwards tenants of that sacred tabernacle. The Church fathers were the first to affirm that the mother of Jesus the Christ was not only a virgin at the time he was born but ever afterwards, and this belief was not called in question in the first ages. A denial of the virginity of the Blessed Virgin  Mary at the time of her conception had indeed been made by the Corinthians and Ebionites, who, in the 1James , 2 d centuries, asserted that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary by natural generation; but no doubt of her perpetual virginity was expressed by any who believed that Christ was born of a virgin (Isa 7:14; Luk 1:27) until the 4th century. It was then, after Apollinaris had denied the Blessed Virgin to be the real mother of the Word Incarnate, that some were led on to the denial of her perpetual virginity. These were called Antidicomarians, and their heresy gave rise to another, that of the Collyridians, who made the Blessed Virgin the object of an idolatrous worship, consisting in the offering of little cakes (collyrides), which were afterwards eaten as sacrificial food. -Epiphanius. in his treatise against heresies, severely condemned these two extremes. He denounced those who denied Christ's mother to be ever virgin, as adversaries of Mary, who deprived her of “honor due;” while he insisted that, according to the essential principles of Christianity, worship was due to the Trinity alone. Jerome wrote a tract against Helvidius, who maintained the view of the Antidicomarians; and this tract contains the most of the arguments that have been brought by bishop Pearson and other divines in support of the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin. Helvidius denied it on the ground of the words of the evangelist Matthew, that Joseph “knew her not till she had brought forth her first-born son” (Mat 1:25); as if it implied that he knew her afterwards, and that a first-born son inferred a second-born. Jerome answered the first objection by citing other instances in which no such inference can be drawn from similar language (Gen 27:15; Deu 25:6; 1Sa 15:35; 2Sa 6:23; Mat 28:20).

But none of these passages are in point, Bengel, who treats the matter as an open question, says, “ἕως ου, non sequitur ergo post.” The word “first-born,” on which the Antidicomarians laid so much stress, does not occur in the Vatican MS., but, if its genuineness be admitted, the difficulty has been met by the supposition that Christ is called the first-born, not with reference to any that succeeded, but for the following reasons: 1. Because there were special rites attending the birth of a first-born son. These were not delayed until a second was born, but performed at once. The law was, “Sanctify unto me all the first-born: whatsoever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast, it is mine” (Exo 13:2). Joseph and Mary, in obedience to this law, brought our Savior to Jerusalem “to present him to the Lord; as it is written in the law of the Lord: Every male that openeth the womb shall be called holy to the Lord”  (Luk 2:22-23). “First-born” is therefore equivalent to “one that openeth the womb.” Bishop Pearson says, “the Scripture notion of priority excludeth an antecedent, but inferreth not a consequent; it suffereth none to have gone before, but concludeth not anv to follow after” (Creed, 1:214. See also Hooker, Ecl. Pol. bk. 5, ch. 45, sec. 2; Jerome, contra Helvid. 2:7; Augustine, Haer. 84, 8. 24; Whitby and BishopWordsworth, ad loc.). 2. The First-born was one of the titles of Jesus. In its classical sense, πρωτοτόκος (thus accentuated) never means the first-born, but has an active signification in relation to the mother who for the first time bears a child ( Iliad, 17:5); but in Holy Scripture it is used in the Sept., with a different accentuation, πρωτότοκος, to signify (a) sometimes the first- born, (b) sometimes the privileges which belong to the elder son, and also (c) as a title of the Messiah. (a) In the first sense it is used in Gen 27:19; Gen 48:18; Exo 12:29; Num 18:15, etc. (b) There are other passages in which it is used metaphorically to express peculiar honor and dignity: “Israel is my son, even my first-born” (Exo 4:22); “Ephraim is my first-born” (Jer 31:9). This is also a Hebrew use which has been rendered by the translator of the A.V. “first-born” in Isa 14:30, where “the first-born of the poor” means very poor; and Job 18:13, where “the first-born of death” means the most terrible form of death. (c) It is used as a title of the Savior, without reference to priority of birth, in Psa 89:27. In the New Testament our Lord is called πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, “the first-born among many brethren” (Rom 8:29), πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, “the first- born of every creature,” signifying the dominion which he has received who is made Head over all things. Πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (Col 1:18; Rev 1:5) means not simply the first who was raised, for that Christ was not, but he who hath power over death, and whose resurrection is an earnest of that of all his people: Hence it is argued that the word πρωτότοκος, in Matthew's Gospel, may be nothing more than a synonym of Christ. He was the “first-born” because he was the Second Adam, the Perfect Man, the Restorer and Redeemer of his brethren, the Lord of the Church, and the Heir of all things. The metaphor was borrowed from the dominion which the first-born exercised over his brethren, but when the word is compared with other passages in which it occurs it avails nothing for Helvidius's argument against the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin Mary. But this philological argument is evidently inconclusive as applied to the passage in question, where the ord  “first-born” is not used thus generally, nor as a title, but is explicitly limited to the fact of parturition. SEE FIRSTBORN.

Another argument of the Antidicomarians was drawn from the mention made of the brethren of our Lord (Mat 12:46; Joh 7:5), from which they inferred that these brethren were the children of our Lord's mother by her marriage with Joseph; but

(1) these brethren may have been the children of Joseph by a former wife. There is an old tradition preserved by Epiphanius and followed by Hilary, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Cyril, Euthymius, Theophylact, OEcumenius, and Nicephorus that Joseph had four sons and two daughters by a former wife named Escha. (See Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. 2:1; Pearson, On the Creed, 2:140). Jerome was the first to confute this opinion, alleging that it rested only on a statement contained in an apocryphal writing.

(2) It was held by Jerome, Augustine, and generally by the later commentators, that the brethren are not strictly the brethren but the cousins o our Lord, in which sense the term is frequently used in Holy Scripture (Gen 13:8; Gen 29:12; Lev 10:4). Helvidius argued that there was proof from Scripture of James and John being notioxly the brethren of our Lord, but the sons of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Among the women at the cross were Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Jamies and Moses. The sister Mary; he thought, was none other than the mother of our Lord, because she was found early at the sepulcher with Mary Magdalene and Salome, and it was improbable that any one should have greater care for the body of her son than his mother. The answer to this is clearly shown by bishop Pearson: “We read in St. Joh 19:25, that ‘there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene.' In the rest of the evangelists we find at the same place ‘Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of James and Joses,' and again at the sepulcher, ‘Mary Magdalene and the other Mary;' wherefore that other Mary, by the conjunction of these testimonies, appeareth to be Mary the wife of Cleophas and the mother of James and Joses; and consequently James and Joses, the brethren of our Lord, were not the sons of Mary his mother, but of the other Mary, and therefore called his brethren, according to the language of the Jews, because that the other Mary was the sister of his mother” (Pearson, On the Creed, 1:217). A fragment of Papias, respecting the relationship of Christ's brethren, has  been printed by Dr. Routh (Relig. Sacr. 1:16), in which he distinguishes four Marys, as follows:

(1.) Mary the mother of Jesus;

(2.) Mary the wife of Cleophas or Alphaeus, who was the mother of James the bishop and apostle, and of Simon and Thaddaeus, and a certain Joseph;

(3.) Mary Salome, the wife of Zebedee, the mother of John the Evangelist and James (Mat 27:56; Mar 15:40; Mar 16:1);

(4.) Mary Magdalene. These four are found in the Gospels. James and Judas and Joseph were the sons of the maternal aunt of Jesus. Mary the mother of James the Less and Joseph, wife of Alphueus, was sister of Mary the Lord's mother, whom John calls “of Cleophas” (ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, Joh 19:25), either from her father or her family, or from some other cause. Mary is called Salome either from her husband or her residence. Her, too, some call “of Cleophas,” because she had had two husbands. SEE BRETHREN OF OUR LORD.

In the Greek Church the Blessed Virgin has always been called ἀεὶ πάρθενος. This term was used by St. Athanasius. She was so called at the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451), and in the Confession of Faith published by Justin II in the 6th century. If the gate of the sanctuary in the prophet Ezekiel be understood of the Blessed Virgin — “This gate shall be shut, it shall not be opened, and no man shall enter in by it; because the Lord God of Israel hath entered by it, therefore it shall be shut” (Eze 44:2) — the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin will appear necessary to that honor which belongs to her Divine Son, as well as to that which, for his sake, the Church has always accorded to her. But the inconclusiveness of this argument is obvious. SEE MARIOLATRY; SEE MARY.

## Perpignan, Council Of[[@Headword:Perpignan, Council Of]]

             was convened Nov. 1, 1408, by pope Benedict XIII in the city of Perpignan, in the Eastern Pyrenees, and then belonging to the kingdom of Navarre, whither this rival pope had been obliged to retire from Avignon after the withdrawal of French support. This council was intended to anticipate the action of the council to meet shortly after at Pisa (in 1409). in order to terminate the long-continued schism of the Church. The Council of Perpignan was attended only by a few French and Spanish ecclesiastics, and they quitted the council when they found Benedict stubbornly refusing  to resign the pontifical honors. No action was taken by the council worthy of notice. SEE BENEDICT XIII (a).

## Perrache, MICHEL[[@Headword:Perrache, MICHEL]]

             a French sculptor, was born at Lyons in 1685. At the age of sixteen he visited Italy for improvement, and also went to Flanders, where he executed a number of sculptures for a church at Malines, and was honored with the freedom of the city. In 1717 he returned to France and settled at Lyons, where he practiced the art for many years, and executed a variety of sculptures for the churches and gardens. He died in 1750.

## Perrault, Nicolas[[@Headword:Perrault, Nicolas]]

             a French theologian, was born in Paris about 1611. Having been received doctor of the Sorbonne in 1652, he was one of the seventy doctors excluded with Arnauid on the charge of Jansenism, Jan. 31, 1656. Perrault died at Paris in 1661. He published only, La Morale des Jesuifes, extraitesfidelemem ae leurs livres imprims ares ec l'approbation et permission des superieurs de leur Compagnie (Mons, 1667, 4to, and 1669, 3 vols. 16mo): — three Lettres to Dr. Hasle against signing the Formulary, printed with the responses of the latter in a collection of pieces upon the Formulary, the bulls and constitutions of the popes. See Moreri, Diet. Hlist. s.v.; Niceron, Mem. vol. 33, S. V;

## Perrenot De Granvelle, Antoine De[[@Headword:Perrenot De Granvelle, Antoine De]]

             a noted French cardinal, was born at Besan- on, Aug. 20, 1517; studied at the universities of Paris, Padua, and Lonvain, and at twenty-three became bishop of Arras. Having exhibited great executive talent at the Council of Trent, he was made counselor of state, and upon the death of his father, Nicolas Perrenot, the prime-minister of Charles V, was himself elevated to that position. He soon acquired much distinction, and became known all over the Continent. After the accession of Philip II, Perrenot continued in the premiership, but at the same time received recognition for his valuable services to the Church by being made in 1560 archbishop of Malines, and in 1561 a cardinal. In 1565 he was called to Rome to assist the conclave in the election of pope Pius V. In 1570 he was instrumental in effecting a treaty against the Turks, which so benefited Naples that he was named viceroy of that territory. In 1584 he was elected archbishop of Besadion, and he thereupon resigned the see of Malines. He died at Madrid Sept. 21,  1586. Cardinal Perrenot was one of the most eminent men of his time. He was marvelously successful in all that he undertook. In the State and in the Church he exhibited the same aptitude and power, and developed his plans to perfection. Besides, he was a good man, and sought not to gratify a selfish ambition, but to labor for his fellows and the religious faith he himself honestly avowed. He was a general favorite among his contemporaries, as is evinced by the many works that were dedicated to him by his many friends and progress. Cardinal Perrenot was too busy to write many books; but his letters, which have been collected in 33 vols., with memoir, are much valued for the light they throw of the history of Charles V and on the beautiful character of the cardinal himself. See Courchetet, Hist. du Card. Perrenot de Granvelle (Par. 1761); Robertson, Hist. of Charles V; Prescott, Hist. of Philippians II; Schiller, Gesch. d. Niederlande, vol. i, pt. ii, ch. i.

## Perreyve, Henri[[@Headword:Perreyve, Henri]]

             a Roman Catholic writer of France, was born at Paris in 1831. At the age of twenty he was made a priest, and in 1861 he was professor of Church history at the Sorbonne. He died in 1865, leaving La Journee des Malades, an ascetical work. Father Gratry, the teacher of Perreyve, wrote Vie de Henri Perreyve (Paris, 1866). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Perrier, Francois[[@Headword:Perrier, Francois]]

             a French painter, was born at Macon, Burgundy, about 1590. His father was a goldsmith, and instructed him in the elements of design, but was unwilling that he should become a painter. Opposed in his wishes, young Perrier left his native place, and, being without means of a livelihood, he became the conductor of a blind mendicant who was traveling to Italy, and in this way succeeded in reaching Rome. On arriving there he was employed by a picture-dealer to copy several paintings, and some of his copies were shown to Lanfranco, who encouraged him to persevere and admitted him to his school. After several years' residence at Rome, Perrier returned to France and passed some time at Lyons, where he painted the Decollation of St. John, a Holy Family, and other works for the cloister of the Carthusians. Not content with a provincial field for the exercise of his abilities, Perrier vent to Paris, and associating himself with Vouet, was employed by him to paint from his design the chapel of the chateau de Chilly. Meeting with little encouragement, he revisited Italy in 1635, and applied himself to engraving the principal antique statues and bassreliefs, also a number of plates after the Italian masters. After the death of Simon Vouet he returned to Paris in 1645, and was commissioned to paint the walls of the Hotel de la Vrilliere (now the Bank of France). His pictures evince great warmth of imagination, but the design is often incorrect, the airs of his heads lack elegance and dignity, and his coloring is the dark. Perrier was a member of the Academy, and died at Paris, according to D'Argenville, in 1650. There are a number of etchings by him, incorrectly  and negligently designed, and executed in a slight, hasty style, usually marked Paria, or with his monogram. Among them are the following: A set of one hundred prints from antique statues, published at Rome; a set of fifty taken from the ancient bass-reliefs; ten plates of the Angels in the Farnesina, after Raffaelle; two plates of the Assembly of the Gods, and the Marriage of Cupid and Psyche, from the paintings by Raffaelle in the Farnesina; the Communion of St. Jerome, after Agos. Caracci; the Flight into Egypt, after Agos. Caracci; the Nativity, after S. Vouet, and the Portrait of Simon Foet. Among subjects from his own designs are, the Holy Family, with St. John playing with a Lamb; the Crucifixion (inscribed Franciscus Perrier, Burgundy, pinx. et scul.); St. Roch curing the People (afflicted with the Plague; the Body of St. Sebastian supported by two Saints. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:677.

## Perrier, Guillaume[[@Headword:Perrier, Guillaume]]

             a painter and engraver, nephew and scholar of the preceding, flourished about the middle of the 17th century, and died in 1655. His works are executed in the style of his uncle. Among his principal pictures are those in the sacristy of the Minims at Lyons, where he had taken refuge, having killed his antagonist in a duel. There are a few etchings by him in the style of Francois Perrier, among which are an emblematic subject, the Portrait of Lazarus Messonier, the Death of the Magdalen, and the holy Family.

## Perrimezzi, Giuseppe-Maria[[@Headword:Perrimezzi, Giuseppe-Maria]]

             a learned Italian prelate, was born Dec. 17, 1670, at Paula, Calabria. He joined the Order of the Minims, and acquired, by his preaching and his writings, a considerable reputation. He became successively provincial of his order and a member of the Holy Office and of the Congregation of the Index. In 1707 he was made bishop of Scala and Ravello, whence he was transferred in 1714 to the diocese of Oppida. He received from pope Benedict XIII, who honored him with particular esteem, the title of archbishop of Bostra in partibus, and then fixed his residence at Rome. He died in that city in 1740. We have thirty works of his, among which the following are worthy of notice: Panegirici (Rome, 1702-3, and Naples, 1722. 4 vols. 12mo): — Vita di S. Francisci de Paula (Rome, 1707, 2 vols. 4to): — T'ita di Niccolo di Longobardi (ibid. 1713, 4to): — Raggionamenti pastorali (Naples, 1713-21, 6 vols. 4to): — Decisioni academiche degl' Infecnundi (ibid. 1719, 2 vols. 12mno): — 1n sacram de  Deo scientiam disserf. selectce (ibid. 17301733, 8 vols. fol.): — Vita del Antonio Torres (ibid. 1733, 4to). See Tipaldoi, Biogr. degli Italiani illustri, vol. viii.

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

             a noted English divine, was born near the opening of the 17th century, and was educated at Cambridge University. He was made prebend of Westminster in 1664, prebend of London in 1667, and archdeacon of Huntingdonl in 1670. He died in 1673. He published, Sermon (Lond. 1666, 4to): — Discourse on Toleration (1667, 4to): — Indulgence not justified, against Dr. John Owen's Peace Offering; and two works of a semi- political character, evincing hatred of the Puritans and decided leaning towards the cause of king Charles I. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. und Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Perrine, Matthew La Rue, D.D[[@Headword:Perrine, Matthew La Rue, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Freehold. Monmouth County, N. J, May 4 1777. He entered the College of New Jersey in 1794, graduated in 1797, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of New Brunswick Sept. 18,1799. In May, 1800, he was appointed a missionary; on June 24 following he was ordained as an evangelist, and on June 15, 1802, he was installed pastor of the Church at what was then called Bottle Hill, but is now Madison, N. J. After some other changes he was finally installed pastor of the Spring Street Church, New York City, Oct. 31, 1811, which situation he filled until July 26, 1820, when the connection was dissolved at his request. In 1821 he was elected professor of ecclesiastical history and Church polity in the theological seminary at Auburn, and filled that station until his death, Feb. 11, 1836, acting also for two years as professor of theology, and frequently preaching in the chapel of the seminary and in the churches of the neighborhood. Dr. Perrine published, Letters concerning the Plan of Salvation (N. Y. 1816): — Sermon before a Female Missionary Society in New York (1817): — and an Abstract of Biblical Geography (Auburn, 1835). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:237 sq.

## Perrine, Matthew La Rue, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Perrine, Matthew La Rue, D.D (2)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Freehold, N.J., May 4, 1777. He graduated from Princeton College in 1797, studied theology under Dr. John Woodhull of Freehold, and was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, September 18, 1799. On the 24th of June, 1800, he was ordained, and for four months acted as a missionary in western New York. On June 15, 1802, he was installed as pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Bottle Hill (now Madison), N.J. In 1809 he made another missionary tour, and on October 31, 1811 was installed as pastor of the Spring Street Church, New York city. Here he continued till the summer of 1820, when, by his own request, the relation was dissolved. In 1821 he was elected to the professorship of ecclesiastical history and Church polity in the Auburn Theological Seminary. He died February 11, 1836. Dr. Perrine had the reputation of being an accurate and thorough scholar. He was of a speculative and metaphysical turn. As a preacher he was always instructive and interesting. He published, Letters Concerning the Plan of Salvation (New York, 1816): — A Sermon Before a French Missionary Society in N.Y. (1817): — An Abstract of Biblical Geography (1835). See Alexander, Princeton College in the 18th Century; Genesis Cat. of Auburn Theol. Sem. 1883, page 193; Aikman, Historical Discourse (1876), page 13.

## Perrine, William Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Perrine, William Henry, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Lyons, N.Y., October 8, 1827, and moved with his parents to Michigan in 1833. He was converted at the age of thirteen; in 1853 graduated at the Spring Arbor College, having entered the ministry in 1851. The following are his successive appointments: South Albion, Jackson; Lafayette Street, Detroit; Adrian, Ann Arbor; superannuated two years; Flint; professor in Albion College four years; presiding elder of Lansing District; professor' again in Albion College; St. Joseph, Albion, Marengo, Parma, Concord. He died in Albion, Michigan, January 22, 1881. Dr. Perrine was a fine pulpit orator, and had great versatility of his talent. He took especial interest in Sunday-schools and Bible studies, having visited Palestine in 1857. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1881, page 312; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Perron, Jacques Davy Du[[@Headword:Perron, Jacques Davy Du]]

             an eminent Roman Catholic prelate, distinguished for his learning and influence, was descended from ancient and noble families on both sides.  His parents, having been educated in the principles of Calvin, retired to Geneva; and settled afterwards in the canton of Berne, where he was born, Nov. 25, 1556. His father, who was a man of learning, instructed him till he was ten years of age, and taught him mathematics and Latin. Young Perron seems afterwards to have built upon this foundation by himself; for, while his parents were tossed about from place to place by civil wars and persecutions, he applied himself entirely to study. He learned Greek and philosophy, beginning the latter study with the logic of Aristotle, thence passing to the orators and poets; and afterwards applied himself to the study of the Hebrew language, which he attained so perfectly that he read without points, and lectured on it to the ministers. In the reign of Henry III, after the Pacification with the Huguenots, his parents returned to France, and shortly after young Du Perron was (in 1576) introduced to the king, as a prodigy of pal is and learning. His controversial talents were very great, so that none dared dispute with him, although he made many challenges to those who would have been glad to attack him. At the breaking up of the states he came to Paris, and mounted the chair in the habit of a cavalier, in the grand hall of the Augustines, where he held public conferences upon the sciences. He set himself afterwards to read the “Sum” of St. Thomas Aquinas, and cultivated a strict friendship with Philip Desportes, abbot of Tiron, who put him into his own place of reader to Henry III.

Perron is said to have lost the favor of this prince in the following manner: One day, while the king was at dinner, he made an admirable discourse against atheists; with which the king was well pleased, and commended him much for having proved the being of a God by arguments so solid. But Perron, whose spirit of policy had not vet got the better of his passion for shining or showing his parts, replied, that “if his majesty would vouchsafe him audience, he would prove the contrary by arguments as solid;” which so offended the king that he forbade him to come into his presence. Perron recovered himself, however, from this fall. The reading of St. Thomas had engaged him in the study of the fathers. and made him particularly acquainted with Augustine's writings, so that he devoted himself wholly to divinity-, and resolved to abjure Protestantismm. Having discovered, or rather pretended to discover, many false quotations and weak reasonings in Du Plessis-Mornay's Treatise upon the Church, he instructed himself thoroughly in controverted points, and made his abjuration. He now labored for the conversion of others, even before embracing any ecclesiastical function, which occurred in 1577. By these arts and his uncommon abilities he acquired great influence, and was  selected to pronounce the funeral oration of Mary queen of Scots in 1587. Some time after he wrote, by order of the king, A Compassion of Moral and Theological Virtues; and two Discourses, one upon the soul, the other upon self-knowledge, which he pronounced before that prince. After the murder of Henry III he retired to the house of cardinal de Bourbon, and labored more vigorously than ever in the conversion of the Reformed. He brought a great number of them back to the Church, among whom was Henry Spondanus, afterwards bishop of Pamiez; as this prelate acknowledges, in his dedication to cardinal Du Perron of his “Abridgment of Baronius's Annals.”

This conversion was followed by several others; and among them he claimed the agency in the conversion of Henry IV, before whom he had held at Nantes a famous dispute with four ministers, which resulted in his appointment to the bishopric of Evreux, that he might be capable of sitting in a conference which the king convened for religious matters. Perron attended with the other prelates at St. Denis, and is supposed to have contributed more than any other person to the conversion of that great prince. After this, Perron was sent with Mr. D'Ossat to Rome, to negotiate Henry's reconciliation to the holy see; which at length he effected, to the satisfaction of the king, but not of his subjects-that part of them at least who were zealous for Gallican liberties, and thought the dignity of their king compromised upon this occasion (see Jervis, 1:203 sq.). Du Perron stayed a whole year at Rome, was there consecrated to his holy office by cardinal De Joyeuse, archbishop of Rouen, Dec. 27, 1595, and then returned to France; where, by such kind of services as have already been mentioned, he advanced himself to the highest dignities. He wrote and preached and disputed against the Reformed; particularly against Du Plessis-Mornay, with whom he had a public conference in 1600, in the presence of the king, at Fontainebleau. (See for an account, Jervis, 1:218 sq.) The king resolved to make him grand almoner of France, to give him the archbishopric of Sens, and wrote to Clement VIII to obtain for him the dignity of a cardinal, which that pope conferred on him, in 1604, with singular marks of esteem. The indisposition of Clement made the king resolve to send the French cardinals to Rome; where Du Perron was no sooner arrived than he was employed by the pope in the congregations. He had a great share in the elections of Leo X and Paul V. He became a most devoted advocate of the ultramontane doctrine and a powerful champion of papal interests. In the many anxious questions which arose Du Perron's decisions always carried great weight. Thus he assisted in the congregations upon the subject of  Grace, and the disputes which were agitated between the Jesuits and the Molinists; and it was principally upon his advice that the pope resolved to determine nothing with respect to these questions.

He was sent a third time to Rome, to accommodate the differences between Paul V and the republic of Venice; but his health not permitting him to stay long, he was recalled to France. After the murder of Henry IV, which happened in 1610, Du Perron devoted himself entirely to the court and see of Rome, and prevented any action in France which might, displease it or hurt its interests. He rendered useless the arrst of the Parliament of Paris against the book of cardinal Bellarmine; and favored the infallibility of the pope, and his superiority over a council, in a thesis maintained in 1611 before the nuncio. He afterwards held a provincial assembly, in which he condemned Richer's book “concerning ecclesiastical and civil authority:” and, being at the assembly of Blois, he made a harangue to prove that they ought not to decide questions of faith. He was one of the presidents of the assembly of the clergy which was held at Roan in 1615; and made harangues to the king at the opening and closing of that assembly, which were much applauded. This was the last shining action of his life; for after this he retired to his house -at Bagnolet, and employed himself wholly in revising and putting the last hand to his works. He set up a printing-house there, that he might have them published correctly; in order to do which he revised every sheet himself. He died at Paris Sept. 5, 1618. Cardinal Du Perron was a man of great abilities; had a lively and penetrating wit, and a special talent for making his views appear reasonable. He delivered himself upon all occasions with great clearness, dignity, and eloquence. He had a prodigious memory, and had studied much. He was very well versed in antiquity, both ecclesiastical and profane; and had read much in the fathers, councils, and ecclesiastical historians, of which he knew how to make the best use against his adversaries. He was very powerful in dispute, so that the ablest ministers were afraid of him; and he always confounded those who had the courage to engage with him. He was warmly attached to the see of Rome, and strenuous in defending its rights and prerogatives; and therefore it cannot be wondered at that his name has never been held in high honor among those of his countrymen who have been accustomed to stand up for Gallican liberties.

The works of Du Perron, the greatest part of which had been printed separately in his lifetime, were collected after his death, and printed at Paris (1620 and 1622) in 3 vols. folio. The first volume contains his great  Treatise upon the Eucharist, against that of Du Plessis-Mornay. The second, his Reply to the Answer of the King of Great Britain, which originated as follows: James I of England sent to Henry IV of France a book, which he had written himself, concerning differences in religion. Henry put it into the hands of Du Perron's brother. who informed his majesty, from what the cardinal had observed to him, that there were many passages in that book in which the king of England seemed to come near the Catholics; and that it might be proper to send some able person, with a view of bringing him entirely over. Henry, taking the advice of his prelates in this affair, caused it to be proposed to the king of England whether or not he would take it in good part to have the cardinal Du Perron sent to him? who returned for answer that he should be well pleased to confer with him, but for reasons of state could not do it. Isaac Casaubon, however, a moderate person among the Reformed, who had had several conferences with Du Perron about religion, and who seemed much inclined to a reunion, was prevailed on to take a voyage into England; where he spoke advantageously of Du Perron to the king, and presented some pieces of poetry to him, which the cardinal had put into his hands.

The king received them kindly, and expressed much esteem for the author; which Casaubon noticing to Du Perron, he returned a letter of civility and thanks to his Britannic majesty; in which he told him that, except the sole title of Catholic, he could find nothing wanting in his majesty that was necessary to make a most perfect and accomplished prince.” The king replied that, “believing all things which the ancients had unanimously thought necessary to salvation, the title of Catholic could not be denied him.” Casaubon having sent this answer to Du Perron, he made a reply to it in a letter, dated July 15, 1611, in which he sets forth the reasons that obliged him to refuse the name of Catholic to his Britannic majesty. Casaubon answered in the name of the kin, to all the articles of his letter; to which the cardinal made a reply, which constitutes the bulk of the second volume of his works. The third contains his miscellaneous pieces; among which are, Acts of the Conference held at Fontainebleu against Du Plessis-Mornay; moral and religious pieces in prose and verse, orations, dissertations, translations, and letters. A fourth volume of his embassies and negotiations was collected by Caesar de Ligni, his secretary, and printed at Paris in 1623, folio; but these have not done him much honor, as they do not show that profound reach and insight into things with which he is usually credited. There were also published afterwards, under his name, Perroniana, which, like most of the ana, is a collection of puerilities and impertinences. See  Jervis, Ch. Hist. of France, 1:203, 216 sq., 219 sq., 279; Ranke, History of the Papacy in the 16th and 17th Centuries, vol. i (see Index in vol. ii); Gen. Biogr. Dict. s.v.; Dupin, Bibliotheque des Auteurs soclis. — 17th Siecle, s.v.

## Perrone, Cardinal[[@Headword:Perrone, Cardinal]]

             SEE PERRON.

## Perrone, Giovanni[[@Headword:Perrone, Giovanni]]

             a noted Italian Jesuit, one of the ablest of modern Romanist theologians, was born in 1794, in Chieri, Piedmont. After studying in the college of his native city, he finished his theological course in the University of Turin, where he was finally received doctor. At the age of twenty-one he went to Rome, and entered the Society of Jesus. After one year of novitiate, he was sent to Orvieto to teach dogmatic and moral theology to the students of the society, to whom were added the pupils of the Germanic college. Being ordained priest, he taught in the Roman college, and was appointed, in 1830, rector of the college of Ferrara, from whence he was recalled, in 1838, to resume the teaching of theology in the Roman college. In 1848, at the time of the Roman revolution, he went to England for safety, and only returned to Rome in 1850. Three years afterwards he was made rector of all the Roman colleges. Father Perrone, who, with father Passaglia, is counted among the greatest theologians of Italy, thereafter took his seat in the congregation of bishops and regulars, and in the provincial councils, and was charged with the revision of the books of the Eastern churches. He was also counselor to the Propaganda, and the Ritual committee, etc. Indeed, Perrone was in scientific and literary relations with the most distinguished savans of Europe. He died at Rome in 1875. His works amount to more than sixty, and have been translated into Latin, French, German, English, and Armenian. The principal are, Proelectiones theologiam (Rome, 1835, 9 vols. 8vo). .This work has had more than twenty-five editions, and the different treatises of which it is composed have been translated into French and German. An abridged edition of it was made (ibid. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo), and was followed by seventeen others: — Synopsis historiae theologiae cum philosophia comnparatae (ibid. 1845, 8vo): — De immaculato B. V. Marice concepta, an dogmatico de crto deJiniripossit (ibid. 1847, 8vo); several editions in German, French, and Dutch: — Analyse et Considerations sur 1 t Symbolique de Moehler  (ibid. 1836, 8vo): — II Hermesianismo (ibid. 1838, 8vo); translated into French and Latin: — Analyse et Reflexions sur I'Histoire d'Innocent III, by Fred. Hurter (ibid. 1840, 8vo): — II Protestantismo (ibid. 1853, 3 vols. 8vo); translated into French by the abbe A. C. Peltier (Paris, 1854, 3 vols. 8vo). See F. Ed. Chassay, Notice sur la Vie et les Ecrits du R. P. Perrone, at the beginning of the last work quoted.

## Perronet, Charles[[@Headword:Perronet, Charles]]

             a Wesleyan preacher in the days of the founder of Methodism, and one of the companions of the Wesleys, was born about 1720 at Shoreham, England, where his father was then vicar. He was educated at Oxford University, and was untended for the ministry in the Church Establishment. But becoming interested in the Wesleyan movement, like his brother Edward and his father, Charles accompanied Charles Wesley in 1747 to Dublin, and traveled for more than half a year over Ireland. This was his initiation into the itinerant ministry, and he became a most efficient helper in the Wesleyan cause. When Charles Perronet joined the Conference we have been unable to determine. His name does not appear in the appointments or minutes even as late as 1753, but as many of Wesley's assistants did not join the itinerant ranks, it is possible that Perronet simply labored as the opportunity opened. In 1755, at the twelfth Conference, e.g., there were present 63 preachers, who are subdivided into three classes; the first is a list of 34 names, beginning with John and Charles Wesley, headed “Our present itinerants are.” The second is a list of 12 names, headed “half itinerants; “the third contains 14 names, who are called “our chief local preachers.” “These half itinerants,” says Smith (Life of Wesley, p. 288), “were unquestionably men who gave themselves up to travel under Wesley's direction.” Charles Perronet must have belonged to this class. Aug. 12. 1776, we find the death of Charles Perronet recorded, and he is spoken of as an itinerant Methodist preacher of “more than twenty years' faithful service.” “He was a living and a dying witness of the blessed doctrine he always defended entire sanctification. ‘God,' he said shortly before his death, ‘has purged me from all my dross; all is done away. I am all love.'“ See Arminian Mag. 1871, 529; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 2:260.

## Perronet, Edward[[@Headword:Perronet, Edward]]

             was the son of Vincent Perronet (q.v.), and for some time the associate of the Wesleys. In Charles Wesley's diary he appears under the affectionate nickname of “Ned.” In college Perronet figured as one of the poetic trio beside John and Charles Wesley. In 1746 he traveled with Charles Wesley in the north of England, and was then initiated into the persecutions and other trials of an itinerant preacher's life in early Methodism. Stevens says that “Perronet showed good courage, and sometimes intercepted blows and missiles aimed at Wesley by receiving them himself.” In 1748, at the fifth Annual Conference, we find Perronet's name recorded as an itinerant member. Shortly after, however, he ceased to travel with the Wesleyans, having taken exception to Wesley's adherence to the Church. He was for a while employed by lady Huntingdon, and preached successfully at Norwich, Canterbury, and other places, but from her views of the Church he also differed so widely that he quitted her connection likewise, and became the pastor of a Church of Dissenters at Canterbury. He died in 1792. His last words were, “Glory to God in the height of his divinity; glory to God in the depth of his humanity; glory to God in his all- sufficiency! Into his hands I commit my spirit.” He was the author of an anonymous poem called the Mitre, one of the most cutting satires on the National Establishment that has ever been written. It was suppressed, after it was in print, by the influence of John Wesley, it is thought, though he himself in later life said, “For forty years I have been in doubts concerning that question, ‘ What obedience is due to heathenish priests and mitred infidels?'“ Charles Wesley was shocked at the poem, and declared it to be lacking in wit and of insufferable dullness, but his feeling as a churchman may have dimmed his sight as a critic. Perronet, however, it must be acknowledged, is severe, even though it be considered that in his day there was much to provoke his satirical genius. He wrote also several small poems, chiefly on sacred subjects, and hymns, published by request of his friends, and entitled Occasional Verses, Moral and Sacred, published for the Instruction and Amusement of the candidly Serious and Religious (1785). But that which has given him his place in the memory and gratitude of the Christian world is his hymn entitled The Coronation, beginning, “All Hail the power of Jesus' name.” This hymn was in some measure the product of the times in which Perronet lived. They were times made memorable by the wonderful victories gained for the Gospel of Jesus  Christ. See Stevens, Hist. of Methodism (see Index in vol. 3); Christopher, Epworth Singers, ch. 9.

## Perronet, Vincent[[@Headword:Perronet, Vincent]]

             an English divine of the 18th century, noted for his association with the Wesleys, and the service he rendered to Methodism in the days of its first establishment, was born of Swiss-French parentage about 1700. He was educated at Oxford University. After taking holy orders, he was given the parish of Sandwich, Kent, where he remained about nine years, when he was presented to the vicarage of Shoreham. While in this position, two of his sons (Charles and Edward), who were students at Oxford, became intimately associated with the Wesleys, their classmates. Thus the vicar of Shoreham himself conceived a lively interest in the Oxford movement, and when in 1746 John Wesley met vicar Perronet, he found in him a true friend, a warm admirer, and a most confidential counselor. Charles Wesley called him the “archbishop of Methodism.” He welcomed the traveling evangelists into his own church; though his parishioners mobbed them. When Charles Wesley first appeared in his pulpit, they “roared, stamped, blasphemed, rang the bells, and turned the church into a bear-garden.” Their hostility was subdued, however, and when John Wesley arrived, soon after, he preached without interruption. Perronet adopted their strongest views of personal religion, and wrote several pamphlets in defense of Methodism, and even went so far in his enthusiasm as to send forth this declaration: “I make no doubt that Methodism is designed by Providence to introduce the approaching millennium.” Wesley dedicated to him the Plain Account of the People called Methodists. For nearly forty years the vicarage of Shoreham was a frequent and endeared refuge to both the great leaders, and the Shoreham church virtually a Methodist chapel; Vicar Perronet died May 9, 1785. He was a man of saintly piety, and “was entitled on various accounts,” says a Calvinistic Methodist authority, “to a conspicuous place among the brightest ornaments of the Christian Church in the last century” (Life and Times of the Countess of Huntingdon, 1:387). He published A Vindication of John Locke from the Charge of giving Encouragement to Scepticism (Lond. 1736, 8vo): — A Second Vindication (1738, 8vo): — Some Enquiries chiefly relating to Spiritual Beings (Lond. 1740, 8vo): — An Affectionate Address to the People called Quakers (ibid. 1747, 8vo), and his defences of Methodism (1740- 53). See Jackson, Centenary of Methodism, ch. v; Wesleyan Mag. 1858, p. 484; Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 1:25 sq.; 2:259 sq.

## Perrot, Charles[[@Headword:Perrot, Charles]]

             a Protestant minister, was born in 1541. He was the son of a counselor in the Parliament of Paris, but embraced the Reformed doctrines and retired to Geneva, where he was provided with a place as pastor in 1567. Besides, he ably fulfilled the duties of rector of the academy and professor of theology. What rendered him especially commendable was the courage with which he preached religious tolerance. He died in Geneva Oct. 15, 1608. He became suspected by the theologians of the Calvinistic school, who persuaded the council to forbid the printing of the works which he had composed, among others the treatises De la Foi and De extremis in Ecclesia Vitandis.

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

             a preacher of the Society of the Friends, noted as a schismatic, flourished in the 17th century. He was an associate of George Fox for a while, but differing from that good man, Perrot, with a number of followers, branched off into an independent relation. He was an eccentric man, and inaugurated many impracticable measures. Thus, e.g., he went to Rome “to convert the pope,” and was imprisoned by the Inquisition at Rome. While in confinement he wrote Epistles to the Romans, of which Southey says, “This book is the most frantic I ever saw.” See Southy's Life and Corresp. ch. 9.

## Perrot, Paul[[@Headword:Perrot, Paul]]

             Sieur de La Salle, nephew of Charles Perrot, was a writer who flourished in the 16th century. He was educated at Oxford, and published several works which testify to his great piety. Of these we mention, La Gigautomachie, ou Combat de tous les Arts et Sciences (Middleburg, 1593, 8vo): — Tableaux sacres (Frankf. 1594, 8vo), extracts from the Old Testament in verse: — and Le Trsor de Salomon, enz Quatrains et Sonnets (Rotterdam, 1594, 12mo). According to Bayle, he had worked upon the famous Catholicon d'Espnagne. One of his sons was the translator, Nicolas Perrot. See Bayle, Diet. Hist. et Crit.; Patru, Vie de Perrot d'Ablancourt, in his (Euvres; Senebier, Hist. Litter. de Geneve; Haag, La France Protestante.

## Perry, Benjamin Franklin[[@Headword:Perry, Benjamin Franklin]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born of pious parentage in Talbot Co., Ga., Feb. 13, 1836. He was early converted, and dedicated himself to the service of God. In 1853 he became a student at Emory College, Va., where he graduated in 1855, taking the first honor of his class, and about that time he was licensed to preach. In 1856 he received his first appointment 2. The Texas Conference. In 1861 he filled the Austin Station with great credit to himself. At the outbreak of the civil war he determined, after removing his family to Alabama, where they would be better cared for, to enter the Southern army as chaplain. He thus spent the eventful years of 1862 and 1863, sharing the hardships of the Vicksburg siege. Having resigned his chaplaincy, he was appointed, in 1864, a missionary to Johnson's army. In 1865, after the close of the war, he returned to the itinerant ranks; was transferred to the Montgomery Conference, and stationed at Lowndesboro, the appointment of which he held at the time of his death. He was also for two years in charge of the Female College. His health began to decline about June 1, 1868. He refused to rest, though it was manifest that he was overtaxing his strength. About the last of July he was compelled to desist. He died Sept. 23, 1868. In his last hours he was exultant in Christ's atonement. See Minutes of the Annual Conf. of the M. E. Church, South, p. 229, 230.

## Perry, Gardner Braman[[@Headword:Perry, Gardner Braman]]

             D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born in Norton, Mass., Aug. 9, 1783. He received a very careful academical training, and entered Brown University in the fall of 1800; after two years' study he left, and entered Union College, Schenectady, N.T., where he graduated in 1804. After teaching for one year as principal of Ballston Academy, N. Y., in 1806 he was elected tutor in Union College, where he remained three years. Here he studied theology under Rev. Dr. Nott, and, taking charge of an educational institution at Kingston, N. Y., he resumed teaching, which he continued five years. In the mean time he was licensed, in March, 1812, by Albany Presbytery. In 1814 he was ordained pastor of the Second Congregational Church at Groveland, Mass., where he remained as pastor for forty-five years. Though pastor of a Congregational Church, he was a member of the Presbytery. He was one of the original members of Newburyport Presbytery, preached the sermon at its organization in October, 1826, and was a commissioner from that Presbytery to the General Assembly in 1834.  After the dissolution of Newburyport Presbytery he joined Londonderry Presbytery, which he represented in the Assembly in 1849. This relation existed until his death, Dec. 16, 1859. Dr. Perry was a Christian gentleman of the highest refinement and taste.. His vast stores of general information rendered him a conversationalist of a high order. He was interested in all public movements, an earnest advocate of the temperance reformation, and ever zealous in the cause of education. He published a History of the Town of Bradford; also a number of sermons. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 105. (J. L. S.)

## Perry, Gideon Babcock, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Perry, Gideon Babcock, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at South Kingstown, R.I., October 12, 1800. Among several parishes of which he was rector were St.  Paul's, Cleveland, Ohio, and Grace Church, in the same city. He was also the founder of St. James's parish in Cleveland. Subsequently he was rector of Trinity Church, Natchez, Miss., and of Grace Church in Hopkinsville, Ky., where he died, September 30, 1879, having been fifty-seven years in the ministry. See Providence Journal, October 13, 1879. (J.C.S.)

## Perry, James H[[@Headword:Perry, James H]]

             D.D., a noted minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ulster Co., N. Y., in 1811. His education commenced at an early age, and he made rapid progress in his studies until he was prepared to enter as a cadet at the Military Academy at West Point. Becoming strongly interested in the cause of Texan independence, he resigned his position in the academy in the third year of his connection with it, and, accepting the appointment of colonel in the service of Texas, proceeded to raise a regiment in New York, and then embarked and reached Texas in time to participate in the battle of San Jacinto, which resulted in the defeat of Santa Anna and the establishment of Texan independence. Upon his return from Texas he settled with his family in Newburgh, N. Y. By invitation of his sister, a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, he was induced to attend a love-feast, where the strange but consoling truths of experimental religion excited his attention. At an early moment he disclosed his feelings to the Rev. Seymour Landon, then pastor of the Church. The result was his profession of religion, and he united with the Church on probation. Shortly after he felt called of God to the work of the holy ministry.

In 1838 he joined the New York Conference, and was appointed to Burlington and Bristol Circuit, Connecticut During his ministry, which lasted without interruption from 1838 to the year of his death, he filled many of the first appointments in the New York and New York East Conferences. He was a delegate to the General Conference of 1856. ‘ Shortly after the breaking out of the late civil war, Dr. Perry, believing it to be his duty to give his country the benefit of his military experience, accepted the command of the Forty-eighth Regiment of New York Volunteers. He was ordered to Annapolis, from whence he embarked for the South, and rendered eminent services to the United States army. After the fall of Pulaski he was put in command, and in this fort he died of apoplexy, June 18,1863. As a  preacher Dr. Perry “was calm and impressive. He kept constantly in view the great ends of preachingthe conversion of sinners and the building up of believers in the faith. In debate he was dexterous and cogent, No matter what might be the topic of controversy, ht was an able advocate and a formidable opponent. His ability as a logician and his tact as a debater made him naturally a leader upon the floor of Conference. His brethren who adopted his views of Church administration relied unhesitatingly upon his sagacity, and followed his suggestions with confidence. His well-known kindness of disposition subjected him to constant calls to appear as an advocate in behalf of parties who were, or were likely to be, brought under Conference censure. The services rendered by him at such times were purely disinterested. In his attachments Dr. Perry was firm and constant. He grappled his friends to him with ‘hooks of steel.' His character was so positive that he was incapable of indifference; he liked or disliked decidedly, and with all the force of a strong nature. His ministry was fruitful of good.” See Minutes of Conf. 1863, p. 65, 66; Smith, Memoirs of N. Y. and N. Y. East Conf. p. 256-262; Appleton, Annual Cyclop. 1863.

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

             a Congregational minister, was born about 1733, and was educated at Harvard College, class of 1752. He entered the holy ministry, and became minister of East Windsor, Conn., where he died in 1783. He published, Sersmon on the Death of R Wolcott (1763): — Sermon on the Death of N. Hooker (1771): — Election Sermon (1775).

## Perry, Solomon C[[@Headword:Perry, Solomon C]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in what is now called East Attleborough, Mass., May 27, 1807. His parents were members of the Congregational Church, and exceedingly rigid in their theological creed and strict in their morals. His early education was such as a New Eng. land rural neighborhood and the times afforded. He passed his youth mostly with his father on the farm. When quite a young man he was awakened to the dangers of an unregenerated state, and, encouraged by an uncle who was a Methodist preacher, began to attend Methodist meetings. To do this, however, he had to travel seven miles, there being no Methodist church within that distance from his father's house. It was while making this journey on a certain occasion that he was converted. Soon after he felt called of God to preach, and attached himself as a student to  the Wilbraham Academy, then under the care of the late Dr. Fisk. At the termination of his preparatory course he entered, a year in advance, Brown University, under the presidency of Dr. Wayland. After his graduation he taught at Swinburn's Academy, a very flourishing institution at the time, in the village of White Plains, N. Y. He was licensed as a local preacher. He joined the New York Conference in 1838, and his successive fields of labor were, for the years 1838, 1839, Yonkers; 1840, Durham and Middlefield; 1841, Stratford and Bridgeport; 1842, Bridgeport; 1843, Bushwick; 1844, 1845, Peekskill; 1846, 1847, New York, Twenty-seventh Street; 1848, 1849. Yonkers and Kingsbridge; 1850, 1851, New York, Fiftieth Street; 1852, Red Hook; 1853, 1854, Salisbury; 1855, 1856, Yorkville; 1857, 1858. Tremont; 1859, Washington Heights. In the year 1830 he was made supernumerary, and in 1861 he was superannuated, in which relation he continued until the time of his death, March 6, 1872. “Mr. Perry was a sound theologian, an excellent preacher, an earnest Christian, and in every sense a safe, conservative man. The transparency and purity of his character were singular and distinctive. In his death the ministry has lost one of its most faithful laborers, the Church has been deprived of the presence and influence of one who was devoted to her interests, and whose uniform consistency and integrity reflected upon her the greatest credit; and the fragrance of his good name and exemplary life will ever be grateful to our memories and yield us unceasing satisfaction” (N. Y. Christian Advocate, May 23, 1872).

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

             an English divine, flourished in the second half of the 17th century. He was educated at Cambridge University, and was made fellow of his alma mater, the King's College, Cambridge. After taking holy orders he was presented to the living of Malton and the rectory of Hesterton, Yorkshire. He published Sermon on Act 22:3, which he preached to the Eaton scholars (Lond. 1682, 4to).

## Persecution[[@Headword:Persecution]]

             is any pain or affliction which a person designedly inflicts upon another. In its variability it is threefold:

(1.) Mental, when the spirit of a man rises up and malignantly opposes another;

(2.) Verbal, when men give hard words and deal in uncharitable censures;

(3.) Actual or open by the hand; such as the dragging of innocent persons before the civil tribunal.

In its more restricted sense, persecution for conscience' sake concerns us here only in so far as it has occurred within the Church, or the Church has been the guilty, party. The Church of Christ, in her purity, knows nothing of intolerance, and therefore can never be guilty of persecution. Indeed, the unlawfulness of persecution for conscience' sake, under the New- Testament dispensation, must appear plain to every one that possesses the least degree of Christian thought or feeling, “To banish, imprison, plunder, starve, hang, and burn men for religion,” says the shrewd Jortin, “is not the Gospel of Christ; it is the Gospel of the devil. Where persecution begins, Christianity ends. Christ never used anything that looked like force or violence except once; and that was to drive bad men out of the Temple, and not to drive them in.” Yet would we not overlook that true religion is essentially aggressive and intolerant of error, inasmuch as it “earnestly contends for the faith,” and therefore abhors indifferentism and syncretism, believing that their true source is not faith and charity, but the very opposite of these, Laodicean lukewarmness and tacit infidelity. Toleration of error on the part of the Church would render useless God's revelation of truth, would make God the abettor of error — would either destroy the Church as a society of believers, or contradict the divine order which establishes it as the way of salvation. But the Church as such uses only spiritual weapons — the earnestness of entreaty, the force of prayer, the terrors of conscience, the powers of the Gospel. Its punishments, too, are entirely spiritual censures, and the different degrees of excommunication. This is shown from the nature of religion in general and the spirit of Christianity in particular; from the constitution of the Church as a spiritual body; from the tenor of Scripture, which explains the compulsion of Luk 14:23 as being spiritual compulsion only; from Paul's language to Timothy, as 2Ti 2:24, etc. (see Samuel Clarke's Sermons against Persecution for Religion, Serm. 1, p. 659), and from the fathers (see Bp. Taylor's Liberty of Prophesying, § 14). For these very reasons, however, all temporal penalties inflicted by the Church as a spiritual body must be classed as persecution; for such penalties can be meted out only by a power either usurped or wrongfully given.

The Church, being a spiritual society, has no power over the physical, i.e. the body. Its capital punishment is  deliverance to Satan. It may impose penance, it may enjoin restitution. it may arbitrate, but these sentences it can enforce only by spiritual inducements. Coercive jurisdiction it has none; and if any such jurisdiction be assigned it, it becomes so far a minister of the civil authority which makes the assignation; and so far it leaves its own sphere and becomes a temporal power. Temporal pains and penalties belong only to the temporal power, which moves in the external sphere of overt acts, and does not deal with the will and conscience. The cause of this is that, inasmuch as Almighty God has put man's life into man's keeping, and entrusted him with goods, the society which is to have power over life and goods is not formed without man's concurrence. The Church, on the other hand, is not formed by man's consultation, nor can it be modified at man's pleasure. Man joins it by voluntary submission, without any power of altering its constitution. The Church, therefore, has no power over life and goods; for the power over these which God has once given he will not take away. The concurrence of men in the formation of civil society is properly considered by holding up the ideal of a social contract, a contract perpetually forming and modifying, as the mind of a nation expresses itself in law; and such ordinances of man are ratified by God's providence, which has worked also in their formation. Whence it is said, “Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake.” Such compact, then, according to the religious state of those who make it, may be (1) a complete identity of the members of the Church and State; (2) or an established and preferred Church, with toleration in different degrees for other religious bodies (Jeremy Taylor, e.g., advocated toleration for all those who accept the Apostles' Creed); (3) or complete equality of all religious bodies. Any one of these positions the Church of Christ may hold. In any case it ought to retain distinctly its proper position as a society of divine institution in the world, but not of the world. Especially it ought not to usurp in the name of religion the powers and aims of the state law. There cannot be a greater mistake in statesmanship than to confound the temporal and spiritual estates and jurisdictions. The Church as a spiritual body has nothing to do with the state. It continues its own course, neither intruding into the sphere of the state nor refusing to aid the state, but ever rejecting an alliance with the state. SEE CHURCH AND STATE.

It is from dogmatism invested with political power, and authorized to use that power for the inculcation of its dogmas, that persecution is sure to spring, aye, really springs. The first community based on freedom of conscience was the Roman Catholic colony of Maryland; yet Roman Catholicism in Maryland was as dogmatic  as in Spain. The great consequence from the principles we have tried to establish is that the temporal penalties spoken of can be inflicted only for overt acts. The compact of society does not profess to touch the mind. It leaves the will and conscience to the divine institution of the Church.. Consequently for matters of opinion, for belief privately held, there can be no temporal penalty at all. The temporal penalty is outside the power of the Church; the private belief is outside the supervision of the state. We may therefore define persecution thus: the infliction of temporal penalties by the spirituality as the spirituality, or by the civil power for other than overt acts. Roger Williams has the honor of being the first in modern times who took the right ground in regard to liberty of conscience. It was he who, in 1642, cleared the subject from the subtleties of a thousand years of darkness, and held up to Christian abhorrence in all its forms the “Bloody Tenet” (as he justly called it) of persecution for conscience' sake. John Owen, John Milton, John Locke, and a host of later writers have followed in, his steps. “Persecution for conscience' sake,” says Dr. Doddridge, “is every way inconsistent; because,

1. It is founded on an absurd supposition that one man has a right to judge for another in matters of religion.

2. It is evidently opposite to that fundamental principle' of morality that we should do to others as we could reasonably desire they should do to us.

3. It is by no means calculated to answer the end which its patrons profess to intend by it.

4. It evidently tends to produce a great deal of mischief and confusion in the world.

5. The Christian religion must, humanly speaking, be not only obstructed, but destroyed, should persecuting principles universally prevail.

6. Persecution is so far from being required or encouraged by the Gospel, that it is most directly contrary to many of its precepts, and indeed to the whole of it.” SEE RELIGIOUS LIBERTY; SEE TOLERATION.

Romanism has alone stood out in the Christian Church supplying an interpretation of the Scriptures which Protestantism has as steadfastly discarded. Popes and Church councils have repeatedly declared the extermination of heretics a duty, and pronounced execrable and damnable all opinions to the contrary; so much so that there is no doctrine whatever  more absolutely asserted by the Church officially than this; and the moderate nominal Romanist who allows himself to dissent from it might just as well set his individual judgment against that of the Church upon any other article of its creed. The liberal Protestant must be told that the very central and fundamental conception of the Roman Catholic system must produce, as its natural and inevitable consequence, wherever it is dominant, those three great objects of sacerdotal ambition in the Middle Ages — persecution of recusants at home, propagation of the faith by force abroad, and the supremacy of the religious over the civil power. If these objects are but partially attainable in our modern world, it is because the principle itself has lost its power over the minds of men; half the world is anti-Catholic, and multitudes, who are Roman Catholics by birth and education, and who, in their indifference, are satisfied with the forms of the religion they have inherited, have never really imbibed its spirit.

The doctrine of the Papacy is this: God has entrusted the salvation of mankind to the Church that is, to the clerical order. This salvation is essentially effected by the administration of the sacraments. The spiritual dominion exercised by the Church extends by right over the whole world; every human creature belongs to it as much as he belongs to the civil society of which he is born a member, without any choice of his own, both the one and the other being established of God. Lastly, the great mission of the Church is to make this right a fact, by bringing the entire race to obedience to their spiritual advisers, and to the habitual use of the sacraments, and by obtaining from all local civil governments entire freedom of action for the universal spiritual government. A bad logician may admit this theory, and deny its consequences; but no man can embrace it from the heart, and prize it as the great divine appointment for the everlasting weal of mankind, without approving its consequences, and desiring practically to follow them out. Why scruple at converting barbarians by the sword? The method has been successful; whole populations have thus been brought within reach of sacramental grace; and if the hearts of a first generation are-too obdurate to profit by it, their descendants will. Why shudder at the fearful punishment of heretics? They are rebels, rebels against the highest and holiest authority: we must, cut off the diseased member for the good of the whole body: we must punish those that would poison souls. Why be astonished at the assumption of a priest's superiority over the kings of the earth?

Is he not a nearer representative of God, the possessor of a higher order of authority, addressing itself to the deepest powers and susceptibilities of our nature? The king, as well as the peasant, in all his  conduct comes under the cognizance of the authorized interpreter of the divine will. “The king of England,” wrote Innocent III to Philip Augustus, “thy brother in the faith, complains that thou hast sinned against him: he has given thee warning; he has taken as witnesses great lords, in order to re-establish peace; and when that failed, he has accused thee to the Church. The Church has sought to employ paternal love, and not the severity of a judge. She has entreated thee to conclude a peace, or, at least, a truce; and if thou wilt not hear the Church, must thou not be to us as a pagan and a publican? “It is impossible to adopt the conception of the Church and its agency supposed in the pope's reasoning, and not admit that his conclusion is just and scriptural. An expression constantly recurring in Innocent's letters is that of “the liberty of the Church:” in its use he was not always wrong; for the pretensions of the spiritual power produced reprisals and usurpations on the part of the temporal; but the phrase generally meant that the civil power was to walk out of the Church's way whenever they came into conflict. And so it ought to do, if it were true that the Creator of heaven and earth had founded the sacerdotal body, and given it the mission to take men and save them, as children are carried out of a burning house, with a merely passive cooperation of their own. The priest' does not want to be king; but he claims the right to reign over the king, which is the surest way of reigning; and, from his point of view, the great business of the secular arm — the reason for which it exists — is the repression of heresy. It is an arm, and no more. Here are two systems in presence of each other. On the one, man belongs to himself, that he may give himself to God; the Church is the society formed by those who have freely given themselves to God; individual piety thus logically, even when not chronologically, preceding collective life; the knowledge of God in Jesus Christ being the introduction to the Church, and the ordinances of the latter being means of grace, the blessing of which depends upon the recipient's moral state and personal relation to God. On the other system, man belongs to the sacerdotal order, and the services of the Church are the only introduction to Jesus Christ: she is the nursing mother of his members, receiving them into her bosom before they are conscious of it, and feeding them with ordinances, the blessing of which is independent of the recipient's moral experiences. It is evident that conceptions so utterly at, variance must make their opposition felt throughout the whole series of ecclesiastical relations, in the character of their proselytism, in their manner of dealing with the impenitent, in their attitude toward the heretic or the heathen.

As has already been said, religious indifference may make the  merely nominal Catholic tolerant, but the real Romanist must persecute wherever he has the power; he must interpret after the letter that favorite text of the Dominicans, “Compel them to come in.” That is no misrepresentation which makes him say to his adversaries, “When you are the stronger, you ought to tolerate me; for it is your duty to tolerate truth. But when I am the stronger, I shall persecute you; for it is my duty to persecute error.” What are Rome's doings in Spain and Italy at the present moment? Let the Romish hierarchy become dominant in some distant island at the antipodes, away from all foreign influences and all excuse of political interest, and it will immediately exhibit its inevitable tendencies. In 1840 the inhabitants of the largest of the Marquesas, at the instigation of their priests, expelled from the island the minority that had become Protestant. An infallible Church can persecute with a good conscience; for the infallibility of an authority implies its resistless evidence, so that it cannot be resisted without guilt, nor can it ever be mistaken in its blows. This is so true that it is avowed by the most consistent ultramontane organs of England and the Continent, by the Tablet, and more unreservedly still by the Universe. Nay, the zeal of the Anglo-Catholic might shame many a lukewarm Romanist; for one of the symptoms of a thorough appropriation of the sacramental system among recreant Protestants is a cordial approbation of the use of the sword against the Albigenses and their fellows, who dared to mar the unity of the Church. The late dean Hurter retained the presidency of the Protestant clergy L, Schaffhausen for many years after he wrote his Life of Innocent III; yet in that work he boldly advocates the propagation of Christianity by force, and. notwithstanding some hypocritical reserves, can hardly be said to conceal his sympathy with the crusaders of Simon de Montfort and the inquisitors of the Middle Ages. We have an authoritative declaration of Romish doctrine in the bull of Pius VI, A.D. 1794, which condemns the reforming Synod of Ricci, bishop of Pistoia.

The synod had affirmed, “Abusum fore auctoritatis ecclesise transferendo illam ultra limites doctrinne ac morum, et eam extendendo ad res exteriores, et per vim exigendo id quod pendet a persuasione et corde, turn etiamn multo minus ad eamr pertinere, exigere per vim exteriorem subjectionem suis decretis;” and this proposition is declared heretical so far as by the Indeterminate words “extendendo ad res exteriores” denenoted an abuse of Church power; and “Qua parte insinuat, ecclesiam non habere auctoritatem subjectionis suis decretis exigendse aliter quam per media quae pendent a persuasione-quatenus intendat ecclesiam; non habere collatam sibi a Deo potestatem, non solum dirigendi per consilia et  suasiones, sed etiam jubendi per leges, ac devios contumacesque exteriore judicio ac salubribus poenis coercendi atque cogendi” (ex Bened. XIV in brevi Ad Assiduas, anni 1755; comp. Damnatio Synodi Pistoiensis, art. iv, v, in the Appendix to Canones Conc. Trident. Tauchnitz ed. p. 298). By this determination of two popes must be interpreted the oath taken by a bishop upon consecration: “Haereticos, schismaticos, et rebelles eidem Domino nostro vel successoribus praedictis, pro posse persequar et impugnabo” (Pontificale Ronm.). The claim from the Church of the power of temporal punishment is distinct. The union of civil sovereignty over the Papal States with the ecclesiastical primacy makes such a claim more natural to the head of the Romish Church; but as the history of the Papal States does not recommend such a union of the temporal and civil powers, so neither does the history of the Romish obedience recommend a transfer of coercive jurisdiction from the civil to the ecclesiastical tribunals. That there is no such power divinely given to the Church we have endeavored to show. See Elliott, Romanism; Milman, Lat. Christianity; Leakey, Hist. of Europ. Morals, and his Hist. of Rationalism, 1:74, 156, 331, 350, and esp. 2:11, 99; Thompson, Papacy and the Civil Power (see Index); Riddle, Persecutions of the Papacy (Lond. 1859, 2 vols. 8vo). SEE ROMANISM.

## Persecutions Of Christians[[@Headword:Persecutions Of Christians]]

             The persecution of Christians dates from the day when Jesus Christ appeared among men to preach the glad tidings of redemption from sin and salvation eternal. The very earliest sufferings of the Church of Christ and its Head are subjects of New-Testament history. It is clear that these earliest sufferings Christians endured from the Jews. But the persecutions were of no great severity so long as the Jews were the persecutors. When, however, the Roman authorities assumed the exercise of the state's sovereignty persecution took a more terrible form, and there were then inaugurated a series of measures intended to compel the rising community of Christians to renounce their new creed, and to conform to the established religion of the empire. In later times persecutions of heretics and dissenters have been not uncommon on the part of certain Christian bodies, especially the Romish and Anglican churches.

I. Pagan Persecutions. — These are called the ten persecutions in ecclesiastical history, and designate certain periods of special severity. The Christian community were at all times regarded with suspicion and dislike in the Roman empire — the constitution of Rome not only being essentially  intolerant of those new religions which, like the Christian, were directly aggressive against the established religion of the state, but being particularly hostile to private associations and private assemblages for worship, such: as those which every Christian congregation by its very nature presented; and thus there are very few periods during the first three centuries in which it can be said that the Church enjoyed everywhere a complete immunity from persecution. But the name is given particularly to certain periods when either new enactments were passed against Christianity, or the existing ones were enforced with unusual rigor. The notion of ten such periods is commonly accepted almost as a historical axiom; and it is not generally known that this precise determination of the number is comparatively recent. In the 4th century no settled theory of the number of persecutions seems to have been adopted. Lactantius reckons up but six; Eusebius does not state what the number was, but his narrative supplies data for nine. Sulpicius Severus, in the 5th century, is the first who expressly states the number as ten; but he only enumerates nine in detail, and in completing the number to ten, he adds the general persecution which, at the coming of Antichrist, is to precede the end of the world. The fixing of ten as the number seems to have originated in a mystic allusion to the ten horns of the beast in the Apocalypse (Rev 17:12). It need hardly be said, however, that this is only a question of words, the diversity of enumeration arising from the different notions attached by the several historians to the designation general. If taken quite strictly to comprise the entire Roman empire, the number must fall below ten; if used more loosely of local persecutions, the number might be very largely increased. The ten persecutions commonly regarded as general are the following:

(1.) The persecution under Nero, A.D. 64, when that emperor, having set fire to the city of Rome, threw the odium of that execrable action on the Christians. First, those were apprehended who openly avowed themselves to be of that sect; then by them were discovered an immense multitude, all of whom were convicted. Their death and tortures were aggravated by cruel derision and sport; for they were either covered with the skins of wild beasts, and torn in pieces by devouring dogs, or fastened to crosses, and wrapped up in combustible garments, that, when the daylight failed, they might, like torches, serve to dispel the darkness of the night. For this tragical spectacle Nero lent his own gardens, and exhibited at the same time the public diversions of the circus; sometimes driving a chariot in person, and sometimes standing as a spectator, while the shrieks of  women, burning to ashes, supplied music for his ears. SEE NERONIAN PERSECUTIONS.

(2.) The second general persecution was under Domitian. From the death of Nero to the reign of Domitian the Christians remained unmolested and daily increasing; but towards the close of the 1st century they were again involved in all the horrors of persecution. In this persecution many eminent Christians suffered; but the death of Domitian soon delivered them from this calamity. In the year 95 40,000 were supposed to have suffered martyrdom.

(3.) The third began in the third year of Trajan, in the year 100. Many things contributed towards it: as the laws of the empire, the emperor's zeal for his religion and aversion to Christianity, and the prejudices of the pagans, supported by falsehoods and calumnies against the Christians. Under the plausible pretense of their holding illegal meetings and societies, they were severely persecuted by the governors and other officers; in which persecution great numbers fell by the rage of popular tumult, as well as by laws and processes. This persecution continued several years, with different degrees of severity, in many parts of the empire, and was so much the more afflicting because the Christians generally suffered under the notion of malefactors and traitors, and under an emperor famed for his singular justice and moderation. The most noted martyr in this persecution was Ignatius of Antioch, although some name also Clement, bishop of Rome. After some time the fury of this persecution was abated, but did not cease during the whole reign of Trajan. In the eighth year of his successor, Adrian, it broke out with new rage. This is by some called the fourth general persecution, but is more commonly considered as a revival or continuance of the third.

(4.) This persecution took place under Antoninus the philosopher; and at different places, with several intermissions and different degrees of severity, it continued the greater part of his reign. Antoninus himself has been much excused as to this persecution. As the character of the virtuous Trajan, however, is sullied by the martyrdom of Ignatius, so the reign of the philosophic Marcus is forever disgraced by the sacrifice of the venerable Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, the friend and companion of St. John. A few days previous to his death, he is said to have dreamed that his pillow was on fire. When urged by the proconsul to renounce Christ, he replied, “Fourscore and six years have I served him, and he has never done  me an injury: can I blaspheme my King and my Savior?” Several miracles are reported to have happened at his death. The flames, as if unwilling to injure his sacred person, are said to have arched over his head; and it is added that at length, being dispatched with a sword, a dove flew out of the wound, and that from the pile proceeded a most fragrant smell. It is obvious that the arching of the flames might be an accidental effect, which the enthusiastic veneration of his disciples might convert into a miracle; and as to the story of the dove, etc., Eusebius himself apparently did not credit it, since he has omitted it in his narrative of the transaction. Among many other victims of persecution in this philosophic reign we must also record that of the excellent and learned Justin. But it was at Lyons and Vienne, in Gaul, that the most shocking scenes were acted. Among many nameless sufferers, history has preserved from oblivion Pothinus, the respectable bishop of Lyons, who was then more than ninety years of age; Sanctus, a deacon of Vienne; Attalus, a native of Pergamus; Maturus, and Alexander; some of whom were devoured by wild beasts, and some of them tortured in an iron chair made red hot. Some females also, and particularly Biblias and Blandina, reflected honor both upon their sex and religion by their constancy and courage.

(5.) A considerable part of the reign of Severus proved so far favorable to the Christians that no additions were made to the severe edicts already in force against them. For this lenity they were probably indebted to Proculus, a Christian, who, in a very extraordinary manner, cured the emperor of a dangerous distemper by the application of oil. But this degree of peace, precarious as it was, and frequently interrupted by the partial execution of severe laws, was terminated by an edict, A.D. 197, which prohibited every subject of the empire, under severe penalties, from embracing the Jewish or Christian faith. This law appears, upon a first view, designed merely to impede the further progress of Christianity; but it incited the magistracy to enforce the laws of former emperors, which were still existing, against the Christians; and during seven years they were exposed to a rigorous persecution in Palestine, Egypt, the rest of Africa, Italy, Gaul, and other parts. In this persecution Leonidas, the father of Origen, and Irenseus, bishop of Lyons, suffered martyrdom. On this occasion Tertullian composed his “Apology.” The violence of pagan intolerance was most severely felt in Egypt, and particularly at Alexandria.

(6.) The next persecution began with the reign of the emperor Maximinus, A.D. 235, and seems to have arisen from that prince's hatred of his  predecessor, Alexander, in whose family many Christians had found shelter and patronage. Though this persecution was very severe in some places, yet we have the names of only a few martyrs. Origen at this time was very industrious in supporting the Christians under these fiery trials.

(7.) The most dreadful persecution that ever had been known in the Church occurred during the short reign of Decius, the Christians being exposed to greater calamities than any they had hitherto suffered. It has been said, and with some probability, that the Christians were involved in this persecution by their attachment to the family of the emperor Philip. Considerable numbers were publicly destroyed; several purchased safety by bribes or secured it by flight; and many deserted from the faith, and consented to burn incense on the altars of the gods. The city of Alexandria, the great theater of persecution, had even anticipated the edicts of the emperor, and had put to death a number of innocent persons, among home were some women. The imperial edict for persecuting the Christians was published A.D. 249; and shortly after Fabianus, bishop of Rome, with a — number of his followers, was put to death. The venerable bishops of Jerusalem and Antioch died in prison the most cruel tortures were employed, and the numbers that perished are by all parties confessed to have been very considerable.

(8.) The emperor Valerian, in the fourth year of his reign, A.D. 257, listening to the suggestions of Macrinus, a magician of Egypt, was prevailed upon to persecute the Christians, on pretense that by their wicked and execrable charms they hindered the prosperity of the emperor. Macrinus advised him to perform many impious rites, sacrifices, and incantations; to cut the throats of infants, etc.; and edicts were published in all places against the Christians, who were exposed without protection to the common rage. We have the names of several martyrs, among whom were the famous St. Laurence, archdeacon of Rome, and the great St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage.

(9.) A persecution took place under the emperor Aurelian, A.D. 274; but it was so small and inconsiderable that it gave little interruption to the peace of the Church.

(10.) The last general persecution of the Christians began in the nineteenth year of the emperor Diocletian, A.D. 303. The most violent promoters of it were Hierocles the philosopher, who wrote against the Christian religion, and Galerius, whom Diocletian had declared Caesar. This latter was  excited not only by his own cruelty and superstition, but likewise by his mother, who was a zealous pagan. Diocletian, contrary to his inclination, was prevailed upon to authorize the persecution by his edicts. Accordingly it began in the city of Nicomedia, whence it spread into other cities and provinces, and became at last universal. Great numbers of Christians suffered the severest tortures in this persecution, though the accounts given of it by succeeding historians are probably exaggerated. There are, however, sufficient well-authenticated facts to assure us amply of the cruel and intolerant disposition of the professors of pagan philosophy. The human imagination was, indeed, almost exhausted in inventing a variety of tortures. Some were impaled alive; some had their limbs broken, and in that condition were left to expire. Some were roasted by slow fires; and some suspended by their feet with their heads downward, and, a fire being placed under them, were suffocated by the smoke. Some had melted lead poured down their throats, and the flesh of some was torn off with shells, and others had splinters of reeds thrust under the nails of their fingers and toes. The few who were not capitally punished had their limbs and their features mutilated. It would be endless to enumerate the victims of superstition. The bishops of Nicomedia, of Tyre, of Sidon, of Emesa, several matrons and virgins of the purest character, and an immense number of plebeians, arrived at immortality through the flames of martyrdom. At last it pleased God that the emperor Constantine, who himself afterwards became a Christian, openly declared for the Christians, and published the first law in favor of them. The death of Maximin, emperor of the East, soon after put a period to all their troubles; and this was the great epoch when Christianity triumphantly got possession of the thrones of princes.

In this dreadful persecution, which lasted ten years, houses filled with Christians were set on fire, and numbers of them were tied together with ropes and thrown into the sea. It is related that 17,000 were slain in the space of one month, aid that during the continuance of this persecution, in the province of Egypt alone, no less than 144,000 Christians died by the violence of their persecutors, besides 700,000 that died through the fatigues of banishment or the public works to which they were condemned. The time fixed for the exterminating edicts, as they are called, was the Feast of Terminalia in the year 302, which historians remark was to put an end to Christianity. So complete was supposed to be the extirpation of the  sect, that coins were struck and inscriptions set up recording the fact that the Christian superstition was now utterly exterminated, and the worship of the gods restored by Diocletian, who assumed the name of Jupiter; and Maximian, who took that of Hercules. In the annexed coin, from the collection of the Louvre at Paris, the obverse represents the head of the emperor Diocletian crowned with laurel, and his shoulders covered with a robe, with the legend Diocletianus Perpetuis Felix Augustus, “Diocletian, perpetual, happy, august.”

On the reverse is Jupiter holding in his raised hand a thunderbolt, and trampling a kneeling figure with serpent-like feet, having the legend Jovi Fulgeratori, “To Jupiter the thunderer.” The prostrate figure designates Christianity, and the figure of Jupiter brandishing his thunderbolt is taken probably from Ovid's description, “Quo centimanum dejecerat igne Typhcea;” he is dashing down the Christians with the same fire as he hurled upon the Titans, who had equally but vainly tried to dispossess him of heaven. The figure of this coin is very remarkable, and has a resemblance so strong as to identify it with the Abrasax on the Gnostic gems, with serpent-like feet, supposed to be the God of the Christians. We see him here disarmed of his weapons, the very being which the Christians were supposed to adore, and this single sect and its impure idol bringing persecution on the whole of the Christian Church. In the exergue is Pecunia Romae, “The money of Rome.” A coin similar to that of Diocletian was struck by his colleague, Maximilian, to commemorate an event in which he also had acted a distinguished part. In the following coin the obverse represents the naked bust of the emperor crowned with laurel, having the legend Maximianus Perpetuus Augustu., ‘Maximian, perpetual, august.” On the reverse is the figure of Jupiter Tonans, in nearly the same attitude, and with the same legend as the former, but having his head covered. In the prostrate figure the serpentine part of the legs is not distinct, and it has on the whole more of a human form. It may be conjectured that Diocletian wished to represent only the depraved and corrupt sectarians of which his figure is the emblem; and that his more atrocious colleague, careless of distinction, exhibited the genius of Christianity under any form as equally the object of his persecution. This, the most dreadful of all the heathen persecutions, was happily also the last; and the time shortly arrived when Christianity became the public religion of the Roman empire. Constantine was converted A.D. 312, and, according to ecclesiastical writers, his conversion was effected, like that of St. Paul, by a sensible miracle, while he was performing a journey on a public road. He immediately afterwards adopted the cross as his ensign, and formed on the  spot the celebrated labarum or Christian standard, which was ever afterwards substituted for the Roman eagle. This, as Eusebius describes it, was a spear crossed by an arrow, on which was suspended a velum having inscribed on it the monogram formed by the Greek letters X and P, the initials of the name of Christ. SEE LABARUM.

The coin below represents on the obverse the naked bust of the emperor crowned with a laurel wreath, and surrounded with the leg. end Flavius Valerius Constanitnus Per. petuus Felix Augustus, “Flavius Valerius Constantine, perpetual, happy, august.” On the reverse is the whole-length figure of the emperor in armor, covered with a helmet, standing on the prow of a galley (a ship was the common emblem of the state among the Romnans. See the ode of Horace, O Navis); in his right hand he holds a globe, surmounted by a rayed phoenix, the adopted emblem of his family, to intimate the renovation of the empire; in his left is the labarum, inscribed with the monogram; behind is the angel of victory, directing his course; around is the appropriate legend, Feli Temporum Reparatio, “The happy reformation of the times.” In the exergue is Pecunia Tereveromrum, “The money of Treves.” For monographs on these pagan persecutions, see Volbeding, Index Progammaturn, p. 96 sq.

II. Christian Persecutions. — The guilt of persecution has, however, been attached to professing Christians. Had men been guided solely by the spirit and the precepts of the Gospel, the conduct of its blessed Author, and the writings and example of his immediate disciples, we might have boldly affirmed that among Christians there could be no tendency to encroach upon freedom of discussion, and no approach to persecution. The Gospel, in every page of it, inculcates tenderness and mercy; it exhibits the most unwearied indulgence to the frailties and errors of men; and it represents charity as the badge of those who in sincerity profess it. In Paul's description of this grace (1 Corinthians 13) he has drawn a picture of mutual forbearance and kindness and toleration, upon which it is scarcely possible to dwell without being raised superior to every contracted sentiment, and glowing with the most diffusive benevolence. In the churches which he planted he had often to counteract the efforts of teachers who had labored to subvert the foundation which he had laid, to misrepresent his motives, and to inculcate doctrines which, through the  inspiration that was imparted to him, he discerned to proceed from the most perverted views, and to be inconsistent with the great designs of the Gospel. These teachers he strenuously and conscientiously opposed; he endeavored to show the great importance of those to whom he wrote being on their guard against them; and he evinced the most ardent zeal in resisting their insidious purposes; but he never, in the most distant manner, insinuated that they should be persecuted, adhering always to the maxim which he had laid down, that the weapons of a Christian warfare are not carnal but spiritual. He does, indeed, sometimes speak of heretics; and he even exhorts that, after expostulation with him, a heretic should be rejected, and not acknowledged to be a member of the Church to which he had once belonged. But that precept of the apostle has no reference to the persecution which it has sometimes been conceived to sanction, and which has generally been directed against men quite sincere in their belief, however erroneous they may be esteemed.

Upon a subject thus enforced by precept and example, it is not to be supposed that the first converts, deriving their notions of Christianity immediately from our Lord or his apostles, could have any opinion different in theory, at least, from that which has been now established. Accordingly we find that the primitive fathers, although in many respects they erred, unequivocally express themselves in favor of the most ample liberty as to religious sentiment, and highly disapprove of every attempt to control it. Passages from many of these writers might be quoted to establish that this was almost the universal sentiment till the age of Constantine. Lactantius in particular has, with great force and beauty, delivered his opinion against persecution: “There is no need of compulsion and violence, because religion cannot be forced; and men must be made willing, not by stripes, but by arguments. Slaughter and piety are quite opposite to each other; nor can truth consist with violence, or justice with cruelty. They are convinced that nothing is more excellent than religion, and therefore think that it ought to be defended with force; but they are mistaken, both in the nature of religion, and in proper methods to support it; for religion is to be defended, not by murder, but by persuasion; not by cruelty, but by patience; not by wickedness, but by faith. If you attempt to defend religion by blood, and torments, and evil, this is not to defend, but to violate and pollute it; for there is nothing that should be more free than the choice of religion, in which, if consent be wanting, it becomes entirely void and ineffectual.”

The general conduct of Christians during the first three centuries was in conformity with the admirable maxims now quoted. Eusebius has recorded that Polycarp, after in vain endeavoring to persuade Anicetus, who was bishop of Rome, to embrace his opinion as to some point with respect to which they differed, gave him, notwithstanding, the kiss of peace, while Anicetus communicated with the martyr; and Irenseus mentions that although Polycarp was much offended with the Gnostic heretics, who abounded in his days, he converted numbers of them, not by the application of constraint or violence, but by the facts and arguments which he calmly submitted for their consideration. It must be admitted, however, that even during the second century some traces of persecution are to be found. Victor, one of the early pontiffs, because the Asiatic bishops differed from him about the rule for the observance of Easter, excommunicated them as guilty of heresy; and he acted in the same manner towards a person who held what he considered as erroneous notions respecting the Trinity. This stretch of authority was, indeed, reprobated by the generality of Christians, and remonstrances against it were accordingly presented. There was, however, in this proceeding of Victor too clear a proof that the Church was beginning to deviate from the perfect charity by which it had been adorned, and too sure an indication that the example of one who held so high an office, when it was in harmony with the corruption or with the worst passions of our nature, would be extensively followed. But still there was in the excommunication rashly pronounced by the pope merely an exertion of ecclesiastical power, not interfering with the personal security, with the property, or with the lives of those against whom it was directed; and we may, notwithstanding this slight exception, consider the first three centuries as marked by the candor and the benevolence implied in the charity which judgeth not, and thinketh no evil.

It was after Christianity had been established as the religion of the empire, and after wealth and honor had been conferred on its ministers, that the monstrous evil of persecution acquired gigantic strength, and threw its blasting influence over the religion of the Gospel. The causes of this are apparent. Men exalted in the scale of society were eager to extend the power which had been entrusted to them; and they sought to do so by exacting from the people acquiescence in the peculiar interpretations of tenets and doctrines which they chose to publish as articles of faith. The moment that this was attempted the foundation was laid for the most inflexible intolerance; because reluctance to submit was no longer regarded  solely as a matter of conscience, but as interfering with the interest and the dominion of the ruling party. It was therefore proceeded against with all the eagerness which men so unequivocally display when the temporal blessings that gratify their ambition or add to their comfort are attempted to be wrested from them. To other dictates than those of the Word of God the members of the Church now listened; and opinions were viewed, not in reference to that Word, but to the; effect which they might produce upon the worldly advancement or prosperity of those by whom they were avowed. From the era, then, of the conversion of Constantine we may date, if not altogether the introduction, at least the decisive influence of persecution.

III. Roman Catholic Persecution. — Numerous were the persecutions of different sects from Constantine's time to the Reformation; but when the famous Martin Luther arose, and opposed the errors and ambition of the Church of Rome, and the sentiments of this good man began to spread, the pope and his clergy joined all their forces to hinder their progress. A general council of the clergy was called: this was the famous Council of Trent, which was held for near eighteen successive years, for the purpose of establishing popery in greater splendor and preventing the Reformation. The friends of the Reformation were anathematized and excommunicated, and the life of Luther was often in danger, though at last he died on the bed of peace. From time to time innumerable schemes were suggested to overthrow the Reformed Church, and wars were set on foot for the same purpose. The Invincible Armada, as it was vainly called, had the same end in view. The Inquisition, which was established in the 12th century against the Waldenses, SEE INQUISITION, was now more effectually set to work. Terrible persecutions were carried on in various parts of Germany, and even in Bohemia, which continued about thirty years, and the blood of the saints was said to flow like rivers of water. The countries of Poland, Lithuania, and Hungary were in a similar manner deluged with Protestant blood.

1. Holland. — In the Low Countries, for many years, the most amazing cruelties were exercised under the merciless and unrelenting hands of the Spaniards, to whom the inhabitants of that part of the world were then in subjection. Father Paul observes that these Belgic martyrs were 50,000; but Grotius and others observe that there were 100,000 who suffered by the hand of the executioner. Herein, however, Satan and his agents failed of their purpose; for in the issue a great part of the Netherlands shook off the  Spanish yoke, and erected themselves into a separate and independent state, which has ever since been considered as one of the principal Protestant countries.

2. France. — No country, perhaps, has ever produced more martyrs than this. After many cruelties had been exercised against the Protestants, there was a most violent persecution of them in the year 1572, in the reign of Charles IX. Many of the principal Protestants were invited to Paris, under a solemn oath of safety, upon occasion of the marriage of the king of Navarre with the French king's sister. The queen-dowager of Navarre, however, a zealous Protestant, was poisoned by a pair of gloves before the marriage was solemnized. Coligni, admiral of France, was basely murdered in his own house, and then thrown out of the window to gratify the malice of the duke of Guise: his head was afterwards cut off; and sent to the king and queen-mother; and his body, after a thousand indignities offered to it, was hung by the feet on a gibbet. After this the murderers ravaged the whole city of Paris, and butchered, in three days, above ten thousand lords, gentlemen, presidents, and people of all ranks. A horrible scene of things, says Thuanus, when the very streets and passages resounded with the noise of those that met together for murder and plunder; the groans of those who were dying, and the shrieks of such as were just going to be butchered, were everywhere heard; the bodies of the slain were thrown out of the windows; the courts and chambers of the houses were filled with them; the dead bodies of others were dragged through the streets; their blood ran through the channels in such plenty that torrents seemed to empty themselves in the neighboring river: in a word, an innumerable multitude of men, women with child, maidens, and children were all involved in one common destruction; and the gates and entrances of the king's palace were all besmeared with their blood. From the city of Paris the massacre spread throughout the whole kingdom. In the city of Meaux they threw above two hundred into jail; and after they had ravished and killed a great number of women, and plundered the houses of the Protestants, they executed their fury on those they had imprisoned; and calling them one by one, they were killed, as Thuanus expresses, like sheep in a market. In Orleans they murdered above five hundred men, women, and children, and enriched themselves with the spoil.

The same cruelties were practiced at Angers, Troyes, Bourges, La Charite. and especially at Lyons, where they inhumanly destroyed above eight hundred Protestants-children hanging on their parents' necks, and parents embracing their children; putting ropes  about the necks of some, dragging them through the streets, and throwing them, mangled, torn, and half dead, into the river. According to Thuanus, above thirty thousand Protestants were destroyed in this massacre, or, as others affirm, above one hundred thousand. But what aggravates these scenes with still greater wantonness and cruelty was the manner in which the news was received at Rome. When the letters of the pope's legate were read in the assembly of the cardinals, by which he assured the pope that all was transacted by the express will and( command of the king, it was immediately decreed that the pope should march with his cardinals to the church of St. Mark, and in the most solemn manner give thanks to God for so great a blessing conferred on the see of Rome and the Christian world; and that, on the Monday after, solemn mass should be celebrated in the church of Minerva, at which the pope, Gregory XIII, and cardinals were present; and that a jubilee should be published throughout the whole Christian world, and the cause of it declared to be to return thanks to God for the extirpation of the enemies of the truth and Church in France. In the evening the cannon of St. Angelo were fired to testify the public joy; the whole city was illuminated with bonfires; and no one sign of rejoicing was omitted that was usually made for the greatest victories obtained in favor of the Roman Church. SEE BARTHOLOMEWS DAY.

But all these persecutions were far exceeded in cruelty by those which took place in the time of Louis XIV. It cannot be pleasant to any man's feelings, who has the least humanity, to recite these dreadful scenes of horror, cruelty, and devastation; but to show what superstition, bigotry, and fanaticism are capable of producing, and for the purpose of holding up the spirit of persecution to contempt, we shall here give as concise a detail as possible. The troopers, soldiers, and dragoons went into the Protestants' houses, where they marred and defaced their household stuff; broke the looking-glasses and other utensils; threw about them corn and wine; sold what they could not destroy; and thus, in four or five days, the Protestants were stripper of above a million of money. But this was not the worst: they turned the dining-rooms of gentlemen into stables for horses, and treated the owners of the houses where they quartered with the greatest cruelty, lashing them about, not suffering them to eat or drink. When they saw the blood and sweat run down their faces they sluiced them with water, and, putting over their heads kettle-drums turned upside down, they made a continual din upon them, till these unhappy creatures lost their sense. At Negreplisse, a town near Montauban, they hung up Isaac Favin, a  Protestant citizen of that place, by his arm-pits, and tormented him a whole night by pinching and tearing off his flesh with pincers.

They made a great fire round about a boy twelve years old, who, with hands and eyes lifted up to heaven, cried out, “My God, help me!” and when they found the youth resolved to die rather than renounce his religion, they snatched him from the fire just as he was on the point of being burned. In several places the soldiers applied red-hot irons to the hands and feet of men and the breasts of women. At Nantes they hung up several women and maids by their feet, and others by their arm-pits, and thus exposed them to public view stark- naked. They bound suckling mothers to posts, and let their sucking infants lie languishing in their sight for several days and nights, crying and gasping for life. Some they bound before a great fire, and being half-roasted let them go — a punishment worse than death. Amid a thousand hideous cries, they hung up men and women by the hair, and some by their feet, on hooks in chimneys, and smoked them with wisps of wet hay till they were suffocated. They tied some under the arms with ropes, and plunged them again and again into wells; they bound others, put them to the torture. and with a funnel filled them with wine till the fumes of it took away their reason, when they made them say they consented to be Catholics. They stripped them naked, and, after a thousand indignities, stuck them with pins and needles from head to foot. In some places they tied fathers and husbands to bed-posts, and before their eyes ravished their wives and daughters with impunity They blew up men and women with bellows till they burst them. If any, to escape these barbarities, endeavored to save themselves by flight, they pursued them into the fields and woods, where they shot at them like wild beasts, and prohibited them from departing the kingdom (a cruelty never practiced by Nero or Diocletian) upon pain of confiscation of effects, the galleys, the lash, and perpetual imprisonment. With these scenes of desolation and horror the popish clergy feasted their eyes, and made only matter of laughter and sport of them.

3. England has also been the seat of much persecution. Though Wickliffe, the first Reformer, died peacefully in his bed, yet such was the malice and spirit of persecuting Rome that his bones were ordered to be dug up and cast upon a dunghill. The remains of this excellent man were accordingly dug out of the grave, where they had lain undisturbed forty-four years. His bones were burned, and the ashes cast into an adjoining brook. In the reign of Henry VIII, Bilney, Bayman, and many other Reformers, were burned; but when queen Mary came to the throne the most severe persecutions  took place. Hooper and Rogers were burned in a slow fire. Saunders was cruelly tormented a long time at the stake before he expired. Taylor was put into a barrel of pitch, and fire set to it. Eight illustrious persons, among whom was Ferrar, bishop of St. David's, were sought out, and burned by the infamous Bonner, in a few days. Sixty-seven persons were this year, A. D. 1555, burned, among whom were the famous Protestants Bradford, Ridley, Latimer, and Philpot. In the following year, 1556, eighty-five persons were burned. Women suffered; and one, in the flames, which burst her womb, being near her time of delivery, a child fell from her into the fire, which being snatched out by some of the observers more humane than the rest. the magistrate ordered the babe to be again thrown into the fire and burned. Thus; even the unborn child was burned for heresy! O God, what is human nature when left to itself! Alas, dispositions ferocious as infernal then reign and usurp the heart of man I The queen erected a commission court, which was followed by the destruction of near eighty more. Upon the whole, the number of those who suffered death for the reformed religion in this reign were no less than 277 persons; of whom were five bishops, twenty-one clergymen, eight gentlemen, eighty-four tradesmen, one hundred husbandmen, laborers, and servants, fifty-five women, and four children. Besides these, there were fifty-four more under prosecution, seven of whom were whipped, and sixteen perished in prison.

Nor was the reign of Elizabeth free from this persecuting spirit. If any one refused to consent to the least ceremony in worship, he was cast into prison, where many of the most excellent men in the land perished. Two Protestant Anabaptists were burned, and many banished. She also, it is said, put two Brownists to death; and though her whole reign was distinguished for its political prosperity, yet it is evident that she did not understand the rights of conscience; for it is said that more sanguinary laws were made in her reign than in any of her predecessors', and her hands were stained with the blood of both Papists and Puritans. James I succeeded Elizabeth: he published a proclamation commanding h Protestants to conform strictly, and without any exception, to all the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England. Above five hundred clergymen were immediately silenced or degraded for not complying. Some were excommunicated, and some banished the country. The Dissenters were distressed, censured, and fined in the Star Chamber. Two persons were burned for heresy, one at Smithfield and the other at Lichfield. Worn out with endless vexations and unceasing persecutions, many retired into  Holland, and from thence to America. It is stated by a judicious historian that. in this and some following reigns, 22,000 persons were banished from England by persecution to America. In Charles I's time arose the persecuting Laud, who was the occasion of distress to numbers. Dr. Leighton, for writing a book against the hierarchy, was sentenced to a fine of £10,000, perpetual imprisonment, and whipping. He was whipped, and then he was placed in the pillory; one of his ears was cut off; one side of his nose slit; he was branded on the cheek with a red-hot iron with the letters S. S.; whipped a second time, and placed in the pillory. A fortnight afterwards, his sores being yet uncured, he had the other ear cut off, the other side of his nose slit, and the other cheek branded. He continued in prison till the Long Parliament set him at liberty. About four years afterwards William Prynne, a barrister, for a book he wrote against the sports on the Lord's day, was deprived from practicing at Lincoln's Inn, degraded from his degree at Oxford, set in the pillory, had his ears cut off, imprisoned for life, and fined £5000.

Nor were the Presbyterians, when their government came to be established in England, free from the charge of persecution. In 1645 an ordinance was published subjecting all who preached or wrote against the Presbyterian directory for public worship to a fine not exceeding £50; and imprisonment for a year, for the third offense, for using the Episcopal book of Common Prayer even in a private family. In the following year the Presbyterians applied to Parliament, pressing them to enforce uniformity in religion, and to extirpate popery, prelacy, heresy, schism, etc., but their petition was rejected; yet in 1648 the Parliament, ruled by them, published an ordinance against heresy, and determined that any person who maintained, published, or defended the following errors should suffer death. These errors were: 1. Denying the being of a God. 2. Denying his omnipresence, omniscience, etc. 3. Denying the Trinity in any way. 4. Denying that Christ had two natures. 5. Denying the resurrection, the atonement, the Scriptures. In Charles II's reign the Act of Uniformity passed, by which two thousand clergymen were deprived of their benefices. Then followed the Conventicle Act and the Oxford Act, under which, it is said, eight thousand persons were imprisoned and reduced to want, and many to the grave. In this reign, also, the Quakers were much persecuted, and numbers of them imprisoned. Thus we see how England has bled under the hands of bigotry and persecution; nor was toleration enjoyed until William III came to the throne, who showed himself a warm friend to the rights of conscience. The  accession of the present royal family was auspicious to religious liberty; and as their majesties have always befriended toleration, the spirit of persecution has long been curbed.

4. Ireland has likewise been drenched with the blood of the Protestants, forty or fifty thousand of whom were cruelly murdered in a few days in different parts of the kingdom in the reign of Charles I. It began Oct. 23,1641. Having secured the principal gentlemen, and seized their effects, they murdered the common people in cold blood, forcing many thousands to fly from their houses and settlements naked into the bogs and woods, where they perished with hunger and cold. Some they whipped to death, others they stripped naked, and exposed to shame, and then drove them, like herds of swine, to perish in the mountains: many hundreds were drowned in rivers, some had their throats cut, others were dismembered. With some the execrable villains made themselves sport, trying who could hack the deepest into an Englishman's flesh; wives and young virgins were abused in the presence of their nearest relations; nay, they taught their children to strip and kill the children of the English, and dash out their brains against the stones. Thus many thousands were massacred in a few days, without distinction of age, sex, or quality, before they suspected their danger, or had time to provide for their defense.

5. Scotland, Spain, etc. — Besides the above-mentioned persecutions, there have been several others carried on in different parts of the world. Scotland, for many years together, was the scene of cruelty and bloodshed, till it was delivered by the monarch at the Revolution. Spain, Italy, and the valley of Piedmont, and other places, have been the seats of much persecution. Popery, we see, has had the greatest hand in this mischievous work. It has to answer, also, for the lives of millions of Jews, Mohammedans, and barbarians. When the Moors conquered Spain in the eighth century, they allowed the Christians the free exercise of their religion; but in the fifteenth century, when the Moors were overcome, and Ferdinand subdued the Moriscoes, the descendants of the above Moors, many thousands were forced to be baptized, or were burned, massacred, or banished, and their children sold for slaves; besides innumerable Jews who shared the same cruelties, chiefly by means of the infernal courts of the Inquisition. A worse slaughter, if possible, was made among the natives of Spanish America, where fifteen millions are said to have been sacrificed to the genius of popery in about forty years. It has been computed that fifty millions of Protestants have at different times been the victims of the  persecutions of the papists, and put to death for, their religious opinions. Well, therefore, might the inspired penman say, that at mystic Babylon's destruction “was found in her the blood of prophets, of saints and of all that was slain upon the earth” (Rev 18:24).

See Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1:156 sq.; Elliott,: Romanism; Milman, Hist. of Lat. Christ.; Leckey, Hist. of Rat.; European Mora's; Littell, Living Age, Aug. 11, 1855, .p. 330 sq.; Edinb. Rev. 63:38 sq.; Zeitschrift fur hist. Theol. 1861; North British Rev. 34:271; Limborch, Introduction to his History of the Inquisition; D'Enarolles, Memoirs of the Persecutions of the Protestants in France; Robinson, History of Persecution; Lockman, Hist. of Popish Persecution; Clark, Looking glass for Persecutors; Doddridge, Sermon on Persecution; Jortin, ibid. vol. iv, ser. 9; Fox, Martyrs; Wodrow, Hist. of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland; Neale, History of the Puritans, and of New England; Hist. of the Bohemian Persecutions; Roger Williams, Bloody Tenet; Backus, Hist. of New England; Bancroft, Hist. of the United States, vol. 1.

## Persephone[[@Headword:Persephone]]

             was the name of the. Grecian goddess who ruled over the infernal regions. By the Romans she was called Proserpina. She was the daughter of Zeus (Jupiter) and Demeter (Ceres). In Attica she was therefore called Κόρη, i.e. the Daughter. By Homer she was styled the wife of Hades (Pluto), and the queen of the lower world, and of the realms inhabited by the souls of the dead. Hence she is called Juno Inferna, Averna, and Stygia. She is said to have been the mother of the Eumenides, Erinyes, or Furies. Hesiod mentions a story of her having been carried off by Pluto, and of the search of Demeter instituted for her (laughter all over the earth by torch-light, until at length she found her in the realms below. An arrangement was now made that Persephone should spend a third of the year with Pluto, and two thirds with the gods above. She was generally worshipped along with Demeter, and temples in her honor are found at Corinth, Megara, Sparta, and at Locri, in the South of Italy. In art she is represented as grave and severe, as would become the queen of the lower world.

## Persepolis[[@Headword:Persepolis]]

             (Περσέπολις; Persepolis). This city is mentioned only once in the Bible, namely, in 2Ma 9:2, where it is said that Antiochus Epiphanes “entered [a city] called Persepolis, and went about to rob the temple and to hold the city; “but the inhabitants defending themselves, Antiochus was ignominiously put to flight. Persepolis was the capital of Persia at the time of the invasion of Alexander the Great, who, as is well known, wantonly burned it, as has been supposed at the suggestion of the courtesan Thais, to revenge the taking of Athens by Xerxes, but this story probably rests on the sole authority of Cleitarchus (Cleitarch. ap. Athen. 13, p. 576 e; Diod. Sic. 17:71, 2, 3; 72, 6; Plutarch, in Alex. 38 Quint. Curt. v. 7, 3). According to some authors, the whole city, as well as the magnificent palace, suffered in the general conflagration (Diod. Sic. l. c.; Arrian, 3:18, 11; Pliny, H. N. 6:26); but according to others it was only the palace (τὸ βασίλειον) that was destroyed (Strabo, xv, p. 730; Plutarch, in Alex. 38). Quintus Curtius (v. 7, 5) mentions that the palace was built with a great quantity of cedar, which increased the ardor of the flames. It is probable that the temples, which were of stone, escaped. That it could have been entirely destroyed seems hardly credible, for not only was it existing in the time of Antigonus, king of Asia (B.C. 306), who visited the palace himself (Diod. Sic. 19:46, 6), but at the same period Peucestas and Eumenes, formerly generals of Alexander, and now antagonists of Antigonus, both visited Persepolis, and the latter moved his camp there and; held it as the seat of government (προῆγον τῆς Περσίδος εἰς Περσέπολιν τὸ βασίλειον, Diod. Sic. 19:21, 2; 22, 1).

From this it would appear that the city itself was called τὸ βασίλειον. Moreover, at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, as recorded above (2Ma 9:2), it seems to have still been a repository of treasure; and Ptolemy (Geog. 6:44; 8:5, 13) mentions it as existing in his time. The extensive ruins now remaining would prove that it must either have been rebuilt or not totally destroyed by Alexander. It does not seem to have long survived the blow inflicted upon it by Alexander; for after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes it disappears altogether from history as an inhabited place. Persepolis has been considered by many as identical with Pasargadae (Niebuhr, Lect. on Ant. Hist. 1:115; Ousely, Travels, 2:6, 18), and in one passage of an ancient author there is some obscurity (Arrian, 3:18, 11), but the two cities are  afterwards distinguished (7:1, 1). All other ancient authors, however, carefully distinguish the position of the two cities (Strabo, 15, p. 729; Pliny, 6:26; Ptol. 6:4), and it is now ascertained that the ruins of these two cities are more than forty miles apart. Persepolis was situated on the plains of Merdusht, near the junction of two streams, the Araxes (Bendamir) and the Medus (Pulwan), while Pasargadee was about forty-nine miles from Persepolis on the plain of Murghab, where even now exist the ruins of the tomb of Cyrus (Arrian, 6:29). The ruins of Persepolis, which are very extensive, bear the name of Chehel Minar, or “Forty Pillars,” the remains of the palaces built by Darius, son of Hystaspes, and his son Xerxes. The city seems to have stood at the foot of the rock on which these ruins are placed. Three groups are chiefly distinguishable in the vast ruins existing on the spot. First, the Chehel Minar (Forty Pillars), with the Mountain of the Tombs (Rachmed), also called Takht-i-Jamshid, or the structure of Jamshid, after some fabulous ancient king, popularly supposed to be the founder of Persepolis. The next in order is Naksh-i-Rustam, to the north- west, with its tombs; and the last, the building called the Haram of Jamshid. The most important is the first group, situated on a vast terrace of cyclopean masonry at the foot of a lofty mountain-range.

The extent of this terrace is about 1500 feet from north to south, and about 800 from east to west, and it was, according to Diodorus Siculus, once surrounded by a triple wall of 16, 32, and 60 cubits respectively in height, for the threefold purpose of giving strength, inspiring awe, and defense. The whole internal area is further divided into three terraces-the lowest towards the south; the central being 800 feet square, and rising 45 feet above the plain; and the third, the northern, about 550 feet long, and 35 feet high. No traces of structures are to be found on the lowest platform; on the northern, only the so-called “Propyleea” of Xerxes; but the central platform seems to have been occupied by the foremost structures, which again, however, do not all appear to have stood on the same level. There are distinguished here the so-called “Great Hall of Xerxes” (called Chehel Minar, by way of eminence), the Palace of Xerxes, and the Palace of Darius, towering one above the other in successive elevations from the ground. The stone used for the buildings is darkgray marble, cut into gigantic square blocks, and in many cases exquisitely polished. The ascent from the plain to the great northern platform is formed by two double flights, the steps of which are nearly 22 feet wide, 83 inches high, and 15 inches in the tread, so that several travelers have been able to ascend them on horseback. What are called the Propylaea of Xerxes on this platform are two masses of stone-  work, which probably formed an entrance-gateway for foot-passengers, paved with gigantic slabs of polished marble. Portals, still standing, bear figures of animals 15 feet high, closely resembling the Assyrian bulls of Nineveh. The building itself, conjectured to have been a hall 82 feet square, is, according to the cuneiform inscriptions, as interpreted by Rawlinson, the work of Xerxes. An expanse of 162 feet divides this platform from the central one, still bearing many of those columns of the Hall of Xerxes from which the ruins have taken their name. The staircase leading up to the Chehel Minar, or Forty Pillars, is, if possible, still more magnificent than the first; and the walls are more superbly decorated with sculptures, representing colossal warriors with spears, gigantic bulls, combats with wild beasts, processions, and the like; while broken capitals, shafts, pillars, and countless fragments of buildings, with cuneiform inscriptions, cover the whole vast space of this platform, 350 feet from north to south, and 380 from east to west. The Great Hall of Xerxes, perhaps the largest and most magnificent structure the world has ever seen, is computed to have been a rectangle of about 300 X 350 feet, and to have consequently covered 105,000 square feet, or 2.5 acres. The pillars were arranged in four divisions, consisting of a center group six deep every way, and an advanced body of twelve in two ranks, the same number flanking the center. Fifteen columns are all that now remain of the number. Their form is very beautiful. Their height is 60 feet, the circumference of the shaft 16, the length from the capital to the torus, 44 feet.

The shaft is finely fluted in 52 divisions: at its lower extremity begin a cincture and a torus, the first two inches in depth, and the latter one foot, from whence devolves the pedestal, shaped like the cup and leaves of the pendent lotus, the capitals having been surmounted by the double semi-bull. Behind the Hall of Xerxes was the so-called Hall of Hundred Columns, to the south of which are indications of another structure, which Fergusson terms the Central Edifice. Next along the west front stood the Palace of Darius, and to the south the Palace, of Xerxes, measuring about 86 feet square, similarly decorated, and of similar grand proportions. For a further and more minute description, see Le Bruyn, Voy. au Levant, 4:301; Chardin, 2:140; Niebuhr, Reise in Arabien, etc., 2:121; Sir R. K. Porter, Travels, 1:576; Heeren, Asiatic Nations, 1:91; Rich, Residence in Kurdistan, 2:218-222; Fergusson, Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis Restored, p. 89; Vaux, Nineveh and Persepolis, p. 360; Ussher, A Journey from London to Persepolis, p. 532, etc. Persepolis is about four miles from Istakhr, the earliest occurrence of which name appears on a coin of the Mohammedan  conquerors of Persia, struck at this place A.H. 94 =A.D. 712; and as, according to Mr. Fergusson, “Pasargadae had been the royal residence of the Achaemenidne [βασίλειον ἀρχαῖον, Strabo, 15:3, 7], so Persepolis became the new town when Darius removed to Istakhr — the latter having been, in all ages subsequent, the city par excellence” (Fergusson, p. 92; Vaux, Nin. and Pers. p. 397, 401). It is curious that, while Herodotus and other ancient writers mention Susa, Babylon, and Ecbatana, no contemporary author mentions Persepolis; and moreover they “mark the portions of the year which the Persian monarchs used to spend at their several residences in such a manner as to leave no portion of the year vacant for Persepolis” (Heeren, Asiatic Nations, 1:92). Atheneus (Deipnosoph. 12:513, F), however, says that the Persian kings resided at Persepolis during the autumn of each year; but statements of other writers (Xenoph. Cyrop. 8:6, 22; Plutarch, De Exil. 12:10) leave this uncertain. Notwithstanding, it cannot be doubted that it was a royal residence, and. as Strabo (xv, p. 729) states, after Susa, the richest city of the Persians. SEE PERSIA.

It is, however, to be observed that the expedition of Antiochus Epiphanes to Persia is very differently related in 1Ma 6:1-2. It is there stated that Antiochus, “having heard say that Elymais, in the country of Persia, was a city (ὅτι ἐστιν Ε᾿λυμα ϊvς ἐν τῇ Περσίδι πόλις; ὅτι ἐστιν ἐν Ε᾿λυμὲς ἐν τῇ Περσιδι πόλις, Cod. Alex.) greatly renowned for riches, silver, and gold, and that there was in it a very rich temple, wherein were coverings of gold, and breastplates and shields, which Alexander, son of Philip, the Macedonian king, who reigned first among the Grecians, had left there, came and sought to take the city and to spoil it,” but was defeated in the attempt. This account is strictly followed by Josephus (Ant. 12:9, 1), who adds that it was the temple of Diana against which the expedition was made — a fact also recorded by Polybius (31:11), but by Appiain (Syr. 66) stated to have been the temple of Venus. These statements receive some confirmation from the temple of the goddess “Nanaea” being mentioned as visited by Antiochus (2Ma 1:13-15). Nanaea has been identified with both Artemis and Aphrodite, and is evidently the Α᾿ναῖτις of Strabo (15, p. 532), the numnen patriunm of the Persians. Medes, and Armenians. (For an account of this deity, see Norris, in Roy. As. Soc. 15:161; Rawlinson, Herod. 1:634.) SEE NANAEA.

It is quite evident that there is an error in the Maccabees and in Josephus, in both of which Elymais is called “a city,” for all historians and geographers  call it a province (Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. s.v. Elymais), and it is even so particularized in the Cod. Alex.; and Strabo especially (16, p. 744), who mentions three temples-of Belus, Minerva, and Diana, called Azara-does not place them in the city of Elymais, but at different places in the country of the Elymaeans. It was the temple of Belus that was attacked by Antiochus the Great in B.C. 187, when he was killed by the people, who rose in its defense (Strabo, l.c. 16:1, 18; Diod. Sic. 29:15; comp. 28:3; Justin, 32, ch. 2), against the opinion of Aurelius Victor (De Viris Illust. 54), who says he was slain by his attendants during the carousals. Taking the following facts into consideration —

1. That Persepolis, according to the account of most historians, was utterly destroyed, and all the treasures carried away;

2. that the expedition of Antiochus Epiphanes thereto is only recorded in the 2d Maccabees;

3. that Antiochus's father had already made an attack on the temple of Elymais, which was perhaps a judgment, for the, soon to do the same;

4. that the expedition to Elymais and to its temple — the deity of which is named — is not only mentioned in the 1James , 2 d Maccabees, but is also recorded by Polybius and Appian — it seems more probable that it was against an Elynocean temple that Antiochus Epiphanes directed his attack, an opinion that has been already advanced by Grimm (Kurzgef. exeg. Handb. zu den Apokr.). See Rawlinson, Anc. Monarchies, 4:237 sq.; North Amer. Rev. 1836, p. 7. SEE ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.

## Perseus[[@Headword:Perseus]]

             the name of a Grecian character in mythology, was the son of Zeus and Danae, and grandson of Acrisius. Acrisius had been warned by an oracle that he should be killed by the hand of the son of Danae, so he shut her up in a brazen tower. Zeus visited her there in the form of a shower of gold, and became the father of Perseus. Hence his is called Aurigena. When Acrisius discovered the birth of the boy, he put both him and his mother into a chest and cast it into the sea, but Zeus carried it ashore at Seriphos (and there Perseus was brought up), one of the Cyclades, where Polydectes reigned, who, wishing to get rid of him to be free in his approaches to Danae, with whom he had become enamored, sent Perseus, when yet a  youth, to bring the head of the Gorgon Medusa, on the pretense that he wanted to present it as a bridal gift to Hippodaania. Perseus set forth under the protection of Athena and Hermes, the former of whom gave him a mirror, by which he could see the monster without looking at her (for that would have changed him into stone); the latter, a sickle; while the nymphs provided him with winged sandals, and a helmet of hades, or invisible cap. After numerous wonderful adventures, he reached the abode of Medunsa, who dwelt near Tartessus, on the coast of the ocean, and succeeded in cutting off her head, which he put into a bag and carried off. On his return he visited Ethiopia, where he liberated and married Andromeda, by whom he subsequently had a numerous family, and arrived at Seriphos in time to rescue his mother from the annoyance of the too ardent addresses of Polydectes, whom, along with some of his companions, he changed into stone. After this he went to Argos, from which Acrisius fled to Thessaly, but Perseus followed him in disguise, hoping to persuade him to return. While taking part in the games there, he threw the discus in such a way that Acrisius was killed by it, without Perseus's intention. Then Perseus assumed the vacant throne. Perseus was worshipped as a hero in various parts of Greece, and according to Herodotus in Egypt too. In ancient works of art the figure of Perseus much resembles that of Hermes. See Vollmer, Mythologisches Worterbuch, s.v.; Mrs. Clement, Sacred and Legendary Art and Mythol. p. 478, 479.

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

             (Περσεύς, the name originally of a mythological Greek character, Vulg. Perses), the eldest (illegitimate or supposititious? ) son of Philip V and last king of Macedonia. After his father's death (B.C. 179) he continued the preparations for the renewal of the war with Rome, which was seen to be inevitable. The war, which broke out in B.C. 171, was at first ably sustained by Perseus; but in 168 he was defeated by L. AEmilius Paullus at Pydna, and shortly afterwards surrendered with his family to his conquerors. He graced the triumph of Paullus, and died in honorable retirement at Alba. The defeat of Perseus put an end to the independence of Macedonia, and extended even to Syria the terror of the Roman name (1Ma 8:5).

## Perseverance[[@Headword:Perseverance]]

             is the continuance in any design, state, opinion, or course of action. In theological science the perseverance of the saints is a doctrine so named, which teaches that those who are truly converted by the Holy Spirit shall never finally and totally fall from grace, but shall hold out to the end and be saved. This doctrine has afforded considerable matter for controversy between the Calvinists and Arminians, the former maintaining this doctrine of Final Perseverance, the latter denying it. We shall briefly state the arguments of the Calvinists and the objections made by the Arminians.

The advocates of the doctrine of Final Perseverance found their belief upon the decree of God, whereby he has predestinated the elect to grace and glory; inferring that therefore they will certainly persevere;. and arguing that their perseverance is a part of their election, for God has decreed to keep such persons that they should not fall. (The Bible passage very generally quoted to prove the perseverance of the saints, in connection with foreordination, unconditional election, etc., is Rom 8:28-30.) It is thus; stated in the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith: “They whom God hath accepted in his beloved, effectually called and sanctified by his Spirit, canneither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace; but shall certainly persevere therein to the: end, and be eternally saved.” According to the Calvinistic theory of regeneration, the soul is chosen by God from eternity, its conversion and regeneration are-wholly the work of the Holy Spirit, and the work, having been begun by God for his own good pleasure, will not and cannot be abandoned by him. Or, to quote, again the words of the Westminster Assembly's Confession of Faith, “This perseverance of the saints depends not upon their own free-will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing ‘from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father: upon the efficacy of the merit and intercession of Jesus Christ; the abiding of the Spirit, and of the seed of God within them; and the nature of the covenant of grace-from all which ariseth also the certainty and infallibility thereof.” “The perfections of God,” says Buck, “are a strong argument to prove this doctrine.

(1.) God, as a Being possessed of infinite love, faithfulness, wisdom, and power, can hardly be supposed to suffer any of his people finally to fall into perdition. This would be a reflection on his attributes, which are all pledged for their good, as a father of his family. His love to his people is unchangeable, and therefore they cannot be the objects of it at one time  and not at another (Joh 13:1; Zep 3:17; Jer 31:3). His faithfulness to them and to his promise is not founded upon their merit, but upon his own will and goodness; this, therefore, cannot be violated (Mal 3:6; Num 23:19). his wisdom foresees every obstacle in the way, and is capable of removing it, and directing them into the right path. It would be a reflection on his wisdom, after choosing a right end, not to choose right means in accomplishing the same (Jer 10:6-7). His power is insuperable, and is absolutely and perpetually displayed in their preservation and protection (1Pe 1:5).

(2.) Another proof of this doctrine is their union to Christ, and what he has done for them. They are said to be chosen in him (Eph 1:4), united to him (Eph 1:23), the purchase of his death (Rom 8:34; Tit 2:14), the objects of his intercession (Rom 5:10; Rom 8:34; 1Jn 2:1-2). Now if there be a possibility of their finally falling, then this choice, this union, his death and intercession, may all be in vain, and rendered abortive; an idea as derogatory to the divine glory, and as dishonorable to Jesus Christ, as possibly can be.

(3.) It is proven also from the work of the Spirit, which is to communicate grace and strength equal to the day (Php 1:6; 2Co 1:21-22). If, indeed, divine grace were dependent on the will of man, if by his own power he had brought himself into a state of grace, then it might follow that he might relapse into an opposite state when that power at any time was weakened; but as the perseverance of the saints is not produced by any native principles in themselves, but by the agency of the Holy Spirit, enlightening, confirming, and establishing them, of course they must persevere, or otherwise it would be a reflection on this Divine Agent (Rom 8:9; Corinthians 6:11; Joh 4:14; Joh 16:14).

(4.) Lastly, the declarations and promises of Scripture are very numerous in favor of this doctrine (Job 17:9; Psa 94:14; Jer 32:40; Joh 10:28; Joh 17:12; 1Co 1:8-9; 1Pe 1:5; Pro 4:18), all of which could not be true, if this doctrine were false.”

According to the Arminian theology, on the other hand, the Spirit of God is equally ready and willing to act upon all hearts; its efficacy over some rather than others depends solely upon their own free-will in choosing Christ, and yielding to the influence of the Spirit; hence, if they thereafter choose again to reject Christ, and steel themselves against the continuing influences of the Holy Spirit, they can do so, in which case they are said to  have fallen from grace. This possibility of the final apostasy of the saints, Arminians assert on the authority of Heb 6:4, as well as of the many warnings against falling away which the Scriptures contain (Eze 7:20; Eze 18:24; Heb 6:3; Heb 6:6; Psa 135:3-5), and inasmuch as it is foretold as a future event that some should fall away (Mat 24:12-13; Joh 15:6; Mat 13:20-21), and that many have in fact fallen away, as David, Solomon, Peter, Alexander, Hymenaeus, etc. This last point has become of so much importance in the controversy that those who hold to the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints maintain that they may temporarily fall away into sin, and suffer loss by their inconsistency and backsliding, and also that those cases in which seeming Christians abandon their Christian profession and hope altogether, are explained by the declaration that the conversion in such cases was a spurious one. The Calvinists go even so far as to claim that “the difference between Arminian and Calvinist on this subject, though very considerable, is less, practically, than has sometimes been supposed, since both agree that one may give all the external evidences of having commenced a Christian life, and yet fall away and be finally lost. The real difference between them is that the Arminians hold that in such a case the professor of religion was really a Christian, but lost his religion by turning his lack upon Christ; while the Calvinist holds that the appearances were deceitful, and the professed Christian was never really a child of God” (Dr. Lyman Abbott); or, as Mr. Edwards says of all apostates, “They had no root, no oil in their vessels.” To this mode of arguing the question Arminians take decided exception, since the fact that professed saints do not persevere does not prove that all real ones will do so. More properly expressed, the Calvinistic proposition stands thus: “Professed saints do not persevere. Therefore all real saints will persevere.” The exposure of the hypocrite the Arminian denies to be proof that the real saint cannot apostatize, and though David and Peter were finally restored, it does riot prove that either had grace in his heart at the time of his fall. “To assert this,” says Nash, “in the case of David, is to assert that a murderer and an adulterer hath eternal life abiding in him; and to assert it in the case of Peter, is to assert that a person may be in a state of grace and yet profanely deny Christ.” Besides, this doctrine absolutely places the Christian higher than Adam stood in his primeval state. SEE PERFECTION.

Even in his first trial Adam could fall. According to Calvinism, the Christian has reached a point where he can no more be liable to fall from God. It also removes the decision of a question from its proper jurisdiction — the final  judgment — and places it at the point of conversion. It teaches that when a person becomes truly converted he is absolutely assured of eternal life, and of course his meetness for heaven is prospectively settled, and therefore, granting the conversion to be genuine, the judgment-day becomes a farce. But the most common objection raised by the Arminians is that the doctrine of final perseverance makes men careless concerning virtue and holiness, and supersedes the use of means and renders exhortation unnecessary. Its advocates, however, reply that this objection is not valid against them, “the true doctrine of Perseverance of Saints being one of perseverance in holiness and giving no encouragement to a confidence of final salvation which is not; connected with a present and even an increasing holiness,” or, as Abbott puts it: “Both Calvinist and Arminian agree in urging all professed Christians to exercise diligence in making their calling and election sure, the one that they be not deceived, the other that they lose not what they have gained.” The Church of England, without pronouncing any authoritative opinion on this question, declares in the 16th Article that “after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin; and by the grace of God may rise again.” “To our own safety our own sedulitv is required,” is the sentiment of Hooker, in his sermon on The Certainty and Perpetuity of Faith in the Elect. See Beza, Principles; Whitby and Gill, On the Five Points; Calvin, Institutes, bk. 3, ch. 23; Williston, Harmony of Divine Truth (art. on Persev.); Cole, Sovereignty of God; Booth, Reign of Grace; Doddridge, Lectures, lect. 179; Turretin, Comp. Theology, loc. 14, p. 156; Witsius, OEconomia; lib. iii, ch. 13; Topladyt, Works, v. 476; Ridgley, Body of Divinity, qu. 79; Wesley, Works, 6:50; Fletcher, Works; Watson, Institutes; Hall, Help to Zion's; Travellers; Newton, Works; Edwards, Works, 3:509-532; Dwight, Theology, serm. 87; Fuller, Works; Goodwin, Works, p. 238, 280; Cunningham, Hist. Theol. 1:355 sq.; 2:490 sq.; Hodge, Doctrinal Theology (see Index); Whately, St. Paul (essay 4); Browne, Expos. of the XXXIX Articles; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. 35:222; Christian Remembr. Jan. 1856, p. 158; Christian Journal, vol. 8; Nevin, in Mercersb. Rev. 1857, p. 73, 197; Griffin, Park Street Lectures; Scott, Synod of Dort, p. 220; Olivers, Perseverance; Nash, Perseverance.

## Persia[[@Headword:Persia]]

             (Heb. Paras', פָּרִס; native Fars, thought to be either from the Zend Pars, “‘pure” or “splendid,” or from Farash [פָּרָשׁ], “a horse,” that animal being abundant there; Sept. Περσίς; Vulg. Perses), the name of one of the interior countries of Hither Asia, varying greatly in application according to time and circumstances. The following account of it embraces the ancient and the modern information, with a special view to Biblical illustration. SEE PERSIAN.

I. Extent and Physical Features. — The name is used in two or three senses geographically and historically.

1. “Persia” was strictly the name of a tract of no very large dimensions on the Persian Gulf, which is still known as Fars, or Farsistin, a corruption of the ancient appellation. This tract was bounded on the west by Susiana or Elam, on the north by Media, on the south by the Persian Gulf, and on the east by Carmania, the modern Kerman. It was, speaking generally, an and and unproductive region (Herod. 9:122; Arrian, Exp. — Alex. v. 4; Plato, Leg. iii, p. 695, A); but contained some districts of considerable fertility. The worst part of the country was that towards the south, on the borders of the gulf, which has a climate and soil like Arabia, being sandy and almost without streams, subject to pestilential winds, and in many places covered with particles of salt. Above this miserable region is a tract very far superior to it, consisting of rocky mountains — the continuation of Zagros — among which are found a good many fertile valleys and plains, especially towards the north, in the vicinity of Shiraz. Here is an important stream, the Bendamir, which, flowing through the beautiful valley of Merdasht and by the ruins of Persepolis, is then separated into numerous channels for the purpose of irrigation, and, after fertilizing a large tract of country (the district of Kurjan), ends its course in the salt lake of Baktigan. Vines, oranges, and lemons are produced abundantly in this region; and the wine of Shiraz is celebrated throughout Asia. Farther north an and country again succeeds, the outskirts of the Great Desert, which extends from Kerman to Mazenderan, and from Kashan to Lake Zerrah.

Ptolemy(Geogr. 6:4) divides Persia into a number of provinces, among which the most important are Paraetacene on the north, which was  sometimes reckoned to Media (Herod. 1:101; Steph. Byz. ad voc Παραίτακα), and Mardyenl on the south coast, the country of the Mardi. The chief towns were Pasargadae, the ancient, and Persepolis, the later capital. Pasargadve was situated near the modern village of Murgaub, 42 miles nearly due north of Persepolis, and appears to have been the capital till the time of Darius, who chose the far more beautiful site in the valley of the Bendamir, where the Chehel Minar, or “Forty Pillars,” still stand. SEE PERPSEPOLIS. Among other cities of less importance were Paraetaca and Gabne in the mountain country, and Taoce upon the coast. See Strab. 15:3, § 1-8; Pliny, H. N. 6:25, 26; Ptolem. Geogr. 6:4; Kinneir, Persian Empire, p. 54-80 Malcolm, Hist. of Persia, 1:2; Ker Porter, Travels, 1:458, etc.; Rich, Journey from Bushire to Persepolis, etc.

2. While the district of Fars is the true original Persia, the name is more commonly applied, both in Scripture and by profane authors, to the entire tract which came by degrees to be included within the limits of the Persian empire. This empire extended at one time from India on the east to Egypt and Thrace upon the west, and included, besides portions of Europe and Africa, the whole of Western Asia between the Black Sea, the Caucasus, the Caspian, and the Jaxartes upon the north, the Arabian desert, the Persian Gulf, and the Indian Ocean upon the south. According to Herodotus (3:89), it was divided into twenty governments, or satrapies; but from the inscriptions it would rather appear that the number varied at different times, and when the empire was most flourishing considerably exceeded twenty. In the inscription upon his tomb at Naksh-i-Rustam, Darius mentions no fewer than thirty countries as subject to him besides Persia Proper. These are — Media, Susiana, Parthia, Aria, Bactria, Sogdiana, Chorasmia, Zarangia, Arachosia, Sattagydia, Gandaria, India, Scythia, Babylonia, Assyria, Arabia, Egypt, Armenia, Cappadocia, Saparda, Ionia, (European) Scythia, the islands (of the AEgean), the country of the Scodrae, (European) lonia, the lands of the Tacabri, the Budians, the Cushites or Ethiopians, the Mardians, and the Colchians.

The name “Persia” is not found in the older records of the Bible, but after the Babylonian period it occurs frequently (2Ch 36:20; 2Ch 36:22; Ezr 4:5 sq.; Ezr 6:14 sq.; Est 1:3; Est 8:10; 1Ma 1:1), meaning the great Persian kingdom founded by Cyrus. The only passage in Scripture where Persia designates the tract which has been called above “Persia Proper” is Eze 38:5. SEE ELAM.

3. Modern Persia or “Iran” is bounded on the north by the great plain of Khiva, the Caspian Sea, and the Trans-Caucasian provinces of Russia; on the east by Bokhara, Afghanistan, and Beloochistan; on the south by the Strait of Ormuz and the Persian Gulf; and on the west by the Shat-el-Arab and Asiatic Turkey. It contains about 545,000 square miles, and consists for the most part of a great table-land or elevated plateau, which in the center and on the east side is almost a dead level; but on the north, west, and south is covered with a broad belt of mountain-region, here and there interspersed with tracts of desert and small fertile plains. The mountain- system of Persia has its root in the north-west corner of the kingdom, and is a continuation of the Taurus, Armenian, and Caucasian chains. The Taurus chain enters Persia a little to the north-east of Lake Van and then turns in a southeasterly direction, ramifying into numerous parallel chains, which traverse the west and south of the country, covering it for a width of from 100 to 330 miles. At its south-eastern extremity this chin joins the Jebel-Abad, which runs eastward through the center of the province of Kerman, and forms the southern boundary of the plateau. The range is generally limestone, and, like all other mountains of the same character, presents many caves and grottos. The province of Azerbijan, in the north- west, is almost wholly mountainous. — On the east side of Azerbijan, a spur of the Caucasus, separated from it, however, by the valley of the Kur and Araxes, runs southwards at some little distance from and parallel to the shore of the Caspian, at the south-west corner of which it becomes more elevated, and as the majestic range of the Elburz takes an easterly direction, following the line of the Caspian coast at a distance varying from 12 to 60 miles.

On reaching Astrabad it divides into three great parallel ranges of somewhat inferior elevation, which pursue first an east, and then a south-east direction, joining the Paropamisus in Afghanistan. Many of the hills in the Elburz are covered with perpetual snow; and the highest peak, Mount Demavend, is more than 20,000 feet above the sea. The Persian mountains are mostly of a primitive character; granite, porphyry, feldspar, and mountain limestone enter largely into their composition; they also, in great part, exhibit indications of volcanic action-Demavend itself being evidently an extinct volcano; and the destructive earthquakes which are still of frequent occurrence in the north and north-west of Persia indicate the presence of subterranean fires. The Elburz on the north, the Zagros on the west, the Kerman mountains on the south, and Afghanistan on the east, are the boundaries of the Persian plateau, which ranges from 2000 to 5000 feet above sea-level, the lowest portion being the Great Salt Desert, in the  north-west of Khorassan, which has 2000 feet of elevation above the sea; while the average elevation of the whole plateau above the sea is about 3700 feet. The lower level, out of which the upland rises, is called the Dushtistan, or “Level Country,” and stretches along the coast of the Persian Gulf and the Gulf of Ormuz, south of the Bakhtiyari and Kerman ranges, and also along the Caspian Sea, between it and the Elhurz. The aspect of the plateau, diversified as it is for the most part with hills and valleys, mountains and plains, is, contrary to what might naturally be expected, dreary and forbidding. The interior mountains are everywhere bare and, unrelieved by trees or shrubs, and present the appearance of huge masses of gray rock piled one on the other, or starting in abrupt ridges from the level plain. The plains are equally unattractive; and those which are not deserts consist either of gravel which has been washed down from the mountain slopes or accumulated into deep and extensive beds during some former revolution of nature, or of a hard, dry clay. To render such a country fertile requires the presence of abundant water; but, unfortunately for Persia, nature has been remarkably sparing in this respect. The whole of the east and center of the country is entirely destitute of rivers; the country south of the Kerman mountains is very meagerly supplied, the rivers, such as they are, being almost wholly confined to the western and the Caspian provinces.

Almost the whole of Khorassan, the north half of Kerman, the east of Irak- Ajemi, which form the great central plain, and detached portions of all the other provinces, with the exception of those on the Caspian Sea, forming more than three fourths of the surface of Persia, are desert. In some parts of this waste the surface is dry, and produces a scanty herbage of saline plants; in other parts it is covered with salt marshes, or with a dry, hard, salt crust, sometimes of considerable thickness, which glitters and flashes in the sunlight, forcing the traveler on these inhospitable wastes to wear a shade to protect his eyes; but by far the greater portion of this region consists of sand, sometimes so light and impalpable as to be shifted thither and thither by the slightest breeze. This great central desert contains a few oases, but none of great extent. The largest of the salt deserts of Persia is the “Dasht Beyad,” commonly known as the Great Salt Desert of Khorassan, which lies in the north-west of that province, and is 400 miles in length by 250 miles in breadth. Some parts of Persia, however, are of exceeding fertility and beauty; the immense valleys, some of them 100 miles in length, between the various ranges of the Kerman mountains,  abound with the rarest and most valuable vegetable productions; great portions of the provinces of Fars, Khuzistan, Ardelan, and Azerbijan have been lavishly endowed by nature with the most luxuriant vegetation; while the Caspian provinces, and the southern slopes of the Elburz, are as beautiful as wood, water, and a fine climate can make them — the mountain-sides being clothed with trees and shrubs, and the plains studded with nature's choicest products.

The climate is necessarily very varied. What the Younger Cyrus is reported to have said to Xenophon regarding the climate, “that people perish with cold at the one extremity, while they are suffocated with heat at the other,” is literally true. Persia may be considered to possess three climate — that of the southern Dushtistan, of the elevated plateau, and of the Caspian provinces. In the Dushtistan, the autumnal heats are excessive, those of summer more tolerable, while in winter and spring the climate is delightful. The cold is never intense, and snow seldom falls on the southern slope of the Kerman range. The rains are not heavy, and occur in winter and spring. The district is extremely healthy. On the plateau, the climate of Fars is temperate, and as we proceed northwards, the climate improves, attaining its greatest perfection about Ispahan. Here the winters and summers are equally mild, and the regularity of the seasons appears remarkable to a stranger. To the north and north-west of this the winters are severe; and in Kurdistan, the greater part of Azerbijan, and the region of the Elburz, the climate is quite alpine. The desert region of the center and east, and the country on its border, suffer most oppressive heat during summer and piercing cold in winter. The Caspian provinces, from their general depression below the sea-level, are exposed to a degree of heat in summer almost equal to that of the West Indies, and their winters are mild. Rains, however, are frequent and heavy, and many tracts of low country are marshy and extremely unhealthy. With the exception of the Caspian provinces, the atmosphere of Persia is remarkable above that of all other countries for its dryness and purity, a fact frequently proved by exposing pieces of polished iron to the action of the air, and finding whether or not they rust.

II. Inhabitants. —

1. Classification of the Population. Herodotus tells us that the Persians were divided into ten tribes, of which three were noble, three agricultural, and four nomadic. The noble tribes were the Pasargadee, who dwelt,  probably, in the capital and its immediate neighborhood; the Maraphians, who are perhaps represented by the modern Mafi, a Persian tribe which prides itself on its antiquity; and the Maspians, of whom nothing more is known. The three tribes engaged in agriculture were called the Panthialaeans, the Derusiaeans, and the Germanians, or (according to the true orthography) the Carmanians. These last were either the actual inhabitants of Kerman, or settlers of the same race, who remained in Persia while their fellow-tribesmen occupied the adjoining region. The nomadic tribes are said to have been the Dahi, who appear in Scripture as the “Dehavites” (Ezr 4:9), the Mardi, mountaineere famous for their thievish habits (Steph. Byz.), together with the Sagartians and the Derbices or Dropici, colonists from the regions east of the Caspian. The royal race of the Achaemenidae was a phratry or clan of the Pasargadse (Herod. 1:126); to which it is probable that most of the noble houses likewise belonged. Little is heard of the Maraphians, and nothing of the Maspians, in history; it is therefore evident that their nobility was very inferior to that of the leading tribe.

The modern population of Persia is naturally divisible into two classes, the settled and the nomad. The settled population are chiefly Tajiks, the descendants of the ancient Persian race, with an intermixture of foreign blood — Turkish, Tartar, Arab, Armenian, or Georgian. To this class belong the agriculturists, merchants, artisans, etc. From having long been a subject race, they have to a large extent lost their natural independence and manliness of character, and acquired, instead, habits of dishonesty, servility, and cunning. The Tajiks are Mohammedans of the Shiite sect, with the exception of the few remaining Parsees (q.v.) or Guebres who are found in Kerman and Fars, and still retain their purity of race and religious faith. The nomad or pastoral tribes, or eylats (Qyl, a clan), are of four distinct races — Tulkomans, Kurds, Luurs, and Arabs. Their organization is very similar to that which formerly subsisted among the Highland clans of Scotland, with the exception that the former are nomad, while the latter inhabited a fixed locality. Each tribe is ruled by its hereditary chief (ujak), and under him by the heads of the cadet branches (tirehs) of his family. Of the four races, the Turkoman is by far the most numerous, and forms at the present day the ruling race in Persia. The Kurds are few in number, the greater part of their country and race being hinder the sway of Turkey. The Arabs are also few in number, and at the present day can hardly be distinguished from the Persians, having adopted both their manners and  language. The Luurs are of nearly pure Persian blood. The nomad races, especially the Turkomans, profess the Sunni creed; they are distinguished from the Tajiks by their courage, manliness, and independence of character; but they are inveterate robbers, and since their entrance into the country in the 10th century it has continually been distracted by civil wars and revolutions. The whole population of Persia is estimated in round numbers at 10,000,000, of whom 3,000,000 are nomads (200,000 of these being Arabs). Classed according to their religious belief, they stand thus: 7,500,000 are Shiites; 500,000 are unorthodox Shiites; 1,500,000 are Sunnites; while the remaining 500,000 are made up of Christians of all denominations (including 200 000 Armenians, 100,000 Nestorians), along with Jews, Guebres, etc.

2. Character and Customs. — The government of Persia was despotic, though there seems to have been a council of state, composed perhaps of the seven princes who “see the king's face” (Ezr 7:14; Est 1:14). These, after the time of Cyrus, may have been the six magnates or their representatives (“his well-wishers,” as he names them) who conspired with Darius against the pseudo-Smerdis, along with a prince of the royal house. The sovereign often administered judgment promptly and personally, though he was approached with tedious and stately formalities, as if in some sense he was an impersonation of Ormuzl. The council might speak faithfully, as did Artabanus to Xerxes; or they might be as compliant as when they told the same monarch that, though there was no law permitting him to marry his sister, there was a law allowing him to do as he pleased. The Spartan embassy refused to do the required homage to Xerxes, as in their opinion it amounted to religious worship. In Plutarch (Themist. 27) reference is made to the king, who was to be worshipped ώς εἰκόνα θεοῦ, “as the image of God,” and Curtius tells us how much Alexander coveted this deification (8:5, 11). The seven princes of the empire, seem to have been regarded also as representing the seven amshashpands who stand before the throne of Ormuzd. The sculptures at Persepolis tell the same story, and the Visparad directs prayer to to be offered “to the ruler of the country” (Spiegel, Eridn, p. 74). The satraps appointed by Darius are called in Hebrew אֲחִשְׁדִּרְפְּנַים, in Greek σατράπης. in old Persian, as on the inscriptions, khshatrapai — the X in the Hebrew form being usually inserted before the Persian khsh. A district  or smaller portion of country was put under a פֶּחָה, or prefect (Est 3:12; Ezr 8:36), the word being allied to the familiar term pacha.

This name is applied to the Persian governor west of the Euphrates (Neh 2:7; Neh 2:9; Neh 3:7); also to the governor of Judaea, as Zerubbabel (Hag 1:1; Hag 2:2; and Neh 5:14; Neh 12:26). Another term given to a Jewish prefect is “the Tirshatha,” applied to Nehemiah (Neh 8:9; comp. Ezr 2:63; Neh 7:65). The title probably means, as Gesenius says, “your serenity,” or, as we have it, “most dread sovereign.” The royal scribes kept a regular journal of judicial procedure, and these “chronicles” were deposited in the chief cities. Thus in Ezra we read of the “house of the rolls,” in which search was made, by command of Darius, for a copy of the decree of Cyrus concerning the Jews and Jerusalem, and the “record” was found in the palace at Achmetha (Ezr 6:1). In Esther occurs also this incident (Est 6:1-2): “On that night could not the king sleep; and he commanded to bring the book of records of the chronicles; and they were read before the king. And it was found written that Mordecai had told of Bigthana and Teresh, two of the king's chamberlains, the keepers of the door, who sought to lay hand on the king Ahasuerus” (see also Est 10:2). When the enemies of Daniel were afraid that the king might relent towards a favorite, they pressed upon him this constitutional maxim, “Sign the writing, that it be not changed, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not.” As the king solemnly admitted the maxim, he was again pressed with it: “Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, that no decree or statute which the king establisheth may be changed” (Dan 6:15).

We are not to infer from such language that a royal decree was in every sense irrevocable, or beyond the power of modification or repeal. But the words imply that edicts could not be capriciously altered, and that the despot was bound and regulated by past decisions and precedents. The book of Esther shows, moreover, how a decree, though it could not be reversed, might easily be neutralized. The Jews marked out for assassination got warrant to defend themselves, and to become assassins in turn (Esther 8, 9). The satrapian form of administration necessitated the employment of posts and means of conveyance. A vivid picture of such an organization — scribes, translators, and couriers — is given in Est 8:9-10. The system is described by Herodotus (8:98). “Nothing mortal,” he says, “travels so fast.” Relays of men and horses were stationed at due distances, and license was given to the couriers to press men, horses, and ships into their service. This service was called ἀγγαρήϊον — a Tatar  word meaning “work without pay.” Rawlinson, however, suggests other derivations. The verb αγγαρεύω came to signify to press into service like a Persian ἄγγαρος; and Persian domination brought the wood into Palestine. Compare Mat 5:41; Mar 15:21, where the verb is rendered in the first instance “compel thee to go,” and in the second is applied to the soldiers forcing Simon to carry Christ's cross. The Persian revenues were raised partly in money and partly in kind. The queen's wardrobe and toilet were provided for by certain districts, and they were named according to the article which they were taxed to furnish — one being called the Queen's Veil and another the Queen's Girdle. The court, according to Ctesias, consisted of an immense retinue. The only water which the king drank was that of the Choaspes; the salt on his table was imported from Africa, and the wine from Syria. Athenneus (4) depicts at length the royal etiquette and extravagance, such as we have it in the first chapter of Esther. The surveillance of the harem was committed to eunuchs, and the seraglio was often the real governing power. The residences of the monarchs of Persia (who called themselves “king of kings; “see Gesen. Jesa. 1:392; comp. Berfey, Pers. Keilinschr. p. 54, 57, 62) were various. Pasargada, with its royal tombs was most ancient. Persepolis rose not very far from it, and became a treasure-city. After the overthrow of the Babylonian kingdom, Cyrus, while preserving a regard for the more ancient cities of the empire, seems to have thought Babylon a more suitable place for the metropolis of Asia; but as it might not be politic, if it were possible, to make a strange place the center of his kingdom, he founded a new city. Susa, where he was still on Persian ground, and yet not far distant from Babylon. There was also Ecbatana, the Median capital. These several royal abodes seem to have been occupied by the later monarchs, according to the season of the year.

Among the people there were minute distinctions of rank and formal salutations. When two persons of equal station met, they kissed on the lips; if one was of slightly lower rank, the kiss was on the cheek; and where the difference was great, the inferior prostrated himself on the ground. They drank wine in large quantities, and often under its influence formally deliberated on public affairs. Polygamy was freely practiced. No one was put to death for a first offense, but ferocity was often shown to captives or rebels. Darius himself says of Phraortes, “I cut off his nose and his ears. He was chained at my door; all the kingdom beheld him; afterwards I crucified  him” (Inscription at Behistun, Colossians 3). The severity of masters towards slaves was wisely restrained (Herod. 1:133, etc.). The Persian youth were taught three things — ἱππεύειν, καὶ τοξεύειν, καὶ ἀληθίζεσθαι — “to ride, to shoot, and to speak truth” (Herod. 1:136). The Persians had made no small progress in the fine arts, especially in architecture, as the ruins of Persepolis testify. These stately and imposing ruins stand on a leveled platform, raised above several terraces — the ascent being by a stair, or double flight of steps the grandest in the world, and yet so gradual in its rise that the traveler may ride up on horseback. The stones are of dark gray marble, often exquisitely polished. Colossal bulls guarded the front of the portals, and the sculptures are not unlike those of Assyria. The space on the upper platform stretches north and south 350 feet, and east and west 380 feet, and is now covered with broken capitais, shafts, etc.; of beautiful workmanship. The pillars are arranged in four divisions — a central group six deep every way, an advanced body of twelve in two ranks, and the same number flanking the center (Sir R. K. Porter). The principal apartments are adorned with sculptures and bass-reliefs, such as the king on his throne and his courtiers around him, with processions of warriors, captives, and bearers of tribute. These sculptures, many of them of the period of Darius and Xerxes, verify the descriptions of Herodotus and Xenophon. The royal pleasure-gardens and hunting-grounds were named פִּרְדֵּס, in Greek παράδεισος. The original term is an old Eastern one, and it is vain to seek for a Greek derivation. The kings were passionately fond of hunting, and, as exhibited on the rock sculptures, seem to have followed the pastime in a truly Easter manner. The soldiers were armed with bows and short spears, and protected with small helmets on their heads, and steel-scaled tunics on their bodies. In war they fought bravely, but without discipline, generally gaining their victories by the vigor of their first attack; if they were strenuously resisted, they soon flagged; and if they suffered a repulse, all order was at once lost, and the retreat speedily became a rout. The old Persian dress-tight and close-fitting-was superseded under Cyrus by the more flowing Median vestments; and on the Persepolitan monuments the Persians appear “in long robes, with their hair floating behind.”

The Persians were a people of lively and impressible minds, brave and impetuous in war, witty, passionate, for Orientals truthful, not without  some spirit of generosity, and of more intellectual capacity than the generality of Asiatics. Their faults were vanity, impulsiveness, a want of perseverance and solidity, and an almost slavish spirit of sycophancy and sevility towards their lords. In the times anterior to Cyrus they were noted for the simplicity of their habits, which offered a strong contrast to the luxuriousness of the Medes; but from the date of the Median overthrow this simplicity began to decline; and it was not very long before their manners became as soft and efeminate as those of any of the conquered peoples.

3. Language. — The spoken language of the ancient Persians was closely akin to the Sanscrit, or ancient language of India (see Schultz, Handbuch der Persischen Sprache, Elbing, 1863, 8vo). We find it in its earliest stage in the Zendavesta — the sacred book of the whole Aryan race, where, however, it is corrupted by a large admixture of later forms. The inscriptions of the Achaemenian kings give us the language in its second stage, and, being free from these later additions, are of the greatest importance towards determining what was primitive, and what more recent in this type of speech. The earliest form of the written characters was the cuneiform (q.v.). Modern Persian is a degenerate representative, being a motley idiom largely impregnated with Arabic; still, however, both in its grammar and its vocabulary, it is mainly Aryan; and, historically, it must be regarded as the continuation of the ancient tongue, just as Italian is of Latin, and modern of ancient Greek (see Adelung, Mithridat. 1:255 sq.; Frank. De Persidis Lingua et Genio [Norimb. 1809]; Wahl, Gesch. d. Morgenland. Sprache u. Literatur, p. 129 sq.; Lassen, in the Zeitschrift f die Kunde des Morgenlandes, VI, 3:488 sq.).

4. Religion. — The religion which the Persians brought with them into Persia Proper seems to have been of a very simple character, differing from natural religion in little, except that it was deeply tainted with dualism. Like the other Aryans, the Persians worshipped one Supreme God, whom they called Aura-mazda (Oromasdes) — a term signifying (as is believed) “the Great Giver of Life.” From Oromasdes came all blessings — “he gave the earth, he gave the heavens, he gave mankind, he gave life to mankind” (Inscriptions, passin) — he settled the Persian kings upon their thrones,  strengthened them, established them, and granted them victory over all their enemies. The royal inscriptions rarely mention any other god. Occasionally, however, they indicate a slight and modified polytheism. Oromasdes is “the chief of the gods,” so that there are other gods besides him; and the highest of these is evidently Mithra (q.v.), who is sometimes invoked to protect the monarch, and is beyond a doubt identical with “the sun.” To the worship of the sun as Mithra was probably attached, as in India, the worship of the moon, under the name of Homa, as the third greatest god. Entirely separate from these — their active resister and antagonist — was Ahriman (Arimanius), “the Death-dealing” — the powerful, and (probably) self-existing Evil Spirit, from whom war, disease, frost, hail, poverty, sin, death, and all other evils, had their origin. Ahriman was Satan, carried to an extreme — believed to have an existence of his own, and a real power of resisting and deifying God. Ahriman could create spirits, and as the beneficent Auramazda had surrounded himself with good angels, who were the ministers of his mercies towards mankind, so Ahriman had surrounded himself with evil spirits, to carry out his malevolent purposes. Worship was confined to Auramazda and his good spirits; Ahriman and his daemons were not worshipped. but only hated and feared. SEE ORMUZD.

The character of the original Persian worship was simple. They were not destitute of temples, as Herodotus asserts (Herod. 1:131; comp. Beh. Inscr. Colossians 1, par. 14, § 5); but they had probably few altars, and certainly no images. Neither do they appear to have had any priests. Processions were formed, and religious chants were sung in the temples, consisting of prayer and praise intermixed, whereby the favor of Auramazda and his good spirits was supposed to be secured to the worshippers. Beyond this it does not appear that they had any religious ceremonies. Sacrifices, apparently, were nusunal, though thank-offerings may have been made in the temples. SEE PARSEES.

From the first entrance of the Persians, as immigrants, into their new territory, they were probably brought into contact with a form of religion very different from their own Magianism, the religion of the Scythic or Turanian population of Western Asia, had long been dominant over the greater portion of the region lying between Mesopotamia and India. The essence of this religion was worship of the elements more especially of the subtlest of all, fire. It was an ancient and imposing system, guarded by the venerable hierarchy of the Magi, boasting its fire-altars where from time  immemorial the sacred flame had burned without intermission, and claiming to some extent mysterions and miraculous powers. The simplicity of the Aryan religion was speedily corrupted by its contact with this powerful rival, which presented special attractions to a rude and credulous people. There was a short struggle for pre-eminence, after which the rival systems came to terms. Dualism was retained, together with the names of Auramazda and Ahriman, and the special worship of the sun and moon under the appellations of Mithra and Homa; but to this was superadded the worship of the elements and the whole ceremonial of Magianism, including the divination to which the Magian priesthood made pretense. The worship of other deities, as Tanata or Anaitis, was a still later addition to the religion, which grew more complicated as time went on, but which always maintained as its leading and most essential element that dualistic principle whereon it was originally based. SEE MAGI.

III. History. — In remote antiquity it would appear that the Persians dwelt in the region east of the Caspian, or possibly in a tract still nearer India. The first Fargard of the Vendidad seems to describe their wanderings in these countries, and shows the general line of their progress to have been from east to west, down the course of the Oxus, and then, along the southern shores of the Caspian Sea, to Rhages and Media. It is impossible to determine the period of these movements; but there can be no doubt that they were anterior to B.C. 880 at which time the Assyrian kings seem for the first time to have come in contact with Aryan tribes east of Mount Zagros. Probably the Persians accompanied the Medes in their migration from Khorassan, and, after the latter people took possession of the tract extending from the river Kur to Ispahan, proceeded still farther south, and occupied the region between Media and the Persian Gulf. It is uncertain whether they are to be identified with the Bartsu or Partsu of the Assyrian monuments. If so, we may say that from the middle of the 9th to the middle of the 8th century B.C. they occupied South-eastern Armenia, but by the end of the 8th century had removed into the country which thenceforth went by their name. The leader of this last migration would seem to have been a certain Acheemenes. who was recognized as king of the newly occupied territory, and founded the famous dynasty of the Achaemenide-, about B.C. 700. Very little is known of the history of Persia between this date and the accession of Cyrus the Great, near a century and a half later. The crown appears to have descended in a right line through four princes-Teispes, Cambyses I, Cyrus I, and Carmbyses II, who was the  father of Cyrus the Conqueror Telspes must have been a prince of some repute, for his daughter Atossa married Pharnaces, king of the distant Cappadocians (Diod. Sic. ap. Phot. Bibliothec. p. 1158). Later, however, the Persians found themselves unable to resist the growing strength of Media, and became tributary to that power about B.C. 630, or a little earlier. The line of native kings was continued on the throne, and the internal administration was probably untouched; but external independence was altogether lost until the revolt under Cyrus.

Of the circumstances under which this revolt took place we have no certain knowledge. The stories told by Herodotus (1:108-129) and Nicolas of Damascus (Fr. 66) are internally improbable; and they are also at variance with the monuments, which prove Cyrus to have been the son of a Persian king. SEE CYRUS. We must therefore discard them, and be content to know that after about seventy or eighty years of subjection, the Persians revolted from the Medes, engaged in a bloody struggle with them, and finally succeeded, not only in establishing their independence, but in changing places with their masters, and becoming the ruling people. The probable date of the revolt is B.C. 558. Its success, by transferring to Persia the dominion previously in the possession of the Medes, placed her at the head of an empire the bounds of which were the Halys upon the west, the Euxine upon the north, Babylonia upon the south, and upon the east the salt desert of Iran. As usual in the East, this success led on to others' Craesus, the Lydian monarch, who had united most of Asia Minor under his sway, venturing to attack the newly risen power, in the hope that it was not vet firmly established, was first repulsed, and afterwards defeated and made prisoner, by Cyrus, who took his capital, and added the Lydian empire to his dominions. This conquest was followed closely by the submission of the Greek settlements on the Asiatic coast, and by the reduction of Caria, Caunus, and Lycia. The empire was soon afterwards extended greatly towards the north-east and east. Cyrus rapidly overran the flat countries beyond the Caspian, planting a city. which he called after himself (Arrian, Exp. Alex. 4:3), on the Jaxartes (Jihfn); after which he seems to have pushed his conquests still farther to the east, adding to his dominions the districts of Herat, Cabul, Candahar, Seistan, and Beloochistan, which were thenceforth included in the empire (see Ctesias, Pers. Exc. § 5 et sq.; and comp. Pliny, H. N. 6:23). In B.C. 539 or 538 Babylon was attacked, and after a stout defense fell before his irresistible bands. SEE BABYLON.

This victory first brought the Persians into contact  with the Jews. The conquerors found in Babylon an oppressed racelike themselves abhorrers of idols — and professors of a religion in which to a great extent they could sympathize. This race, which the Babylonian monarchs had torn violently from their native land and settled in the vicinity of Babylon, Cyrus determined to restore to their own country; which he did by the remarkable edict recorded in the first chapter of Ezra (Ezr 1:2-4). Thus commenced that friendly connection between the Jews and Persians which prophecy had already foreshadowed (Isa 44:28; Isa 45:1-4), and which forms so remarkable a feature in the Jewish history. After the conquest of Babylon, and the consequent extension of his empire to the borders of Egypt, Cyrus might have been expected to carry out the design which he is said to have entertained (Herod. 1:153) of an expedition against Egypt. Some danger, however, seems to have threatened the north-eastern provinces, in consequence of which his purpose was changed; and he proceeded against the Massagetse or the Derbices, engaged them, but was defeated and slain. He reigned, according to Herodotus, twenty-nine years.

Under his son and successor, Cambyses III, the conquest of Egypt took place (B.C. 525), and the Persian dominions were extended southward to Elephantinb and westward to Euesperidse on the North-African coast. This prince appears to be the Ahasuerus of Ezra (4:6), who was asked to alter Cyrusn's policy towards the Jews, but (apparently) declined all interference. We have in Herodotus (bk. 3) a very complete account of his \warlike expeditions, which at first resulted in the successes above mentioned, but were afterwards unsuccessful, and even disastrous. One army perished in an attempt to reach the temple of Ammon, while another was reduced to the last straits in an expedition against Ethiopia. Perhaps it was in consequence of these misfortunes that, in the absence of Cambyses with the army, a conspiracy was formed against him at court, and a Magian priest, Gomates (Gaumata) by name, professing to be Smerdis (Bardiya), the son of Cyrus, whom his brother Cambyses had put to death secretly, obtained quiet possession of the throne. Cambyses was in Syria when news reached him of this bold attempt; and there is reason to believe that, seized with a sudden disgust, and despairing of the recovery of his crown. he fled to the last resort of the unfortunate, and ended his life by suicide (Behistun Inscription, Colossians 1, par. 11, § 10). His reign had lasted seven years and five months.  Gomates the Magian found himself thus, without a struggle, master of Persia (B.C. 522). His situation, however, was one of great danger and delicacy. There is reason to believe that he owed his elevation to his fellow-religionists, whose object in placing him upon the throne was to secure the triumph of Magianism over the dualism of the Persians. It was necessary for him therefore to accomplish a religious revolution, which was sure to be distasteful to the Persians, while at the same time he had to keep up the deception on which his claim to the crown was professedly based, and to prevent any suspicion arising that he was not Smerdis, the son of Cyrus. To combine these two aims was difficult; and it would seem that Gomates soon discarded the latter, and entered on a course which must have soon caused his subjects to feel that their ruler was not only no Achaemenian, but no Persian. He destroyed the national temples, substituting for them the fire-altars and abolished the religious chants and other sacred ceremonies of the Oromasdians. He reversed the policy of Cyrus with respect to the Jews, and forbade by an edict the farther building of the Temple (Ezr 4:17-22). SEE ATAXERXES.

He courted the favor of the subject nations generally by a remission of tribute for three years, and an exemption during the same space from forced military service (Herod. 3:67). Towards the Persians he was haughty and distant, keeping them as much as possible aloof from his person, and seldom showing himself beyond the walls of his palace. Such conduct made him very unpopular with the proud people which held the first place among his subjects, and the suspicion that he was a mere pretender having after some months ripened into certainty, a revolt broke out, headed by Darius, the son of Hystaspes, a prince of the blood-royal, which in a short time was crowned with complete success. Gomates quitted his capital, and, having thrown himself into a fort in Media, was pursued, attacked, and slain. Darius then, as the chief of the conspiracy, and after his father the next heir to the throne, was at once acknowledged king. The reign of Gomates lasted seven months.

The first efforts of Darius were directed to the re-establishment of the Oromasdian religion in all its purity. He “rebuilt the temples which Gomates the Magian had destroyed, and restored to the people the religious chants and the worship of which Gomates the Magian had deprived them” (Beh. Inscr. Colossians 1, par. 14). Appealed to in his second year by the Jews, Who wished to resume the construction of their Temple, he not only allowed them, confirming the decree of Cyrus, but assisted the  work by grants from his own revenues, whereby the Jews were able to complete the Temple as early as his sixth year (Ezr 6:1-15). During the first part of the reign of Darius the tranquillity of the empire was disturbed by numerous revolts. The provinces regretted the loss of those exemptions which they had obtained from the weakness of the Pseudo-Smerdis, and hoped to shake off the yoke of the new prince before he could grasp firmly the reins of government. The first revolt was that of Babylon, where a native, claiming to be Nebuchadnezzar, the son of Nabonadius, was made king; but Darius speedily crushed this revolt and executed the pretender. Shortly afterwards a far more extensive rebellion broke out. A Mede, named Phraortes, came forward, and; announcing himself to be “Xathrites, of the race of Cyaxares,” assumed the royal title. Media, Armenia, and Assyria immediately acknowledged him — the Median soldiers at the Persian court revolted to him — Parthia and Hyrcania after a little while declared in his favor — while in Sagartia another pretender, making a similar claim of descent from Cyaxares, induced the Sagartians to revolt; and in Margiana, Arachotia, and even Persia Proper, there were insurrections against the authority of the new king. His courage and activity, however, seconded by the valor of his Persian troops and the fidelity of some satraps, carried him successfully through these and other similar difficulties; and the result was that, after five or six years of struggle, he became as firmly seated on his throne as any previous monarch. His talents as an administrator were upon this brought into play. He divided the whole empire into satrapies, and organized that somewhat complicated system of government on which they were henceforth administered (Rawlinson's Herodotus, 2:555-568). He built himself a magnificent palace at Persepolis, and another at Susa. SEE PERSEPOLIS; SEE SHUSHAN.

He also applied himself, like his predecessors, to the extension of the empire; conducted an expedition into European Scythia, from which he returned without disgrace; conquered Thrace, Pneonia, and Macedonia towards the west, and a large portion of India on the east, besides (apparently) bringing into subjection a number of petty nations (see the Naksh-i-Rustam Inscription). On the whole he must be pronounced, next to Cyrus, the greatest of the Persian monarchs. The latter part of his reign was, however, clouded by reverses. The disaster of Mardonius at Mount Athos was followed shortly by the defeat of Datis at Marathon; and, before any attempt could be made to avenge the blow, Egypt rose in revolt (B.C. 486), massacred its Persian garrison, and declared itself independent. In the palace at the same time there was dissension; and  when, after a reign of thirty-six years, the fourth Persian monarch died (B.C. 485), leaving his throne to a young prince of strong and ungoverned passions, it was evident that the empire had reached its highest point of greatness, and was already verging towards its decline.

Xerxes, the eldest son of Darius by Atossa, daughter of Cyrus, and the first son born to Darius after he mounted the throne, seems to have obtained the crown in part by the favor of his father, over whom Atossa exercised a strong influence, in part by right, as the eldest male descendant of Cyrus, the founder of the empire. His first act was to reduce Egypt to subjection (B.C. 484), after which he began at once to make preparations for his invasion of Greece. It is probable that he was the Ahasuerus of Esther. SEE AHASUERUS.

The great feast held in Shushan, the palace, in the third year of his reign, and the repudiation of Vashti, fall into the period preceding the Grecian expedition, while it is probable that he kept open house for the “princes of the provinces, of who would from time to time visit the court, in order to report the state of their preparations for the war. The marriage with Esther, in the seventh year of his reign, falls into the year immediately following his flight from Greece, when he undoubtedly returned to Susa, relinquishing warlike enterprises, and henceforth devoting himself to the pleasures of the seraglio. It is unnecessary to give an account of the well-known expedition against Greece, which ended so disastrously for the invaders. Persia was taught by the defeats of Salamis and Platsea the danger of encountering the Greeks on their side of the AEgean, while she learned at Mycale the retaliation which she had to expect on her own shores at the hands of her infuriated enemies. For a while some vague idea of another invasion seems to have been entertained by the court; but discreeter counsels prevailed, and, relinquishing all aggressive designs, Persia, from this point in her history, stood upon the defensive, and only sought to maintain her own territories intact, without anywhere trenching upon her neighbors. During the rest of the reign of Xerxes, and during part of that of his son and successor, Artaxerxes, she continued at war with the Greeks, who destroyed her fleets, plundered her coasts and stirred up revolt in her provinces; but at last, in B.C. 449, a peace was concluded between the two powers, who then continued on terms of amity for half a century.

A conspiracy in the seraglio having carried off Xerxes (B.C. 465), Artaxerxes his son, called by the Greeks Μακρόχειρ, or “the Long- Handed,” succeeded him, after an interval of seven months, during which  the conspirator Artabanus occupied the throne. This Artaxerxes, who reigned forty years, is beyond a doubt the king of that name who stood in such a friendly relation towards Ezra (Ezr 7:11-28) and Nehemiah (Neh 2:1-9, etc.). SEE ARTAXERXES.

His character, as drawn by Ctesias, is mild but weak; and under his rule the disorders of the empire seem to have increased rapidly. An insurrection in Bactria, headed by his brother Hystaspes, was with difficulty put down in the first year of his reign (B.C. 464), after which a revolt broke out in Egypt, headed by Inarus the Libyan and Amyrtaeus the Egyptian, who, receiving the support of an Athenian fleet, maintained themselves for six years (B.C. 460-455) against the whole power of Persia, but were at last overcome by Megabyzus, satrap of Syria. This powerful and haughty noble soon afterwards (B.C. 447), on occasion of a difference with the court, himself became a rebel, and entered into a contest with his sovereign, which at once betrayed and increased the weakness of the empire. Artaxerxes is the last of the Persian kings who had any special connection with the Jews, and the last but one mentioned in Scripture. His successors were Xerxes II, Sogdianus, Darius Nothus, Artaxerxes Mnemon, Artaxerxes Ochus, and Darius Codomannus. These monarchs reigned from B.C. 424 to B.C. 330. None were of much capacity; and during their reigns the decline of the empire was scarcely arrested for a day, unless it were by Ochus, who reconquered Egypt, and gave some other signs of vigor. Had the younger Cyrus succeeded in his attempt, the regeneration of Persia was perhaps possible. After his failure the seraglio grew at once more powerful and more cruel. Eunuchs and women governed the kings, and dispensed the favors of the crown, or wielded its terrors, as their interests or passions moved them. Patriotism and loyalty were alike dead, and the empire must have fallen many years before it did had not the Persians early learned to turn the swords of the Greeks against one another, and at the same time raised the character of their own armies by the employment on a large scale of Greek mercenaries. The collapse of the empire under the attack of Alexander is well known, and requires no description here. On the division of Alexander's dominions among his generals, Persia fell to the Seleucidae, under whom it continued till after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, when the conquering Parthians advanced their frontier to the Euphrates, and the Persians came to be included among their subject tribes (B.C. 164). Still their nationality was not obliterated. In A.D. 226, three hundred and ninety years after their subjection to the Parthians, and five hundred and fifty-six years after the  loss of their independence, the Persians shook off the yoke of their oppressors, and once more became a nation.

The Sassanian kings raised Persia to a height of power and prosperity such as it never before attained, and more than once emperilled the existence of the Eastern empire. The last king was driven from the throne by the Arabs (A.D. 636), who now began to extend their dominion in all directions; and from this. period may be dated the gradual change of character in the native Persian race, for they have been from this time constantly subject to the domination of alien races. During the reigns of Omar (the first of the Arab rulers of Persia), Othman, All, and the Ommiades (634-750), Persia was regarded as an outlying province of the empire, and was ruled by deputy governors; but after the accession of the Abbaside dynasty (A.D. 750), Bagdad became the capital, and Khorassan the favorite province of the early and more energetic rulers of this race, and Persia consequently came to be considered as the center and nucleus of the caliphate. But the rule of the caliphs soon became merely nominal, and ambitious governors, or other aspiring individuals, established independent principalities in various parts of the country. Many of these dynasties were transitory, others lasted for centuries, and created extensive and powerful empires. The chief were the Taherites (820-872), a Turkish dynasty, in Khorassan; the Soffarides (Persian, 869-903), in Seistan, Fars, Irak, and Mazanderan; the Samani, in Transoxiana, Khorassan, and Seistan; the Dilemi (Persian, 933-1056), in Western Persia; and the Ghiznevides, in Eastern Persia. These dynasties supplanted each other, and were finally rooted out by the Seljuks, whose dominion extended from the Hellespont to Afghanistan. A branch of this dynasty, which ruled in Khorezm (now Khiva), gradually acquired the greater part of Persia, driving out the Ghiznevides and their successors, the Ghurides; but they, along with the numerous petty dynasties which had established themselves in the south-western provinces, were all swept away by the Mongols (q.v.) under Genghis-Khan and his grandson Hulaku-Khan, the latter of whom founded a new dynasty, the Perso-Mongol (1253-1335).

This race, becoming effeminate, was supplanted by the Eylkhanians in 1335, but an irruption of the Tartars of Turkestan under Timur again freed Persia from the petty dynasties which misruled it. After the death of Timur's son and successor, shall Rokh, the Turkomans took possession of the western part of the country, which, however, they rather preyed upon than governed; while the eastern portion was divided and subdivided among Timir's descendants, till, at the close of  the 15th century, they were swept away by the Uzbeksi who joined the whole of Eastern Persia to their newly founded khanate of Khiva. A new dynasty now arose (1500) in Western Persia, the first prince of which (Ismail, the descendant of a long line of devotees and saints, the objects of the highest reverence throughout Western Persia), having become the leader of a number of Turkish tribes who were attached by strong ties of gratitude to his family, overthrew the power of the Turkomans, and seized Azerbijan, which was the seat of their power. Ismail rapidly subdued the western provinces, and in 1511 took Khorassan and Balkh from the Usbeks; but in 1514 he had to encounter a much more formidable enemy — to wit, the mighty Selim (q.v.), the sultan of Turkey, whose zeal for conquest was further inflamed by religious animosity against the Shiites, or “Sectaries,” as the followers of Ismail were termed.

The Persians were totally defeated in a battle on the frontiers; but Selim reaped no benefit from his victory, and, after his retreat, Ismail attacked and subdued Georgia. The Persians dwell with rapture on the character of this monarch, whom they deem not only to be the restorer of Persia to a prosperous condition, and the founder of a great dynasty, but the establisher of the faith in which they glory as the national religion. His son Tamasp (1523- 1576), a prudent and spirited ruler, repeatedly drove out the predatory Uzbeks from Khorassan, sustained without loss a war with the Turks, and assisted Homayun, the son of Baber, to regain the throne of Delhi. After a considerable period of internal revolution, during which the Turks and Uzbeks attacked the empire without hinderance, shall Abbas I the Great (1585-1628) ascended the throne, restored internal tranquillity, and repelled the invasions of the Uzbeks and Turks. In 1605 he inflicted on the Turks such a terrible defeat as kept them quiet during the rest of his reign, and enabled him to recover the whole of Kurdistan, Mosul, and Diarbekir, which had for a long time been separated from Persia; and, in the east, Candahar was taken from the Great Mogul. Abbas's government was strict, but just and equitable; roads, bridges, caravansaries, and other conveniences for trade were constructed at immense expense, and the improvement and ornamentation of the towns were not neglected. Ispahan more than doubled its population during his reign. His tolerance was remarkable, considering both the opinions of his ancestors and subjects; for he encouraged the Armenian Christians to settle in the country, well knowing that their peaceable and industrious habits would help to advance the prosperity of his kingdom. His successors, shall Sufi (1628-1641), shall Abbas II (1641-1666), and shall Soliman (1666-1694), were  undistinguished by any remarkable talents, but the former two were sensible and judicious rulers, and advanced the prosperity of their subjects. During the reign of sultan Hussein (1694-1722), a weak and bigoted fool, priests and slaves were elevated to the most important and responsible offices of the empire, and all who rejected the tenets of the Shiites were persecuted. The consequence was a general discontent, of which the Afghans took advantage by declaring their independence, and seizing Candahar (1709).

Their able leader, Mir Vais, died in 1715; but his successors were worthy of him, and one of them, Mahmud, invaded Persia (1722), defeated Hussein's armies, and besieged the king in Ispahan, till the inhabitants were reduced to the extremity of distress. Hussein then abdicated the throne in favor of his conqueror, who, on his accession, immediately devoted his energies to alleviate the distresses and gain the confidence of his new subjects, in both of which objects he thoroughly succeeded. Becoming insane, he was deposed in 1725 by his brother Ashraf (1725-1729); but the atrocious tyranny of the latter was speedily put an end to by the celebrated Nadir Shah, who first raised Tamasp (1729 1732) and his son Abbas II (1732-1736), of the Suffavean race, to the throne, and then, on some frivolous pretext, deposed him, and seized the scepter (1736-1747). But on his death: anarchy again returned; the country was horribly devastated by the rival claimants to the throne; Afghanistan and Beloochistan finally separated from Persia, and the country was split up into a number of small independent states until 1755, when a Kurd, named Kerim Khan (17551779), abolished this state of affairs, re- established peace and unity in Western Persia, and by his wisdom, justice, and warlike talents acquired the esteem of his subjects and the respect of neighboring states.

After the usual contests for the succession, accompanied with the usual barbarities and devastations, Kerim was succeeded in 1784 by Ali-Murad, Jaafar, and Luft-Ali, during whose reigns Mazanderan became independent under Aga-Mohammed, a Turkoman eunuch of the Kajar race, who repeatedly defeated the royal armies, and ended by depriving Luft-Ali of his crown (1795). The great eunuch-king (as he is frequently called), who founded the present dynasty, on his accession announced his intention of restoring the kingdom as it had been established by Kerim Khan, and accordingly invaded Khorassan and Georgia, subduing the former country almost without effort. The Georgians besought the aid of Russia; but the Persian monarch, with terrible promptitude, poured his army like a torrent into the country, and devastated it with fire and sword; his conquest was, however, hardly  completed, when he was assassinated, May 14, 1797. His nephew, Futteh- Ali (1797-1834), after numerous conflicts, fully established his authority, and completely subdued the rebellious tribes in Khorassan. but the great commotions in Western Europe produced for him bitter fruits. He was dragged into a war with Russia soon after his accession, and, by a treaty concluded in 1791, surrendered to that power Derbend and several districts on the Kur. In 1802 Georgia was declared to be .a Russian province.

War with Russia was recommenced by Persia, at the instigation of France; and, after two years of conflicts disastrous to the Persians, the treaty of Gulistan (Oct. 12, 1813) gave to Russia all the Persian possessions to the north of Armenia, and the right of navigation in the Caspian Sea. In 1826 a third war, equally unfortunate for Persia, was commenced with the same power, and cost Persia the remainder of its possessions in Armenia, with Erivan, and a sum of 18,000,000 rubles for the expenses of the war. The severity exercised in procuring this sum by taxation so exasperated the people that they rose in insurrection (Oct. 12, 1829), and murdered the Russian ambassador, his wife, and almost all who belonged to or were connected with the Russian legation. The most humiliating concessions to Russia, and the punishment by mutilation of 1500 of the rioters, alone averted war. The death of the crown prince, Abbas-Mirza, in 1833, seemed to give the final blow to the declining fortunes of Persia, for he was the only man who seriously attempted to raise his country from the state of abasement into which it had fallen. By the assistance of Russia and Britain, Mohammed Shah (1834-1848), the son of Abbas-Mirza, obtained the crown, but the rebellions of his uncles, and the rivalry of Russia and Britain (the former being generally successful) at the Persian court, hastened the demoralization of the country. Mohammed was compelled to grant (1846) to Russia the privilege of building ships of war at Resht and Astrabad, and to agree to surrender all Russian deserters, and Persia became thus more and more dependent on its powerful neighbor. Nazir-uddin succeeded to the throne on his father's death in 1848; and the new government announced energetic reforms, reduction of imposts, etc., but limited itself to these fine promises, and on the contrary, augmented the taxes, suffered the roads, bridges, and other public works to go to ruin, squandered the public money, and summarily disposed of all who protested against their acts. In October, 1856, the Persians took Herat, a town for the permanent possession of which they had striven for a long series of years; and having thus violated the terms of a treaty with Britain, war was declared against them, and a British army was landed on the coast of the gulf, which, under  generals Outram and Havelock, repeatedly defeated the Persians, and compelled them to restore Herat (July, 1857). Since that time treaties of commerce have been concluded with the leading European powers; and Russia, Great Britain, Turkey, France, and Italy have consuls in the chief towns, and, with the exception of Italy, are represented by ministers at the court of Teheran.

IV. Literature. — The sources of information regarding the ancient Persian history are:

1. The Jewish, to be elicited chiefly from the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, of which something has been said.

2. Grecian writers. Of these, Ctesias availed himself of the Persian annals, but we have only extracts from his work in Photins. Herodotus appears also to have consulted the native sources of Persian history. Xenophon presents us with the fullest materials, namely, in his Anabasis, his “Hellenica, and especially in his Cyropaedia, which is an imaginary picture of a perfect prince, according to Oriental' conceptions, drawn in the person of Cyrus the elder. Some of the points in which the classical authorities disagree may be found set forth in Eichhorn, Gesch. der A. Welt, 1:82, 83. A representation of the Persian history, according to Oriental authorities, may be found in the Hallische Allgemeine Welfgeschichte, pt. 4. (See also Becker, Weltgeschichte, 1:638 sq.) A very diligent compilation is that of Brissonilus, De Regno Persarum, 1591. Consult especially Heeren, Ideen, 1:1; his Handbuch der G. d. S. Alterth. 1:102; and H. Brochner, Um det jodiske Folks Tilstand i den Persiske Periode (Copenhagen, 1845). A full and valuable list of the older authorities in Persian affairs may be seen in the Bibliotheca Historica of Meusellius, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 28 sq. See also Malcolm, History of Persia from the Earliest Ages to the Present Times (Lond. 1816, 2 vols. 4to); and Sir H. Rawlinson's “Memoir on the Cuneiform Inscriptions of Ancient Persia,” published in the Journal of the Asiatic Society, vol. 10 and 11: Polak, Persien, dus Land und seine Bewohner (Leips. 1865 sq., 2 vols. 8vo); Friedlainder, De veteribus Persarumr regibus (Hal. 1862, 8vo); Hutchinson, Two Years in Persia (Lond. 1874, 2 vols.); Markham, History of Persia (ibid. 1874). The most complete as well as recent survey of ancient Persia is given in Rawlinson's Ancient Monarchies, vol. iii (new edition, Lond. 1871). SEE ELAM; SEE MEDIA.

## Persian[[@Headword:Persian]]

             (Heb. Parsi', פִּרְסַי; Sept. Περσής; Vulg. Perses), the name of the people who inhabited the country called above “Persia Proper,” and who thence conquered a mighty empire. There is reason to believe that the Persians were of the same race as the Medes, both being branches of the great Aryan stock, which under various names established their sway over the whole tract between Mesopotamia and Burmah. The native form of the name is Parsa, which the Hebrew פִּרְסַיfairly represents, and which remains but little changed in the modern ‘ Parsee.” It is conjectured to signify “the Tigers.” SEE PERSIA.

## Persian Christians[[@Headword:Persian Christians]]

             That the Gospel was early planted in Persia we have the most unequivocal evidence in the terrible persecution of Christians which began there in A.D. 330, whereby, in forty years, about 250 of the clergy and 16,000 others, of both sexes, were martyred in the cause of Christ, though many of them have been considered as heretics by the Church of Rome, being of the Nestorian and Jacobite communions. In the 7th century they fell under the scourge of Mohammedan tyranny and persecution, whereby many were driven to seek a refuge in India, particularly on the coasts of Travancore, while the great mass of the population apostatized to Mohammed; a circumstance that Mr. Yeates very naturally attributes to their not having the Scriptures in their own language till very recently.

In the middle of the last century a version of the Gospels was made by order of Nadir Shah, who, when it was read to him, treated it with contempt and ridicule; but since the commencement of the present century the Rev. H. Martyn has translated the whole New Testament. It was completed in the year in which he died (1812), and has been presented to the king of Persia by the British ambassador, and favorably received. Notwithstanding both persecution and apostasy, the number of Christians in Persia is said to be still very considerable, and to comprise Georgians, Armenians, Nestorians, Jacobites, and Romish Christians. “The number of these (Persian) Christians amounts to about 10,000. They have an archbishop and three bishops. The former resides at Mosul; one of the bishops at Chosrabad; another at Meredin, and the third at Diarbekir. By the Mohammedans they are called Nazarenes, and Syrians by the Arabs; but among themselves: Ebrians, or Beni Israel, which name denotes their  relation to the ancient Jewish Christian Church, as does also their present language. being very like the Hebrew. They have no connection whatever with either Greek or Roman churches. They hold the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity; and declare Jesus Christ to be ‘the way, the truth, and the life,' and that through him alone they are delivered from the wrath to come, and are made heirs of eternal life. They acknowledge only the two sacraments, but both in the full sense and import of the Protestant Church. They have at Chosrabad a large church, nearly of the size and appearance of the Scotch kirk at Madras, which is a fine building. Through fear of the Mohammedans, who insult and oppress them, they assemble for divine worship between the hours of five and seven on Sunday mornings. and in the evenings between six and eight. There are also daily services at the same hours. The women and men sit on opposite sides of the church.” Of the native Mohammedan inhabitants we shall only remark that they are Shiites (q.v.) of the sect of Ali, and have among them some remains of the ancient Magi, with a sect of modern infidels called Sufis (q.v.). See Buchanan, Researches, p. 167-176; Yeates, Indian Church History, p. 40- 47; Life of the Rev. H. Martyn; London Missionary Register, 1822, p. 45; 1823, p. 25.

## Persian Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Persian Version Of The Scriptures]]

             By way of supplement we add the following: "As the style in which the gospels of the Polyglots is written has long been antiquated at Ispahan, several efforts were made during the present century to produce a version in the polished dialect now spoken by the Persians. A translation of the gospels was made under the superintendence of colonel Colebrooke, and printed at Calcutta in 1804. In 1812 the Reverend L. Sebastiani had advanced nearly to the end of the Epistles, in a translation of the New Test. from the Greek, and during the same year the gospels of this version were printed at Serampore. In the meantime another translation of the New Test. was progressing at Dinapore, under the superintendence of Henry Martyn. The translators were Sabat and Murza Firut. This version was completed in 1808, but it was so replete with Arabic and abstruse terms, intelligible only to the learned, that the Reverend H. Martyn determined upon visiting Persia in person for the sake of obtaining a clear and idiomatic version. In 1811 he reached Shiraz, the seat of Persian literature, and remained there nearly a year, in the meantime executing from the original Greek a translation of the New Test. The state of his health compelled him to return to England, but he expired during his journey homeward, at Tlokat, Asia Minor, in 1812. Copies of the work were deposited with Sir Gore Ouseley, the English ambassador in Persia, who, on returning to England by way of St. Petersburg, met with prince Galitzin, then at the head of the Russian Bible Society. The suggestion made to the prince to have an edition of Martyn's Test. printed was complied with, and in less than six months the impression was completed.

In 1813 a communication was received by the corresponding committee at Calcutta from Meer Seid All, the learned native employed by Mr. Martyn, at Shiraz, in which he informed the committee that the manuscript of the Persian New Test. and of the Psalms (which had likewise been translated at Shiraz) was in his possession, and he waited their orders as to its disposal. He was directed to take four copies of the manuscript, and forward, the same to Calcutta, while he was invited himself for the purpose of  superintending the publication. The Psalter and the New Test. passed through the press at Calcutta in 1816. The Psalter was reprinted at London, under the superintendence of Dr. Lee, in 1824, and the New Test., edited by the same scholar, in 1827. Other editions followed in 1837 and 1847.

Of all the editions of the Persian New Test., the most incorrect seems to have been that printed at St. Petersburg in 1815, and, at the request of the missionaries, the issue was stopped by the Russian Bible Society. The Reverend W. Glen, of the Scottish mission at Astrakhan, was in consequence led to undertake a version of the Psalms in Persian, for the benefit of the numerous individuals speaking that language who resort to Astrakhan and the south of Russia. In 1826 the British and Foreign Bible Society made arrangements with the Scottish Missionary Society for the services of Mr. Glen in making a translation of the poetical and prophetical books of the Old Test. In the meantime Mirza Jaffier had been engaged by the same society to produce a translation of the historical books of the Old Test. at St. Petersburg, under the eye of Dr. Pinkerton, and according to specific directions given by Dr. Lee. The only portion of Mirza Jaffier's version which was published is the book of Genesis, printed at London in 1827, under the care of Dr. Lee. Mr. Glen's version of the Psalms and Proverbs was published at London in 183031, and again in 1836. The entire Old Test., translated by Mr. Glen left the press in 1847.

In 1824, the Reverend T. Robinson had commenced another translation of the Old Test., which was printed in 1838. A Persian version of the prophecy of Isaiah was purchased by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1833. This version has been executed by Murza Ibrahim, of the East India College at Haileybury, and was published in 1834.

Since 1872 a revision of St. Martyn's New Test. has been undertaken by the Reverend R. Bruce, of the Church Missionary Society, stationed at Julfa, near Ispahan, which was completed in 1877, The same translator also commenced the revision of the Old Test. From the report of the British. and Foreign Bible Society for 1879, we learn that Mr. Bruce and the Reverends J. Bassett and J.L. Potter, of the American Presbyterian Mission, have formed themselves into a committee for the revision of the Persian Scriptures. The different books of the Old Test. were distributed among the different revisers, and each will carefully examine the work of the others. The revised New Test., too, was to be subjected to a joint  revision. From the report for the year 1882, we learn that the latter, after having been thoroughly revised by the translator and professor Palmer of Cambridge, was published by the British and Foreign Bible Society. As for the Old Test., the work of revision is progressing slowly. (B.P.)

## Persian Versions[[@Headword:Persian Versions]]

             At an early period there seems to have existed a translation of the Old Testament in the Persian language. There is no doubt that, like the Chaldee, such a version was prepared for use in the synagogue and in the education of the people. From the Talmud (Sota, 49 b) we know at least that the Persian language along with the holy language “is mentioned as a vernacular.” Chrysostom (Homil. 2, in Joann.) and the Syrian bishop Theodoret (in his De curandis Graecorumn affect. 1:5) speak of such a version, and according to Maimonides the Pentateuch was translated into Persia long before Mohammed (Zunz, Die gottesd. Vortr. d. Juden, p. 9). But the Persian translation of the Pentateuch which has come down to us, and which was printed at first at Constantinople in 1546, and then in the fourth part of the London Polyglot (the Hebrew character having been used in the former case and the Persian in the latter), is of later origin. This is particularly apparent from the name Babel being rendered Bagdad (Gen 10:10) — a proof that it owes its origin to a period at least later than the 8th century (for Bagdad was built in the year 762 [145 of the Hegira]). According to the inscriptions in the Constantinopolitan edition, this translation was made by R. Jacob ben-Joseph Tawus. A question has  been raised whether the formula עדןאּנע נוחו, he reposes in Paradise, refers to Tawus's father or Tawus himself.

Furst, who inclined to the latter view, made Tawus flourish in the 13th century, while Lorsbach, Zunz, Kohut, and Munk, inclining to the former view, put the age of the author in the 16th century. On this point the latter thus expresses himself in his Notice sur Rabbi Sanadia Gaon, p. 64: “Il suffit de jeter un seul coup- d'ceil sur la version de Rabbi Yacob pour se convaincre qu'un tel langue Persan ne pent surmonter a une epoque oui la langue Persane se parlait et s'ecrivait encore avec beaucoup de purete, et oh les mots Arabes n'y abondaient pas encore... Si je ne me trompe, Rabbi Yacob est un ecrivain tres-moderne, et ii me semble mmme resulter des termes dont se sert a son egard l'editeur du Pelntateuque de Constantinople, que c'etait, un contemporain, et que sa version etait, dis l'origine, destinee a cette edition du Pentateuque.” It may now be regarded as settled that the author of this version did not live in the 9th century (Rosenmüller), nor in the 13th century (Furst, Ginsburg), but in the 16th (Zunz, Lorsbach, Kohut, Munk), and that he was born between 1510 and 1514 (?). As to the name of the author there is a diversity of opinion, inasmuch as some take it for a proper noun (tawus means peacock in Persic), others for an adjective: Tusensis, ex urbe Persica Tus (where a celebrated Jewish school flourished). We are inclined to the former view. As to the version itself, Tawus rendered slavishly the Hebrew text. He uses euphemisms, and avoids anthropomorphisms and anthropopathies; sometimes he follows the Targums, often Saadia's Arabic version and Kimchi's and Aben-Ezra's commentaries, and sometimes he leaves the Hebrew untranslated (as in Gen 7:11; Gen 12:6; Gen 12:8; Gen 16:14; Gen 22:14; Gen 28:3; Exo 3:14; Exo 17:7; Num 21:28; Num 34:4; Num 34:16; Deu 3:10; Deu 4:4; Deu 32:51). On the whole, this version is of little critical value.

Besides the Pentateuch, there is also a Persian version of the Prophets and Hagiographa. as well as of the Apocrypha, in the Paris library. Thus Catal. imprime M.S. Hebr. No. 34 contains the version of Genesis and Exodus, with the Hebrew original after each verse. No. 35 contains the version of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, in a similar manner. No. 40 contains Job and Lamentations, as well as a Persian elegy, or קינה, for the 9th of Ab, bewailing the destruction of the Temple (comp. Taanith, 3:488 a). No. 44 contains Isaiah and Jeremiah in Hebrew characters. No. 45 Daniel, as well as an apocryphal history of this prophet (the latter published in Hebrew characters, with a German transl. by H. Zotenberg, in Merx's  Archiv fur wissenschaltfliche Erfbrsschung des Alten Testaments, I, 385 sq. [Halle, 1869]). No. 46, written in the year 1469, also contains Daniel, with various readings of older MS., Fond de St. Germ.-des-Pres. No. 224 contains the book of Esther with the Hebrew original, as well as a Rabbinical Calendar in Persian, completed in 1290, and extending to 1522. No. 236 contains a version of the Apocrypha in Hebrew characters, written in 1600; the book of Tobit is different from the common Greek text; Judith and Bel and the Dragon agree with the Vulgate, while the book of Maccabees is simply the Megillath Antiochus, מגלת אנטיוכוס, Hebrew and Persian. SEE MACCABEES, BOOKS OF.

A direct version from the Hebrew of Solomon's writings existing in Parisian MSS. was discovered by Hassler (comp. Studien und Kritiken for 1829, p. 469 sq.). The Imperial Public Library at St. Petersburg, which of late has bought the collection of Hebrew MSS. of the famous Karaite Abr. Firkowiez and of the Odessa Society, has also some MSS. with a Persian version. Thus Harkavy and Strack in their Cactalog describe No. 139 as a Persian version of the Minor Prophets, containing Mic 1:13 to Mal 3:2. No. 140, the Haphtaroth in Hebrew, with the Persian version. The Hebrew has the vowels and accents; the Persian has no vowels, and is written in Persian (Arabic) letters. No. 141, Pentateuch with Persian version. The Hebrew text has the vowels. which often differ from our present system. The Persian version, which is written in smaller letters, and which follows, verse by verse, the original, differs very much from that published in the London Polyglot (vol. iv). No. 142, Job with the Persian (Job 23:14 to Job 29:24; Job 41:23-34 a); of the Hebrew, only the initial words of each verse are given (with vowels, but without accents.) On these manuscripts, comp. Harkavy and Strack, Catalog der Hebrdischen Bibelhanld. schriften in St. Petersburg (St. Petersburg and Leips. 1875), p. 165 sq.

There are two Persian versions of the Gospels, one of which is printed in the London Polyglot from a MS. belonging to Pococke, written in the year 1341. Its source is the Peshito, as internal evidence abundantly shows. It was published in Latin by Bode (Helmstadt, 1751). The other version was made from the original Greek. Wheloc, professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge, began to print it with a Latin translation which was afterwards edited by Pierson (Lond. 165257). In our century, translations were published by the Bible Society, by Colebroke (Calcutta, 1805), by Martyn, The New Testament, Translated on the Greek into Persian (Lond. 1821).  On the Old-Testament versions, comp. Rosenmüller, De versione Pentateuchi Persica (Leips. 1813); Lorsbach, Jenaer All. Lit.-Zeitung, 1816, No. 58; Bernstein, in Berthold's Krit. Journ. vol. v, p. 21; Zunz, inl Geiger's Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift (1839), 4:391; Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 3:453; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden (Leips. 1866), 10:34 sq.; Hatvernick, Introd. to the O.T. p. 350 sq.; Keil, Iutro d. 2:281; Simon, Histoire critique, p. 307; De Rossi, Dizionarion delli trtori Ebreei, p. 309 sq. (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Munk, Version Persasne, in Cohen's Bibl (Paris, 1834), 9:134, etc., who institutes a comparison between the printed text of the Persian version and that of the MS., and gives an elaborate account of the MSS., as well as specimens of the translation of Lamentations (reprinted in his Notice sur Rabbi Saadia Gaon et sa version Arabe d'Is'ie, et sur une version Persane, manuscrite de la Bibliotheque royaele [Paris, 1838]), p. 62-87; but especially the latest work on Tawus's Pentateuch by Dr. A. Kohut, Kritische Belt uchtufng der Persischen Pentateuch- Uebersetzung des Jacob ben-Joseph Tavus, unter stetiger Riicksichtnahme auf die altesten Bibelversionen (Heidelb. and Leips. 1871), and Geiger's notice of this work in his Jidische Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaft und Leben (1872), 10:103 sq. (B. P.)

## Persian-Jewish Version[[@Headword:Persian-Jewish Version]]

             SEE JUDAEO-PERSIAN VERSION.

## Persis[[@Headword:Persis]]

             (Περσίς, fem. of Περσικός, Persian, so used by AEschylus, Pers. 151, 281, and often), a female Christian at Rome, whom Paul salutes (Rom 16:12). A.D. 55. The apostle commends her with special affection on account of some work which she had performed with singular diligence (see Origen, ad loc.).

## Person[[@Headword:Person]]

             SEE PERSONALITY.

## Personality[[@Headword:Personality]]

             The word person is derived from the Latin “persona,” originally a term of the theater, and signifying the mask worn of old by actors. Hence it signified a dramatic character, and in Cicero a personage; in Suetonius an individual, as also in law Latin. Tertullian seems to use the word in its original sense, where he says “Personae Dei, Christus Dominus,” for he immediately interprets the words by the apostle's expression, “Qui est imago Dei” — i.e. Christ is the eternal manifestation of the Deity (Adv.  Marc. v, ii); he uses it also in its conventional meaning, “personam nominis,” the personage to whom the name attaches (ibid. 4:14); but elsewhere he applies the word in its true ecclesiastical sense of an intelligent individual Being, “Videmus duplicem statum non confusum sed conjunctum in una persona Deum et hominemn Jesum” (Adv. Proef: 28 Similarly the adverb “personaliter” means with him relative individuality in contrast with absolute being: “Hunc substantialiter quidem αἰῶνα τελειον appellant; personaliter vero πρὸ ἀρχήν et, τὴν ἀρχήν — i.e. the first absolutely, the second in antecedent relation with every after- emanation. It is important to ascertain the meaning of ecclesiastical Latin terms in Tertullian, for when he wrote the language of the Church at Rome was Greek; and the Latinity of the Western Church, as well as the barbarisms of its version of Scripture, were imported shortly afterwards from Africa. “Persona” in Latin bore the same relation to “substantia” as ὑπόστασις to οὐσία in Greek theology; but ὑπόστασις in the sense of person was etymologically equivalent for the very different theological idea of “substantia” in Latin; hence arose the confusion that has been noticed under the article HYPOSTASIS SEE HYPOSTASIS.

Hilary first coined the term “essentia,” to convey the meaning of οὐσία; “novo quiden? nomine,” as says Augustine, “quo usi non slunt veteres Latini auctores, sed jam nostris terimporibus usitato, ne deesset etiam linguae nostrae quod Grseci appellant οὐσιάν” (Civ. Dei, 12:2), and “persona” was retained as the equivalent for ὑποστασις.

The meaning of “person” in theology is as Locke has defined it in metaphysics: “A person is a thinking, intelligent being, that has reason and reflection, and can consider itself as itself, the same thinking thing in different times and places.” There must be a continuous intelligence and a continuous identity, as well as individuality. The memorable axiom of Descartes, “Cogito, ergo sum.” may be applied not only to the reality of thinking substance, but also to the true personality of that intelligent being. “I am a conscious being, therefore in that consciousness I have a personal existence.” But “personality,” as applied to the divine substance, involves a contradiction that defines in this direction, as Dr. Mansel has observed, the limits of human thought (Limits of Religious Thought, p. 59). We are compelled to apply to the Absolute our own insufficient human terms of finite relation. The idea of personality must always involve limitation; one person is invested with acqidents that another has not. Yet God, as the designer and creator of the universe, must have a personal existence; as  Paley has well stated it, “The marks of design are too strong to be gotten over, and design must have had a designer; that designer must have been a person. That person is God.” But how is substance thus affected with personality? Analogy in such a matter cannot lead us through the difficulty, for God is one, and such a test is an impossibility for want of any true means of comparison. Yet thus much may be said: So far as it reaches, analogy shows that the personality of the Deity is very possible; for if beings of another world could watch the growing results of human civilization, without having the power of tracing out the individual efforts that produce it, they would find themselves in a somewhat similar difficulty. Humanity, they might reason, is certainly an intelligent substance; but substance is something vague and undetermined; yet the intelligence that is developing all terrestrial works must be the result of personal design and personal skill: therefore this world-wide humanity must have a definite, personal substance. Adam, in the first instance, was that personal substance. Christ in the end shall recapitulate (Irenaeus) all humanity in himself, we know not how. Therefore in some way that is a present mystery, but of certain future solution, God may be Substance that is All-wise and Absolute, and personality may attach to his being, limiting the Unlimited, and defining the Indefinite (ibid. p. 56-59). In the mean time the idea of personality is mixed up intimately with all man's highest and noblest notions of the Deity (ibid. p. 57, 240), neither is it possible to form the faintest possible conception of a non-personal God. The religious idea revolts against the negation, which, in fact, would be its annihilation. The sense of personal individual responsibility to a personal God and Father of all would pass away, and a “caput mortuum” of pantheism would be all that would remain — an illusive Maya for the present, a hopeless Nirvana for the future. Next, with respect to a plurality of persons in the Deity, Hooker excellently defines the properties that determine this phase of the divine nature; and his generalization may serve to impress upon the mind the impossibility of expressing the mutual relations of three hypostases in one substance by any adequate term that human language can supply. That which transcends thought can never find expression by the tongue. The personality of the Father and Holy Spirit is affected by nothing without the divine nature; the personality of the Son has been modified since the incarnation by taking the manhood into God; and a second definition by Locke exactly covers this modification; “Person,” he says, “belongs only to intelligent agents, capable of a law and happiness and misery,” all of which accidents of personality pertain to Christ, though not to the person of the  Son of (God as pre-existing eternally in the Word. SEE HYPOSTATICAL UNION; SEE SUBSTANCE.

“We attribute personality,” says Ahrens (Cours de Theologie, 2:272) “to every being which exists, not solely for others, but which is in the relation of unity with itself in existing, or for itself. Thus we refuse personality to a mineral or a stone, because these things exist for others, but not for themselves. An animal, on the contrary, which exists for itself, and stands in relation to itself, possesses a degree of personality. But man exists for himself in all his essence, in a manner more intimate and more extensive; that which he is, he is for himself, he has consciousness of it. But God alone exists for himself in a manner infinite and absolute. God is entirely in relation to himself; for there are no beings out of him to whom he could have relation. His whole essence is for himself, and this relation is altogether internal; and it is this intimate and entire relation of God to himself in all his essence which constitutes the divine personality.” It should be observed, however, that personality implies limitation. “Infinite personality,” therefore, would be a contradiction in terms. The term “person,” as applied to the Godhead, is not used in its ordinary sense, as denoting a separate being, but represents the Latin persona or the Greek hypostasis, which means that which stands under or is the subject of certain attributes or properties. Three persons are not thus three parts of one God, nor are they three Gods; nor yet are Father, Son, and Spirit only three names, but distinct hypostases with characteristic attributes. In modern times, especially in Germany, and through a prevalent philosophical mysticism, opinions are propagated about the person of Christ which are quite opposed to the doctrines of all the orthodox and evangelical confessions. The second article of the Church of England, and the eighth of the Westminster Confession, express the general view. So does the Quicunque vult of the Liturgy. But the modern theory teaches a different dogma, thus: Martensen and Ebrard seem to adopt a view very similar to that of Beron in the early ages, who held that the Logos assumed the form of a man, that is, subjected himself to the limitations of humanity.

The infinite became finite, the eternal and omnipresent imposed on himself the limitations of time and space; God became man. The statement of Ebrard is, “The eternal Son of God, by a free act of self-limitation, determined to assume the existenceform of a center of human life, so that he acted as such from the conception onward, and having assumed this form, he fashioned for himself a body,” etc. According to this view there  are not two natures in Christ, in the established sense of the word nature, but only two forms of existence, a prior and posterior form of one and the same nature. The most common mode of presenting the doctrine is to say that the Logos assumed our fallen humanity. But by this, we are told, is not to be understood that he assumed an individual body and soul, so that he became a man, but that he assumed generic humanity, so that he became the man. By generic humanity is to be understood a life-power, that peculiar law of life, corporeal and incorporeal, which develops itself outwardly as a body and inwardly as a soul. The Son, therefore, became incarnate in humanity, in that objective reality, entity, or substance in which all human lives are one. Thus, too, Olshausen, in his comment on Joh 1:14, says, “It could not be said that the Word was made man, which would imply that the Redeemer was a man by the side of other men, whereas, being the second Adam, he represented the totality of human nature in his exalted comprehensive personality.” To the same effect he says, in his remarks on Rom 5:15, “If Christ were a man among other men, it would be impossible to conceive how his suffering and obedience could have an essential influence on mankind: he could then only operate as an example. But he is to be regarded, even apart from his divine nature, as the man, i.e. as realizing the absolute idea of humanity, and including it potentially in himself spiritually as Adam did corporeally.” To this point archdeacon Wilberforce devotes the third chapter of his book on The incarnation, and represents the whole value of Christ's work as depending upon it. If this be denied he says, “the doctrines of atonement and sanctification, though confessed in words, become a mere empty phraseology.” In fine, Dr. Nevin, in his Mystical Presence, p. 210, says, “The Word became flesh; not a single man only, as one among many; but flesh, or humanity, in its universal conception. How else could he be the principle of a general life, the origin of a new order of existence for the human world as such? How else could the value of his mediatorial work be made over to us in a real way by a true imputation, and not a legal fiction only? “The hypostatic union, on these hypotheses, is the assumption on the part of the eternal Son of God, not simply or primarily of a true body and a reasonable soul, as the Church has always held, but of humanity as a generic life, of our fallen humanity, of that entity or substance in which all human lives are one. The effect of this union is that humanity is taken into divinity: it is exalted into a true divine life. The life of Christ is one, and it may be designated as divine or as human. On this point, more than any other, its advocates are specially full and earnest. Schleiermacher ignores  all essential difference between God and humanity, holding that they differ in our conception, and functionally, but are essentially one. Dorner, also, the historian of the doctrine concerning Christ's person, avows that the Church view of two distinct substances in the same person involves endless contradictions, and that no true Christoloy can be framed which does not proceed on the assumption of the essential unity of God and man; while Ullmann makes this essential oneness between the divine and human the fundamental idea of Christianity.

The term person, when applied to Deity, is certainly used in a sense somewhat different from that in which we apply it to one another; but when it is considered that the Greek words' ὑπόστασις and πρόσωπον, to which it answers, are, in the New Testament applied to the Father and Son (Heb 1:3; 2Co 4:6), and that the personal pronouns are used by our Lord (Joh 14:26), it can hardly be condemned as unscriptural and improper. There have been warm debates between the Greek and Latin churches about the words hypostasis and persona: the Latin, concluding that the word hypostasis signified substance or essence, thought that to assert that there were three divine hypostases was to say that there were three Gods. On the other hand, the Greek Church thought that the word person did not sufficiently guard against the Sabellian notion of the same individual Being sustaining three relations. Thus each part of the Church was ready to brand the other with heresy, till, by a free and mutual conference in a synod at Alexandria, A.D. 362, they made it appear that it was a mere contention about the grammatical sense of a word; and then it was allowed by men of moderation on both sides that either of the two words might be indifferently used., See Beza, Principles of the Christian Religion; Owen, On the Spirit; Marci Medulla, 1:5, § 3; Ridgley, Divinity, qu. 11; Hurrion, On the Spirit, p. 140; Doddridge, Lectures, lec. 159; Gill, On the Trinity, p. 93; Watts, Works, v. 48, 208; Gill, Body of Divinity (8vo), 1:205; Edwards, History of Redemption, p. 51, note; Horoe Sol. 2:20; Stuart, Letters to Charming; Keith, Norton, and Winslow, On the Trinity; Knapp, Theology, p. 325; Bibliotheca Sacra, Feb. 1844, p. 159; Oct. 1850, p. 696; July, 1867, p. 570; New Englander, July, 1875, art. iii; Stud. u. Kritiken, 1838, 1847. Older monographs on the subject are cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 82. SEE TRINITY.

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

             is an attribute of conscious beings only, and thus distinguishes individuals from each other. In the Trinity it is simple and absolute, so that the three persons of the godhead are not three beings, since they have a common consciousness. In man it is compound, consisting of a boldy and a soul, which are not homogeneous, as are the three divine persons, and yet constitute but a single being, inasmuch as the consciousness essentially resides in the soul, which is therefore per se the real person, and remains such after the separation from the body. In Jesus Christ there was a double or complex personality, because he had a complete human soul (as well as body), and was also filled hypostatically with the divine spirit. He consequently may be said to have had a sort of double consciousness; for the divine spirit did not always communicate everything to the human spirit, and the latter could not be commensurate with the former. Yet he was not two persons, inasmuch as the two natures were indissolubly blended, and the twofold personality likewise. The partial lack of homogeneity between the divine and the human spirit in him did not negative this, just as the still greater dissimilarity between human flesh and soul does not negative unity in man.

## Personati[[@Headword:Personati]]

             an ecclesiastical term, which does not occur earlier than the 11th century, came into use after tie time of Alexander III, and designates (1) Persons, canons holding office with precedence in chapter and choir after dignitaries, either by institution or custom. A dignitary was also a person because his person was honored, and he was a person constituted in dignity. The “quatuor personae” were the four internal dignitaries. Until recently the dignitaries were called the parsons at Hereford. (2) Stipendiary clerks or chaplains perpetually resident in a cathedral or collegiate church, like the chantry priests of St. William at York and the rectors of choir at Beverley, holding offices for life. At Grenoble, Sens, Aries, and Nevers they had the responsibility of the ordinary choral services.

## Personatus [[@Headword:Personatus ]]

             SEE PERSONATI.

## Persuasion [[@Headword:Persuasion ]]

             the act of influencing the judgment and passions by arguments or motives. It is different from conviction. Conviction affects the understanding only; persuasion the will and practice. It is more extensively used than conviction, which last is founded on demonstration, natural or supernatural. But all things of which we may be persuaded are not capable of demonstration. Eloquence is but the art of persuasion. See Blair, Rhetoric; Maury, Principles of Eloquence; Pulpit Orator.

## Perth Articles Of[[@Headword:Perth Articles Of]]

             SEE ARTICLES.

## Perth Councils Of[[@Headword:Perth Councils Of]]

             (Concilium Perthusanum), held at the Scottish city so named.

I. The first was held in 1202 or 1203, by cardinal John Salerno, Roman legate in Scotland; in which certain regulations relating to the reform of the clergy were drawn up. The council lasted three days, but two only of the canons are known:

1. That they who had received orders on Sunday should be removed from the service of the altar.

2. That every Saturday from 12 o'clock be kept as a day of rest, by abstaining from work; the holy day to continue till Monday morning.

See Skinner, 1:280. Labbe, Conc. 11:24.

II. Another council was held at Perth in 1212. William Malvoisin, bishop of St. Andrew's, Walter, bishop of Glasgow, and others were present. The pope's instructions for preaching the Crusade were published; upon which, says the author of the Scoti-chronicon, great numbers of all ranks of clergy throughout Scotland, regulars as well as seculars, took the cross, but very few of the rich or great men of the kingdom. See Skinner, Works, 1:280; Wilkins, Conc. 1:532; Collier, Eccles. Hist; Landon, Man. of Councils, s.v.

## Perthes, Friedrich Christoph[[@Headword:Perthes, Friedrich Christoph]]

             an eminent German publisher, distinguished not only in his professional capacity, but for his sincere piety and ardent patriotism, was born at Rudolstadt April 21, 1772. In his fifteenth year he was apprenticed to a Leipsic bookseller, with whom he remained six years, devoting much of his leisure time to the acquisition of knowledge. In 1793 he passed into the establishment of Hoffmann, the Hamburg bookseller; and in 1796 started business on his own account; and, by his keen and wide appreciation of the public wants, his untiring diligence, and his honorable reputation, he ultimately made it the most extensive of the kind in modern Germany. During the first few years or so of his Hamburg apprenticeship, his more intimate friends had been either Kantian or skeptical in their opinions, and Perthes, who was not distinguished for either learning or speculative talent, had learned to think with his friends; but a friendship which he subsequently formed with Jacobi (q.v.), and the Holstein poet and humorist, Matthias Claudius, led him to a more serious view of Christianity, and he became one of the noblest types of German orthodox piety, leading a life whose influence is impressed on many distinguished minds of his country to this day. The iron rule of the French in Northern Germany, and the prohibition of intercourse with England, nearly ruined trade, yet Perthes, even in this great crisis of affairs, found ways and means to extend his. He endeavored to enlist the intellect of Germany on the side of patriotism, and in 1810 started the National-Muselum, with contributions from Jean Paul Friedrich Richter, count Stolberg, Claudius, Fouque, Heeren, Sartorius, Schlegel, Gorres, Arndt, and other eminent men. Its success was far beyond Perthes's expectations, and encouraged  him to continue his patriotic activity, until Hamburg's incorporation with the French empire put a temporary stricture upon his activity. He Subsequently took a prominent part in forcing the French garrison to evacuate Hamburg, March 12, 1813; and on its re-occupation by the French, he was one of the ten Hamburgers who were specially excepted from pardon. After peace had been restored to Europe, he steadily devoted himself to the extension of his business, and to the consolidation of the sentiment of German national unity, as far as that could be accomplished by literature and speech. In 1822 he removed to Gotha, transferring his Hamburg business to his partner, Besser. Here he laid himself out mainly for the publication of great historical and theological works. His subsequent correspondence with literary, political, and theological notabilities — such as Niebuhr (one of his dearest friends), Neander, Schleiermacher, Lucke, Nitszch, Tholuck, Schelling, and Umbreit — is extremely interesting, and throws a rich light upon the recent inner life of Germany. He died May 18, 1843. — Chambers. See Friedrich Perthes' Leben (12th edit. 1853, 3 vols. 8vo), written by his second son, Clemens Theodor Pertles, professor of law at Bonn, and translated into English anonymously in Edinburgh (1857, 2 vols. 8vo); Memoirs of Frederick Perthes, or Literary, Religious, and Political Life in Germany from 1789- 1843; Baur, Religious Life in Germany (transl. by Jane Sturge, Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 12mo), 2:132-178.

## Perthes, Friedrich Matthias[[@Headword:Perthes, Friedrich Matthias]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, son of Friedrich Christoph, was born at Hamburg, January 16, 1800. In 1842 he was pastor at Moorburg, near Hamburg, and died August 29, 1859. He is best known as the author of Des Bischofs Johnnes Chrysostomus Leben (Hamburg, 1853). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:984. (B.P.)

## Pertusati, Francesco[[@Headword:Pertusati, Francesco]]

             Count, an ascetic Italian author, was born in Milan May 9,1741. The son of a senator of Milan, he was educated among the Jesuits, for some time wore their habit, and never ceased to be attached to them. He divided his leisure between the education of his children and the direction of works of charity. His devotion to the religious and absolutist party exposed him to persecution: arrested in 1796, on the invasion of the French, and conducted to Nice, he was obliged, in 1799, to seek refuge in Venice. He died at Milan May 22, 1823. His works are very numerous, and all translated from the French into Italian. See Beraldi, Memorie di religione (Modena, 1823); ‘Rudoni,' Cenni sulla vita e sugli scritti del F. Pertusati (Milan, 1823, 8vo).

## Pertz, Georg Heinrich[[@Headword:Pertz, Georg Heinrich]]

             a famous German historian, was born at Hanover, March 28, 1795. In 1823 he was secretary of the royal archives at Hanover, in 1842 head-  librarian at Berlin, and he died at Munich, October 7, 1876. He edited Leibniz-gesammelte Werke (Hanover, 1843 sq.), and published Ueber Leibnizen's kirchliches ,Glaubensbekenntnuiss (Berlin, 1846): — Ueber die gedruckten Ablassbriefe von 1454 und 1455 (1857). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:984. (B.P.)

## Peru[[@Headword:Peru]]

             an important maritime republic of South America, bounded on the north by Ecuador, on the west by the Pacific, on the south and south-east by Bolivia, and on the east by Brazil, in lat. 3° 25'-21° 30' S., and in long. 68°-81° 20' W., has an area estimated at upwards of 500,000 square miles, and a population of 2,630,000. The coast-line is about 1660 miles in length. The shores are in general rocky and steep, and, owing to the comparative unfrequency of bays and inlets along the coast, the harbors are few and unimportant. Those of Callao (the port of Lima) and Payta afford the most secure anchorage. The country is highly interesting from a historical and antiquarian point of view.

I. Islands.— The islands on the Peruvian coast, although valuable, are extremely few in number and small in extent. In the north are the Lobos (i.e. Seal) Islands, forming a group of three, and so called from the seals which frequent them. On their eastern and more Sheltered sides they are covered with guano, and the quantity on the whole group is stated at 4,000,000 tons. The Chincha Islands, famous as the source of Peruvian guano, also form a group of three. Each island presents, on the eastern side, a wall of precipitous rock, with rocky pinnacles in the center, and with a general slope towards the western shore. The cavities and inequalities of the surface are filled with guano, and this material covers the western slopes of the islands to within a few feet of the water's edge. There is no vegetation. At the present rate of consumption, the guano will last until the year 1883. The island of San Lorenzo forms the harbor of Callao. The grand physical feature of Peru, and the source of all its mineral wealth, is the great mountain system of the Andes.

II. Surface, Soil, and Climute. — The surface of Peru is divided into three distinct and well-defined tracts or belts, the climates of which are of every variety from torrid heat to arctic cold, and the productions of which range from the stunted herbage of the high mountainslopes to the oranges and citrons, the sugar-canes and cottons, of the luxuriant tropical valleys.

a. The Coast is a narrow strip of sandy desert between the base of the Western Cordillera and the sea, and extending along the whole length of the country. This tract, varying in breadth from thirty to sixty miles, slopes to the shore with an uneven surface, marked by and ridges from the Cordillera, and with a rapid descent. It is for the most part a barren waste  of sand, traversed, however, by numerous valleys of astonishing fertility, most of which are watered by streams that have their sources high on the slopes of the Cordillera. Many of the streams are dry during the greater part of the year.

b. The Sierra embraces all the mountainous region between the western base of the maritime Cordillera and the eastern base of the Andes, or the Eastern Cordillera. These ranges are, in this country, about 100 miles apart on an average, and have been estimated to cover an area of 200,000 square miles. Transverse branches connect the one range with the other, and high plateaus, fertile plains, and deep tropical valleys lie between the lofty outer barriers. The following are the most striking and distinctive physical features of the Sierra, beginning from the south:

1. The plain of Titicaca, partly in Peru and partly in Bolivia, is enclosed between the two main ridges of the Andes, and is said to have an area of 30,000 miles — greater than that of Ireland. In its center is the great Lake Titicaca, 115 miles long, from 30 to 60 miles broad, from 70 to 180 feet deep, and 400 miles in circumference.

2. The mountain-chains which girdle the plain of Titicaca trend towards the north-west, and form what is called the Knot of Cuzco. The Knot comprises six minor mountain-chains, and has an area thrice larger than that of Switzerland. Here the valleys enjoy an Indian climate, and are rich in tropical productions; to the north and east of the Knot extend luxuriant tropical forests, while the numberless mountain-slopes are covered with waving crops of wheat, barley, and other cereals, and with potatoes; and higher up extend pasture-lands, where the vicuina and alpaca feed.

3. The valley of the Apurimac, 30 miles in average breadth, and extending north-west for about 300 miles. This valley is the most populous region of Peru.

4. From Cuzco proceed two chains towards the north-west; they unite again in the Knot of Pasco. This Knot contains the table-land of Bombon, 12,800 feet above sea-level; as well as other tablelands at a height of 14,000 feet, the highest in the Andes; otherwise, however, the physical features of the country resemble those of the vicinity of Cuzco.

5. The vale of the river Maranfon, which is upwards of 300 miles in length, is narrow, deep, and nearer the equator than any other valley of the Sierra,  and consequently it is the hottest portion of this region; and its vegetation is thoroughly tropical in character. The conformation of the surface of the Sierra is of the most wonderful description. The soil of the Sierra is of great variety; but wherever it is cultivated it is productive.

c. The Montana, forming two thirds of the entire area of the country, stretches away for hundreds of leagues eastward from the Andes to the confines of Brazil. On the north it is bounded by the Amazon, on the south by Bolivia. It consists of vast impenetrable forests and alluvial plains. is rich in all the productions of tropical latitudes, is of inexhaustible fertility, and teems with animal and vegetable life. Among the products which are yielded here in spontaneous abundance are the inestimable Peruvian bark, India-rubber, gum-copal, vanilla, indigo, copaiba, balsam, cinnamon, sarsaparilla, ipecacuanha, vegetable wax, etc. On the western fringe of the Montafia, where there are still a few settlements, tobacco, sugar, coffee, cotton, and chocolate are cultivated with complete success.

The hydrography of Peru may be said to be divided into three systems- those of Lake Titicaca, the Pacific, and the Amazon. All the great rivers of Peru are tributaries of the Amazon.

III. Productions, Exports and Imports, Revenue, etc. — The wealth and resources of Peru consist, not in manufactures, but entirely in mineral, vegetable, and animal products. As no statistics are taken in the country, it is impossible to give the quantity and value of the productions, and of the exports and imports, even approximately. Of the precious metals, in which Peru abounds, the production has greatly fallen off; and this country, which once stood in the same relation to Spain that Australia does to Great Britain, now contributes little to the metallic wealth of the world. The immense stores of gold and silver found here by the Spanish invaders represented the accumulation of centuries, and that among a people who used the precious metals only for the purposes of ornamentation. The Andes mines have gold, silver, copper, lead, bismuth, etc., and in the Montana gold is said to exist in abundance in veins and in pools on the margins of rivers. Although so rich in the precious metals, Peru produces comparatively little specie, which is to be accounted fortchiefly by the unscientific and improvident manner in which the mining operations are carried on. It can hardly be said that Peruvian coinage exists, inasmuch as that in circulation is from the mint of Bolivia. In addition to the precious metals and guano, another important article of national wealth is nitrate of  soda, which is found in immense quantities in the province of Tarapaca. This substance, which is a powerful fertilizer, is calculated to cover, in this province alone, an area of fifty square leagues, and the quantity has been estimated at sixty-three million tons. Great quantities of borax are also found. The working of this valuable substance, however, is interdicted by government, which has made a monopoly of it, as it has of the guano.

The vegetable productions are of every variety, embracing all the products both of temperate and tropical climes. The European cereals and vegetables are grown with perfect success, together with maize, rice, pumpkins, tobacco, coffee, sugar-cane, cotton, etc. Fruits of the most delicious flavor are grown in endless variety. Cotton, for which the soil and climate are admirably adapted, is now produced here in gradually increasing quantity. The land suited to the cultivation of this plant is of immense extent, and the quality of the cotton grown is excellent. The animals comprise those of Europe, together with the hama and its allied species; but although Peru produces much excellent wool, almost the whole of the woolen fabrics used as clothing by the Indians is imported.

IV. Ancient Civilization and History. — Peru, the origin of whose name is unknown, is now passing through its third historical nera, and is manifesting its third phase of civilization. The present sera may be said to date from the conquest of the country by the Spaniards in the early part of the 16th century; the middle aera embraces the rule of the Incas; and the earliest sera, about which exceedingly little is known, is that prencarial period, of unknown duration during which a nation or nations living in large cities flourished in the country, and had a civilization, a language, and a religion different, and perhaps in some cases even more advanced than those of the Incas who succeeded them, and overran their territories. Whence these pre-Incarial nations came, and to what branch of the human family they belonged, still remain unanswered questions. Their existence, however, is clearly attested by the architectural remains, sculptures, carvings, etc., which they have left behind them. Ruins of edifices constructed both before the advent of the Incas and contemporary with and independently of them, are found everywhere throughout the country. For further information regarding pre-incarial times and races, see Bollaert, Antiquities, Ethnology, etc., of South America (Lond. 1860), p. 111 sq.; Hutchinson, Two Years in Peru, with Explorations of its Antiquities (ibid. 1874, 2 vols. 8vo); Brinton, Myths of the New World (N. Y. 1877, revised ed.).

Regarding the origin of the Incas, nothing definite can be said. We have no authorities on the subject save the traditions of the Indians, and these, besides being outrageously fabulous in character, are also conflicting. It appears, however, from all the traditions, that Manco, the first Inca, first appeared on the shores of Lake Titicaca, with his wife Mama Oello. He announced that he and his wife were children of the Sun, and were sent by the glorious Inti (the Sun) to instruct the simple tribes. He is said to have carried with him a golden wedge, or, as it is sometimes called, a wand. Wherever this wedge, on being struck upon the ground, should sink into the earth, and disappear forever, there it was decreed Manco should build his capital. Marching northward, he came to the plain of Cuzco, where the wedge disappeared. Here he founded the city of Cuzco, became the first Inca (a name said to be derived from the Peruvian word for the Sun), and founded the Peruvian race, properly so called. Mannco, or Manco Capac (i.e. Manco the Ruler), instructed the men in agriculture and the arts, gave them a comparatively pure religion, an and a social and national organization; while his wife, Mama Oello, who is also represented as being his sister, taught the women to sew, to spin, and to weave. Thus the Inca was not only ruler of his people, but also the father and the high-priest. The territory held by Manco Capac was small, extending about ninety miles from east to west, and about eighty miles from north to south. After introducing laws among his people, and bringing them into regularly organized communities, “he ascended to his father, the Sun.” The year generally assigned as that of his. death, after a reign of forty years, is 1062. The progress of the Peruvians was at first so slow as to be almost imperceptible. Gradually, however, by their wise and temperate policy, they won over the neighboring tribes, who readily appreciated the benefits of a powerful and fostering government.

Little is clearly ascertained regarding the early history of the Peruvian kingdom, and the lists given of its early sovereigns are by no means to be trusted. They invented no alphabet, and therefore could keep no written record of their affairs, so that almost all we know of their early history is derived from the traditions of the people, collected by the early Spaniards. Memoranda were indeed kept by the Peruvians, and, it is said, even full historical records, by means of the quipu, a twisted woolen cord, upon which other smaller cords of different colors were tied.” Of these cross threads, the color, the length, the number of knots upon them, and the distance of one from another, all had their significance; but after the invasion of the Spaniards, when the whole Peruvian system of government and civilization underwent  dislocation, the art of reading the quipus seems either to have been lost or was effectually concealed. Thus it is that we have no exact knowledge of Peruvian history farther back man abruot on century before the coming of the Spaniards. In 1453 Tutpac Inca Yupanqui, the eleventh Inca, according to the list given by Garcilasso de la Vega, greatly enlarged his already widespread dominions. He led his armies southward, crossed into Chili, marched over the terrible desert of Atacama, and penetrating as far south as the river Maule (lat. 36° S.), fixed there the southern boundary of Peru. Returning, he crossed the Chilian Andes by a pass of unequaled danger and difficulty, and at length regained his capital, which he entered in triumph. While thus engaged, his son, the young Huayna Capac, heir to the fame as well as the throne of his father, had marched northward to the Amazon, crossed that barrier, and conquered the kingdom of Quito. In 1475 Huayna Capac ascended the throne, and under him the empire of the Incas attained to its greatest extent and the height of its glory. His sway extended from the equatorial valleys of the Amazon to the temperate plains of Chili, and from the sandy shores of the Pacific to the marshy sources of the Paraguay. Order and civilization accompanied conquest among the Peruvians, and each tribe that was vanquished found itself under a careful paternal government, which provided for it, and fostered it in every way.

The early government of Peru was a pure but a mild despotism. The Inca, as the representative of the Sun, was the head of the priesthood, and presided at the great religious festivals. He imposed taxes, made laws, and was the source of all dignity and power. He wore a peculiar head-dress, of which the tasseled fringe, with two feathers placed upright in it, was the proper insignia of royalty. Of the nobility, all those descended by the male line from the founder of the monarchy shared, in common with the ruling monarch, the sacred name of Inca. They wore a peculiar dress, enjoyed special privileges, and lived at court; but none of them could enter the presence of the Inca except with bare feet, and bearing a burden on the shoulders, in token of allegiance and homage. They formed, however, the real strength of the empire, and, being superior to the other races in intellectual power, they were the fountain whence flowed that civilization and social organization which gave Peru a position above every other state of South America. Prior to the arrival of the Spaniards Peru contained a population of 30,000,000 — twelve times greater than it is at the present day. Money was unknown among the Peruvians. They were ma nation of  workers, but they wrought as the members of one family, labor being enforced on all for the benefit of all.

The national policy of the Peruvians had its imperfections and drawbacks, and though capable of unlimited extension, it was not capable of advancement. It was in the last degree conservative, and was of such a nature that the introduction of reform in any vital particular must have overturned the whole constitution. Nevertheless the wants of the people were few, and these were satisfied. Their labor was not more than they could easily perform, and it was pleasantly diversified with frequent holidays and festivals. They lived contentedly and securely under a government strong enough to protect them; and a sufficiency of the necessaries of life was obtained by every individual. Still in the valleys of the Cordilleras and on the plain of Cuzco maybe heard numberless songs, in which the Peruvian mourns the happy days of peace, security, and comfort enjoyed by his ancestors. Further, they revered and loved their monarch, and considered it r pleasure to serve him. With subjects of such a temper and inclination, the Incas might direct the entire energies of the nation as they chose; and it is thus that they were able to construct those gigantic public works which would have been wonderful even had they been performed with the assistance of European machinery and appliances.

The Peruvian system of agriculture was brought to its highest perfection only by the prodigious labor of several centuries. Not only was the fertile soil cultivated with the utmost care, but the sandy wastes of the coasts, unvisited by any rains, and but scantily watered by brooks, were rendered productive by means of an artificial system of irrigation, the most stupendous, perhaps, that the world has ever seen. Where the mountain- slopes were too steep to admit of cultivation, terraces were cut, soil was accumulated on them, and the level surfaces converted into a species of hanging gardens. Large flocks of lamas were grazed on the plateaus: while the more hardy vicunias and alpacas roamed the tipper heights in freedom, to be driven together, however, at stated periods, to be shorn or killed. The wool yielded by these animals, and the cotton grown in the plains and valleys, were woven into fabrics equally remarkable for fineness of texture and brilliancy of color.

The character of the architecture of the Peruvians has already been referred to. The edifices of Incarial times are oblong in shape and cyclopean in construction. The materials used were granite, porphyry, and  other varieties of stone; but in the more rainless regions sun-dried bricks were also much used. The walls were most frequently built of stones of irregular size, but cut with such accuracy, and fitting into each other so closely at the sides, that neither knife nor needle can be inserted in the seams. Though the buildings were not, as a rule, more than from twelve to fourteen feet high, they were characterized by simplicity, symmetry, and solidity. The Peruvian architects did not indulge much in external decoration, but the interior of all the great edifices was extremely rich in ornament. In the royal palaces and temples the most ordinary utensils were of silver and gold; the walls were thickly studded with plates and bosses of the same metals: and exquisite imitations of human and other figures, and also of plants, fashioned with perfect accuracy in gold and silver, were always seen in the houses of the great. Hidden among the metallic foliage, or creeping among the roots, were many brilliantly colored birds, serpents, lizards, etc., made chiefly of precious stones; while in the gardens, interspersed among the natural plants and flowers, were imitations of them, in gold and silver, of such truth and beauty as to rival nature. The temple of the Sun at Cuzco, called Coricancha, or “Place of Gold,” was the most magnificent edifice in the empire. On the western wall, and opposite the eastern portal, was a splendid representation of the Sun, the god of the nation. It consisted of a human face in gold, with innumerable golden rays emanating from it in every direction; and when the early beams of the morning sun fell upon this brilliant golden disk, they were reflected from it as from a mirror, and again reflected throughout the whole temple by the numberless plates, cornices, bands, and images of gold, until the temple seemed to glow with a sunshine more intense than that of nature.

The religion of the Peruvians, in the later ages of the empire, was far in advance of that of most abarbarous nations. They believed in a Great Spirit, the Creator of the universe, who, being a spirit, could not be represented by any image or symbol, nor be made to dwell in a temple made with hands. They also believed in the existence of the soul hereafter, and in the resurrection of the body. The after-life they considered to be a condition of ease and tranquillity for the good, and of continual wearisome labor, extending over ages, for the wicked. But while they believed in the Creator of the world, they also believed in other deities, who were of subordinate rank to the Great Spirit. Of these secondary gods the Sun was the chief. They reverenced the Sun as the source of their royal dynasty, and  everywhere throughout the land altars smoked with offerings burned in his worship.

V. Modern History and Characteristics. — About the year 1516, and ten years before the death of Huayna Capac, the first white man had landed on the western shoes of South America; but it was not till the year 1532 that Pizarro, at the head of a small band of Spanish adventurers, actually invaded Peru. On his death-bed the great Inca expressed a wish that the kingdom of Quito should pass to Atahualpa, one of his sons by a princess of Quito whom lie had received among his concubines, and that all his other territories should fall to his son Huascar, the heir to the crown, and who, according to the custom of the fncas, should have inherited all its dependencies. Between these two princes quarrels, resulting in war, arose; and when Pizarro entered Peru he found the country occupied by two rival factions, a circumstance of which he took full advantage. Atahualpa had completely defeated the forces of his brother, had taken Huascar prisoner, and was now stationed at Caxamalca, on the eastern side of the Andes, whither, with a force of 177 men, of whom 27 were cavalry, the dauntless Spanish leader, in September, 1532, set out to meet him. Atahualpa was captured by the Spaniards, and subsequently put to death. Shortly after the execution of the Inca at Caxamalca, the adventurers set out for Cuzco. Their strength had recently been increased by reinforcements, and they now numbered nearly 500 men, of whom about a third were cavalry. They entered the Peruvian capital Nov. 15, 1533, having in the course of their progress towards the city of the Incas had many sharp and sometimes serious encounters with the Indians, in all of which, however, their armor, artillery, and cavalry gave them the advantage. At Cuzco they obtained a vast amount of gold, the one object for which the conquest of Peru was undertaken. As at Caxamalca, the articles of gold were for the most part melted down into ingots, and divided among the band.

Their sudden wealth, however, did many of them little good, as it afforded them the means of gambling, and many of them, rich at night, found themselves again pennils adventurers in the morning. One cavalier having obtained the splendid golden image of the Sun as his share of the booty, lost it in play in a single night. After stripping the palaces and temples of their treasures, Pizarro placed Manco, a son of the great Huayna Capac, on the throne of the Incas. Leaving a garrison in the capital, he then marched west to the sea-coast, with the intention of building a town, from which he could the more easily repel invasion from without, and which should be the future  capital of the kingdom. Choosing the banks of the river Rimac, he founded, about six miles from its mouth, the Cinda de los Reyes, “City of the Kings.” Subsequently its name was changed into Lima, the modified form of the name of the river on which it was placed. But the progress of a higher civilization thus begun was interrupted by an event which overturned the plans of the general, and entailed the severest sufferings on many of his followers. The Inca Manco, insulted on every hand, and in the most contemptuous manner, by the proud Castilian soldiers effected his escape, and headed a formidable rising of the natives. Gathering round Cuzco in immense numbers, the natives laid siege to the city, and set it on fire. An Indian force also invested Xauxa, and another detachment threatened Lima. The siege of Cuzco was maintained for five months, after which time the Peruvians were commanded by their Inca to retire to their farms, and cultivate the soil, that the country might be saved from famine. The advantages, many though unimportant, which the Inca gained in the course of this siege were his last triumphs. He afterwards retired to the mountains, where he was massacred by a party of Spaniards. More formidable, however, to Pizarro than any rising of the natives was the quarrel between himself and Almagro, a soldier of generous disposition, but of fiery temper, who, after Pizarro, held the highest rank among the conquerors. The condition of the country was now in every sense deplorable. The natives, astonished not more by the appearance of cavalry than by the flash, the sound, and the deadly execution of artillery, had succumbed to forces which they had no means of successfully encountering.

Meantime the Almagro faction had not died out with the death of its leader, and they still cherished schemes of vengeance against the Pizarros. It was resolved to assassinate the general as he returned from mass on Sunday, June 26, 1541. Hearing of the conspiracy, but attaching little importance to the information, Pizarro nevertheless deemed it prudent not to go to mass that day. His house was assaulted by the conspirators, who, murdering his servants, broke in upon the great leader, overwhelmed him by numbers, and killed him. The son of Almagro then proclaimed himself governor, but was soon defeated in battle, and put to death. In 1542 a council was called at Valladolid, at the instigation of the ecclesiastic Las Casas, who felt shocked and humiliated at the excesses committed on the natives. The result of this council was that a code of laws was framed for Peru, according to one clause of which the Indians who had been enslaved by the Spaniards were virtually declared free men. It was also enacted that the Indians were not to be forced to labor in unhealthy  localities, and that in whatever cases they were desired to work they were to be fairly paid. These and similar clauses enraged the adventurers. Biasco Nufiez Vela, sent from Spain to enforce the new laws, rendered himself unpopular, and was seized and thrown into prison. He had come from Spain accompanied by an “audience” of four, who now undertook the government. Gonzalo Pizarro (the last in Peru of the family of that name), who had been elected captain-general, now marched threateningly upon Lima. He was too powerful to withstand, and the audience received him in a friendly manner, and, after the administration of oaths, elected him governor as well as captain-general of the country. The career of this adventurer was cut short by Pedro de la Gasca, who, invested with the powers of the sovereign, arrived from Spain, collected a large army, and pursued Pizarro, who was eventually taken and executed.

A series of petty quarrels, and the tiresome story of the substitution of one ruling functionary for another, make up a great part of the subsequent history. The country became one of the four vice-royalties of Spanish America, and the Spanish authority was fully established and administered by successive viceroys. The province of Quito was separated from Peru in 1718; and in 1788 considerable territories in the south were detached, and formed into the government of Buenos Ayres. At the outbreak of the War of Independence in South America, the Spanish government, besides having much declined in internal strength, was distracted with the dissensions of a regency, and torn by civil war; nevertheless in 1820 the Spanish viceroy had an army of 23,000 men in Peru, and all the large towns were completely in the hands of Spanish officials. Peru was the last of the Spanish South American possessions to set up the standard of independence. In August, 1820, a rebel army, under general San Martin, one of the liberators of Chili, sailed for Peru, and after a number of successes both on sea and land, in which the patriots were most effectively assisted by English volunteers, the independence of the country was proclaimed, July 28,1821, and San Martin, assumed the protectorate of the young republic. From this date to the year 1860. twenty-one rulers, under various titles, held sway. For the first twenty-four years of its existence as an independent Republic the country was distracted and devastated by wars and revolutions. In 1845 Don Ramon Castilla was elected president; and under his firm and sagacious guidance the country enjoyed an unwonted measure of peace, and became regularly organized. Commerce began to be developed, and important public works were undertaken. The  term of his presidency ended in 1851, in which year general Rufino Jose Echenique was elected president. The country, however, was discontented with his government, and Castilla, after raising an insurrection in the south, again found himself in 1855 at the head of affairs. Slavery, which, although abolished by the charter of independence, still existed, was put an end to by a decree dated October, 1854. In August, 1863, a quarrel had taken place at the estate of Talambo, in the north, between some Basque emigrants and the natives, in which several of the disputants were killed or wounded. Taking advantage of this occurrence, the Spanish government sent out a “special commissioner” in the spring of 1864, who delivered a memorandum to the Peruvian minister, complaining of injuries sustained by the Spaniards, and accompanied by a letter threatening prompt and energetic reprisals should Spain be insulted or her flag disgraced. The “commissioner” left Lima on April 12, the day on which his memorandum and letter were delivered; and on the 14th a Spanish squadron, under admiral Pinzon, who had been joined by the “commissioner,” took forcible possession of the Chincha Islands, the principal source of the revenue of Peru. This complication provoked disturbances, not only in Peru, but in all the ancient Spanish states of South America. In January, 1865, peace was concluded by the payment of sixty million seals to Spain as war indemnity; but the Peruvians rebelled against this concession of their president, Pezet, and in November he was retired, a provisional government established, and war measures inaugurated against Spain by forcible seizure of the Chincha Islands. An alliance was agreed upon between Peru and Chili, Ecuador, and Bolivia, and war declared by these allies in January, 1866; but only a month later all hostilities ceased. In 1867 the Peruvians adopted a new and mire liberal constitution. Yet frequent revolutionary measures have thus far failed to give perfect quiet to the country. Thus as late as 1872 an attempt was made, to take the life of the head of the government by a powder-plot.

The government of Peru is republican, and elects its president for a term of six years. He is assisted by a Senate, consisting of two members from each province, and a House of Representatives, of whom there is one member for every 20,000 inhabitants. The ministers, together with senators chosen by the congress, form the cabinet. The country is divided into 11 departments, and two provinces with the constitution of departments; and the departments are subdivided into provinces, the provinces into districts, and the districts into parishes. The army consists of 13,000 men, and the  navy of 22 vessels, carving 88 guns. Of the whole population, 240,000 are whites, 300,000 Mestizos, 40,000 Negroes, and 1,620,000 Indians.

The general religion of Peru is that of the conquerors of the country, the Spaniards — the Roman Catholic, which is besides especially favored and protected by the constitution. Roman Catholic missionaries labored among the early settlers from Spain as well as among the natives, especially among the Antes, but towards the close of the 17th century the Indians turned against the missionaries and destroyed the missions. The republic is divided into the archbishopric of Lima. founded in 1541, and the seven episcopal sees of Chachapoyas, Truxillo, Ayacucho, Cuzco, Arequipa, Huanuco, and Puno (the last two were founded in 1861). The clergy are numerous, but uneducated and badly supported. The number of convents, once astonishingly large, was reduced in 1863 to 130. Public instruction is principally in the hands of the clergy. The people's schools are in a very inferior condition. Of the higher institutions, the first are the five universities at Lima, Truxillo, Ayacucho, Cuzco, and Puno, but they have only a nominal existence. Of more importance are the colegios, or technical schools, of which, in 1860, there were 30 public and 38 private ones. Of all these, 17 are for females. The clergy are educated in seminaries. There are a few Jews and some Protestants, but their number is not definitely known. See Hill, Travels in Peru and Mexico (Lond. 1860); Grandidier, Voyage dans l'Amerique du Sad (Paris, 1861); Soldan, Geografia del Peru (ibid. 1862); Tschudi, Reisen in Sudmerika (Leips. 1861); Wappaeus, Peru, Bolivia, and Chili (ibid. 1871); Fuentes, Lima, Esquisses historiques, statistiques, administratives, commerciales; Hutchinson, Two Years in Peru ( Lond. 1874, 2 vols. 8vo ); Prescott, Hist. of the Conquest of Peru; Harper's Monthly, vol. 7.

## Perucci, Orasio[[@Headword:Perucci, Orasio]]

             an Italian painter of Reggio, was born in 1548. According to Tiraboschi, he was a good artist, executed some works for the churches of his native city, and painted much for the collections. Lanzi says there remain various pictures by him in private houses, and an altar-piece in the church of S. Giovanni at Reggio; and, judging from his style, he thinks he was a pupil of Lelio, Orsi. He died in 1624.

## Perudah[[@Headword:Perudah]]

             (Heb. Perudah', פְּרוּדָא, core; Sept. Φαδουρά (;; Ezr 2:55. In Neh 7:57 the name is written Peridah', פְּרַידָא; Sept. Φαρειδά vr. r. Φεριδά), one of “Solomon's servants,” whose posterity returned from the exile. B.C. ante 536.

## Perueino, Pietro Vanuoci[[@Headword:Perueino, Pietro Vanuoci]]

             a celebrated Italian painter, was born of very humble parentage at Citta della Pieve, in Umbria, about 1446, but as he established himself in the neighboring and more important city of Perugia, he is commonly called II Perugino. It is generally thought that he studied under AndreaVerocchio at Florence. He executed numerous excellent works in various cities. particularly in Florence, Siena, Pavia, Naples, Bologna, Rome. and Perugia. Sixtus IV employed him in the Cappella Sistina; and his fresco of Christ giving the Keys to Peter is by far the best of those painted on the side-walls of that chapel, Perugino also, along with other contemporary painters, decorated the stanze of the Vatican; and his works there are the only frescos that were spared when Raffaelle was commissioned to substitute his own works for those formerly painted on the walls and ceilings. The fact of his having had Raffaelle for his pupil has no doubt in one way increased the reputation of Perugino, but it has also in some degree tended to lessen it, as in many of his best productions the work of Raffaelle is confidently pointed out by connoisseurs, and, indeed, many important pictures at one time acknowledged as Perugino's are now ascribed to his great pupil. His high standing as a painter, however, is established by many admirable works, in which no hand superior to his own could have operated; and, with the exception, perhaps, of Francia, who in some respects is esteemed his equal, he is now acknowledged as the ablest of the masters of that section of the early Italian school in which religious feeling is expressed with great tenderness, in pictures remarkable for delicate execution. Perugino's works are also distinguished by rich and warm coloring. One of his most celebrated paintings, The Bewailing of Christ, is now in the Pitti gallery at Florence. An excellent example of his  work may be studied in the collection of the National Gallery, London (No. 288), The Virgin adoring the Infant Christ. In the New York Historical Society theme is a painting of his, The Adoration of the Infant Jesus, and in Yale College there is one on The Baptism of Christ. Perugino's reputation was high, when the introduction of the cinquecento style, by Leonardo and Michael Angelo, tended to throw into the shade the art of the earlier masters. Disputes ran high between the leaders of the old and new styles, and Michael Angelo is said to have spoken contemptuously of Perugino's powers. This, of course, has biased Vasari's opinion in his estimate of the opponent of his idol, but Perugino's reputation is nevertheless great, and his works are much esteemed. Raffaelle was about twelve years of age when he was entered as a pupil with Perugino, who was then (1495) engaged on the frescos in the Sala del Cambia (the Exchange) at Perugia. Perugino died at Castello di Fontignano, near Perugia, in 1524. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v. Lond. Rev. 1854, pt. 2:256.

## Perugia, Giovanni Niccolo da[[@Headword:Perugia, Giovanni Niccolo da]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Perugia, according to Pascoli about 1478. He was probably a scholar of Pietro Perugino. Lanzi says, He was a good colorist, and therefore was willingly received by Pietro to assist him in his works, however inferior to that artist in design and perspective. His works are recognized in the Capella del Cambio near, the celebrated Sala of Perugino. where be painted John the Baptist. In the church of S. Tommaso is his picture of that saint about to touch the wounds of the Savior, and, with the exception of a sameness of the heads, it possesses much of the character of Perugino.” He died in 1544.

## Perugia, Mariano da[[@Headword:Perugia, Mariano da]]

             an Italian painter, who, according to Mariotti, was a reputable artist, and executed some works for the churches at Perugia and Ancona. There are notices of him from 1547 to 1576. That writer commends an altar-piece by him in the church of S. Domenico at Perugia, and another picture by him in the church of S. Agostino at Ancona. He was also called Mariano di Ser Eusterio.

## Perugia, Sinabaldo da[[@Headword:Perugia, Sinabaldo da]]

             an Italian painter, was a native of Perugia. He is highly commended by Mariotti, who flourished in the first part of the 16th century. There are notices of him from the years 1505 to 1528. Lanzi says, “He must be esteemed an excellent painter from his works in his native place, and still more from those in the cathedral at Gabbio, where he painted a fine picture in the year 1505, and a gonfalon still more beautiful, which would rank him among the first artists of the ancient school.”

## Perugino, Domenico[[@Headword:Perugino, Domenico]]

             an Italian painter, was a native of Perugia, and, according to Baglioni, flourished in the latter part of the 16th and the first part of the 17th  centuries. Lanzi says he painted small wood scenes, or landscapes, and that he is scarcely known at Perugia; though it is believed that one of his pictures remains in the church of S. Angelo Magno at Ascoli. His name also occurs at Siena, and he is mentioned by authors as the master of Antiveanto Grammatica.

## Perugino, Lello[[@Headword:Perugino, Lello]]

             an old Italian painter, who was a native of Perugia, decorated, in conjunction with Ugolino Orvietano and other artists, the cathedral of Orvieto in 1321.

## Perunatele[[@Headword:Perunatele]]

             a goddess among the ancient Lithuanians, who was at once the mother and wife of Perun.

## Peruvian Architecture[[@Headword:Peruvian Architecture]]

             Although the buildings of Peru were erected probably about the 12th century A.D., they possess an extraordinary likeness to those of the Pelasgi in Europe. This resemblance in style must be accidental, arising probably from the circumstance that both nations used bronze tools, and were unacquainted with iron. The Peruvian walls are built with large polygonal blocks of stone, exactly like what we call “cyclopean masonry.” The jambs of the doorways slope inwards, like those of Etruscan tombs, and have similar lintels. The walls of Cuzco are good examples of this style. It is further remarkable that these walls are built with re-entering angles, like the fortifications which were adopted in Europe only after the invention of gunpowder. SEE PERU.

## Peruvian Religion[[@Headword:Peruvian Religion]]

             In the earliest times the inhabitants of the kingdom of Peru, which Manco Capac, the first Inca, ruled, seem to have been believers in the coarsest fetichism. They only had one supreme deity, the mother of all, Mama Kocha, in honor of whom wild animals, plants, and prisoners of war were sacrificed. The devouring of fallen or sacrificed enemies was a sacred custom of the Peruvians. A great flood had overflowed the country, and after this Manco Capac, and his wife, Mama Oello, children of the sun, came from a foreign country to the shores of the sea Titicaca, where they built the city of Cuzco, collected the remaining people, and gave them laws and sacred teachings, which were carefully preserved until the arrival of the Spaniards. The supreme being of the later Peruvians was called Pachacamac, who was the creator of all beings, also of the sun; the latter was his only visible representative on earth, and was therefore divinely worshipped; but the god himself was exalted above the sacrifices of mortals. The moon and stars also had temples, like the sun, but of less splendor, inasmuch as all that was of gold in the temples of the sun was made of silver in those of the moon and stars. There were male and female priests: of the latter, the maidens of the sun were of two kinds; the higher, from the Inca family, dedicated their whole lives to the service of the sun, and there were more than fifteen hundred of these in convents. If unfaithful, they and their whole family were to be exterminated, according to the law known as "hard law." But in the entire history of Peru not an instance of this occurs. The second class of servants of the sun did not live in the capital, Cuzco, but in the provinces of the kingdom, and were chosen from all classes. The conditions of reception were beauty and purity. When the cruel Pizarro came to Peru, the immense riches were carried off by the Spaniards, and the beautiful daughters of the Incas, the virtuous sunmaidens, became a prey to the insolent warriors.

## Peruvian Version[[@Headword:Peruvian Version]]

             SEE QUICHUAN.

## Peruzzi, Baldassare[[@Headword:Peruzzi, Baldassare]]

             an eminent Italian painter and architect, was born at Accajano, near Siena, Tuscany, Jan. 15, 1480. He was the child of poor parents, but by dint of persevering effort he succeeded in obtaining a knowledge of painting from  some unknown master in his native city, and afterwards pursued his studies in Rome. While there he formed an intimacy with Raffaelle, for whom he had the most ardent admiration. He attained great eminence at Rome, and received patronage from many of the nobility, and also from pope Alexander VI. In perspective and architecture — on which subject he left several MSS. — he especially distinguished himself; and was even preferred to Bramante, under whom he is said to have studied. Indeed, his work in this branch of art was so skillfully done, and so closely imitated bass-reliefs and real architecture, that the most perfect illusions were produced; and it is said that his perspectives in the arches of the ceiling at the Farnese palace, representing the History of Perseus and other mythological subjects embellished with bass-reliefs, were so admirably executed that Titian himself was deceived by them, and was only convinced of his error by observing the works from other points of view. He was employed in designing and ornamenting numerous churches, palaces, and chapels, all of which were masterpieces, the Palazzo Massimo being considered one of the most original and tasteful edifices in Rome. He was architect of St. Peter's, at Rome, being employed for that work by pope Leo X, with a salary of two hundred and fifty crowns per annum. His frescos were marvels of beauty, and evinced remarkable talent. He also achieved great excellence in grotesques, a style of painting which affords unlimited scope for the play of the imagination.

With the ability to comprehend its principles, he combined rare judgment and good taste, exhibiting surprising skill in the arrangement and adaptation of figures as devices emblematic of stories which they surrounded. It is said too that he engraved on wood, and that he wrote a treatise on the Antiquities of Rome, and a Commentary on Vitruvius, which he purposed to illustrate with wood-engravings. His oil-paintings are rare, but among those mentioned are the Adoration of the Magi, in the National Gallery at London; Charity, in the Museum at Berlin; and a piece containing half-length figures of the Virgin, St. John, and St. Jerome. Critics are unanimous in commendation of his grandeur of conception, purity of design, and nobleness of execution; and Lanzi says of him, “If other artists surpassed him in the vastness of their works, they never did in excellence.” He always remained poor, being too modest to push his way among rivals; and, though patronized by the nobility, he received a merely nominal compensation for his best works. Pursued during his life by misfortune, he died — poisoned by a rival — in the prime of his manhood, in 1536. Artists of every class assisted at his obsequies, and he was buried in the Pantheon by the side of Raffaelle. The  greatness of his talent was recognized after his death; and posterity pays its just tribute to his wonderful genius. Among his other works were The Judgment of Paris; The Sibyl announcing to Augustus the Birth of Christ; and several pieces representing Bible history, among which were three events in the history of Jonah. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:675; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:679.

## Peruzzini, Cav. Giovanni[[@Headword:Peruzzini, Cav. Giovanni]]

             an Italian painter of Pesaro or Ancona, was born in 1629. Canon Lazzarini asserts that both Domenico and Giovanni Peruzzini were natives of Pesaro, and that they transferred their services to Ancona, their adopted, country. Giovanni studied under Simone Cantarini; acquired distinction, and painted several pictures for the churches at Ancona, Bologna, and other places. He was invited to the court of Turin, where he executed several works both in oil and in fresco, so much to the satisfaction of his protector that he made him knight of the Order of St. Maurice. He possessed a lively imagination, ready invention, and facility of execution. He formed a style of his own, founded on those of Cantarini, the Caracci, and Guido. He was vain of his facility, as appears on one of his lunettes of the portico de' Servi at Bologna, on which he inscribed, Opus 24 Hor. Eq. Jo. P. (the work of twenty-four hours, by Gio. Peruzzini, knight), which caused many sarcastic remarks from his brother artists. His best works are finished with more care. The principal at Anlcona are the Decollation of St. John, at Spedale, and St. Teresa, at the Carmelitani; at Bologna, The Descent of the Holy Ghost, in the church of SS. Vitale and Agricola, and an altarpiece of St. Cecilia in the church dedicated to that saint. Lanzi says, “In his picture of St. Teresa are traces of Baroccio's manner; that of the ‘Beheading of St. John' is extremely beautiful, and there he appears a scholar of the Bolognese.” He afterwards took to a wandering life, and painted in various churches and theaters, if not with much study, yet with tolerable correctness, a knowledge of perspective, and with a certain facility, grace, and spirit which delight the eye. His paintings are dispersed through various places in the Picenum, even as far as Ascoli, where are a number of his works. There are also some of his works at Rome and Milan. He died at Milan in 1694. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:681.

## Peruzzini, Domenico[[@Headword:Peruzzini, Domenico]]

             an Italian engraver, was born at Pesaro or Ancona; flourished, according to the dates in the prints attributed to him, from 1640 to 1661. He is supposed to have been the elder brother of Gio. Peruzzini, and, like him, to have studied under Simone Cantarini. Lanzi says that in a MS. at Pesaro it is mentioned that Domenico was a native of that city, and a scholar of Pandolfi. There is much confusion and contradiction about both artists, and still more uncertainty about Domenico. The list of prints given below were formerly attributed to Domenico Piola; but Bartsch repudiates the idea, and adduces several cogent reasons for transferring them to Domenico Peruzzini. They are etched in a masterly style, resembling those of Cantarini. It would seem that both brothers were natives of Pesaro, but preferred to be called after Ancona, the place of their adoption. The following are the prints attributed to him by Bartsch:

1. The Holy Virgin (half length) with the Infant Jesus (1661);

2. The Virgin seated, with the Infant on her Knees (1661);

3. Christ tempted by the Devil, in the form of an old man (1642);

4. Christ bearing his Cross, with other figures half length;

5. The Holy Family and Saints (1661). The figures in this print are half length. Heineken, in his Dictionnaire des Artistes, attributed this print to Gio. Dom. Cerrini, known under the name of II Cavaliere Perugino.

6. St. Anthony of Padua praying, and the infant Jesus appearing to him in a cloud supported by three cherubim. This print has been erroneously attributed to D. Cresti.

7. The Assassination, a man in his shirt on a bed assailed by three soldiers, one of whom thrusts a lance into his body (1640); 8-11. Landscapes; 12. St. Jerome doing Penance in the Desert. The letters D. P. F. are on a plant to the right. Bartsch, however, considers it doubtful whether it belongs to Domenico Peruzzini, as there is a sensible difference in the style from that of others.

## Pesachim[[@Headword:Pesachim]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Pesari, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Pesari, Giovanni Battista]]

             an Italian painter, flourished at Modena about 1650. Tiraboschi says that he was either a pupil of Guido, or made that master' his example. Lanzi says he resembles Guido very closely in his picture of the Madonna in the church of S. Paolo at Modena, and in other works. He afterwards went to Venice, where he died, in the flower of life.

## Pesaro, Aaron di Of Italy[[@Headword:Pesaro, Aaron di Of Italy]]

             a celebrated rabbi of the 16th century, undertook and accomplished the hereulean task of furnishing a sort of concordance to every passage of Scripture quoted or commented upon in the Babylonian Talmud, and called it after his own name, תּוֹלְדוֹת אִהֲרֹן, “the Offering of Aaron.” It was first published at Freiburg and Basle in 1581, in folio. Of such importance did the great Buxtorf consider the work that he published the whole of it as an Appendix to the first edition of his Chaldaic, Talmudical, and Rabbinical Lexicon, in 1639, with the following Latin paraphrase of its title-page: “Index locupletissimus omnium locorum in toto Talmudico opere de sacris Bibliis eompraehensorum, summo studio et fidelitate collectus” (which, however, is not reprinted in the new edition of Buxtorf's Lexicon by Fischer, Leipsic, 1869-1874). In 1590 an enlarged edition, including references to the Zohar, Baal Akeda, or Isaac Arama's philosophical work, entitled עֲקֵדִת יַצְחָק, and Ikkarim of Joseph Albo, was published at Vienna. Between sixty and seventy years afterwards the then famous rabbi Jacob Sasportas, whom subsequent Hebrew writers described as “most distinguished in the law and crowned with humility,” a  native of Oran, in North Africa-who was successively chief rabbi of the Sephardim congregations at Leghorn, Hamburg, and Amsterdam- supplemented the work of Pesaro by a concordance of the passages of Scripture quoted and treated in the Jerusalem Talmud. This supplement the author called after his own name, תולדות יעקב, “the Offering of Jacob.” The twofold work, as a whole, was first published at Amsterdam in 1652, then at Berlin in 1705. The Rev. Dr. Margoliouth, of London, has recently announced an English translation. with editorial annotations and illustrations, in two volumes, of both Pesaro's and Sasportas's work. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:79; De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, p. 262 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:128 sq.; 3:80 sq. (B. P.)

## Pesaro, Jechiel[[@Headword:Pesaro, Jechiel]]

             (also called PISAURENSIS JECHIEL), OF FLORENCE, a Jewish convert to Christianity, is noted as a philosopher, physician, and theologian. Having for some time heard the sermons of the inquisitor Dionysius Costacciario, he repaired to Rome to renounce Judaism. Pope Gregory XIII, who then held the Papal See, was present at the speech Pesaro made before a numerous assembly in 1582, and received him, as he descended from the chair, with the words, “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.” Soon after Pesaro was baptized by this pontiff, and became a preacher. Some of his sermons which he preached before and against the Jews at Florence were printed in the Italian language in 1585. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:79; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:576; Bartolocci, Bibl. Rabb. 4:584; Adams, Hist. of the Jews, 2:79 (Boston, 1812); Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, p. 726 (Taylor's transl.); Kalkar, Israel u. d. Kirche, p. 71 (Hamb. 1869); Pick, Evangelical Review (Gettysburg, 1876), p. 367. (B. P.)

## Pesaro, Niccolo Trometto, Or Niccolo Da[[@Headword:Pesaro, Niccolo Trometto, Or Niccolo Da]]

             an Italian painter of the 16th century, and a native of Pesaro, studied under Zuccaro, whose style he at first followed closely. He executed some works for the churches at Rome, the principal of which are the Nativity, in the Basilica; a Pieta, in S. Francesca; the Nativity and the Circumcision, in S. Maria da Aracaeli. Lanzi says his best piece is the Last Supper, in the church of the Sacrament at Pesaro. “It is a picture so well conceived and harmonized, and so rich in pictorial effect, that Lazzarini has descanted upon it in his lectures as one of the finest works in that city.” It is said that  Baroccio regarded this artist with esteem, and Baglioni commends him for his earlier works. He afterwards fell into a mannered, insipid style, which injured his reputation and fortune. He died at Rome in the pontificate of Paul V, aged seventy years.

## Pescheck, Christian Adolph[[@Headword:Pescheck, Christian Adolph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 1, 1787, at Johnsdorf, Saxony. In 1816 he was pastor at Luckendorf, in 1831 deacon at Zittau, and died in 1859, doctor of philosophy. He is the author of, Geschichte der Colestiner des Oybins, urikundlich esfioscht und dargestellt (Zittau, 1840): — Geschichte der Gegen reformation in Bohmen (Leipsic, 1843-44, 2 volumes): — Die bohminschen Exulanten in Sacshsen (1857): — Die Auswanderung glzaubenstreuer Protestanten aus Bohmen und Sachsen im xvii. Jahrhundert (1858). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2:984 sq. (B.P.)

## Pescia, Mariano Da[[@Headword:Pescia, Mariano Da]]

             an Italian painter, was a native of Pescia. His real name was Mariano Gratiadei, He was born about 1520, and was a scholar of Ridolfo Ghirlandaio (not, as is said, of Domenico G., who died about 1493), whom he assisted in many of his works. He also painted some pictures from his own compositions, of which the principal are an altar-piece in the Capella della Signoria, in the Palazzo Vecchio at Florence, and a picture of the Virgin and the Infant Jesus, with St. Elizabeth and St. John, in the Florentine gallery. It is agreed by all that Pescia died young, but the time of his birth and death is variously stated. Zani says he died in 1520; others that he was born in 1520 or 1525, and died at Florence in 1550. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:682.

## Pesello, Francesco[[@Headword:Pesello, Francesco]]

             an Italian painter of the Florentine school, was born in the year 1380. He studied with Filippo Lippi, and was a good imitator of his style. There is a fine picture by him of the Epiphany in the ducal gallery. He died in the year 1457.

## Pesheth[[@Headword:Pesheth]]

             SEE FLAX.

## Peshito, Or Rather Peshitto[[@Headword:Peshito, Or Rather Peshitto]]

             (Syr., as generally supposed, simple,” “faithful,” sc. Version, or the “explained,” i.e. translated, Bible), is the name given to the authorized Syriac Version of the Old and the greater part of the New Testament. This version holds among the Syrian Christians the same place as the Vulgate in the Roman and the “Authorized Version” in the English Church. Many are the traditions about its origin. Thus the translation of the Old Testament is supposed to date from the time of Solomon and Hiram; or to have been done by Asa the priest; or, again, that it belongs to the time of the apostle Thaddseus (Adaeus), and Abgar, the king of Osrhoene, in the 1st century after Christ. To the same period is also supposed to belong the translation  of the New Testament, which is ascribed to Achaeus, a disciple of Thaddseus, the first Edessian bishop and martyr. Recent investigation has not as yet come to any nearer result than to place the latter vaguely in the 2d, and the former in the 3d century, and to make Judaic-Christians the authors of both. Ephraem Syrus (q.v.), who wrote in the 4th century, certainly speaks of the Peshito as Our Version, and thus early finds it necessary to explain some of its terms, which had become obsolete. Five books of the New Testament (the Apocalypse and four of the Epistles) are wanting in all the MSS., having probably not yet formed part of the canon when the translation was made. The version of the Old Testament was made direct from the Hebrew, and by men imbued with the Palestinian mode of explanation. It is extremely faithful, and astonishingly free from any of those paraphrastic tendencies which pervade more or less all the Targums or Aramaic versions. Its renderings are mostly very happy, and coincide in many places with those of the Septuagint — a circumstance which has given rise to the supposition that the latter itself had been drawn upon. Its use for the Old Testament is more of an exegetical, for the New Testament more of a critical, nature. Anything like an edition of the Peshito worthy of its name is still as much a desideratum as is a critical edition of the Septuagint or the Targums, and consequently investigators have as vet been unable to come to anything but very hazy conclusions respecting some very important questions connected with it. The editio princeps of the New Testament part dates Vienna, 1555; that of the Old Testament is contained in the Paris Polygglot of 1645. SEE SYRIAC VERSIONS.

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

             a French engraver, was born at Rouen in 1623. It is not known under whom he studied, but he went to Paris, where he acquired distinction by the excellence of his works. His execution is not dexterous nor picturesque, but his outline is correct, and he rendered with remarkable fidelity the precise character of the different painters whose works he engraved, which makes his prints interesting and valuable to the collector. Dumesnil mentions 166 prints by him, the best of which are those he engraved after Niccolo Poussin. He died about 1700. The following are his most esteemed prints:

(1) subjects after Poussin — Esther before Ahasuerus; the Adoration of the Shepherds; the Dead Christ, with the Virgin and St. John; the Entombing; the Death of Ananias; the Holy Family; the Vision of St.  Paul; the Triumph of Galatea; the Testament of Eudamidas, one of his best prints; the Seven Sacraments is in seven plates of two sheets each.

(2) The Holy Family (after Raffaelle). See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, 2:682.

## Pessimism[[@Headword:Pessimism]]

             the opposite of Optimism (q.v.), is the doctrine that the universe is the worst possible, or the worst conceivable. This is the broadest form in which the doctrine can be stated or held. In a non-limited application it might be defined as the doctrine that human existence, in its conditions and its destiny, is only an evil. SEE EVIL and SEE ORIGIN OF EVIL. Popularly applied, pessimism might be defined as the doctrine that the evil outweighs the good in the universe at large or in the condition of man.

The term is of recent coinage, and has only become current — in its philosophical or popular meaning — within the last twenty years, chiefly through the influence of Arthur Schopenhauer (q.v.) and Eduard von Hartmann. The very recent introduction of the term indicates, if it does not prove, that the doctrine itself as a formal theory is of recent origin. It is true that all literatures and all philosophies abound in complaints and meditations and proposed remedies having respect to the evils of human existence, and the apparent defects in the constitution or the workings of the universe. But these theories and complaints and remedies all presuppose that some good reason can be given, or some valuable end suggested, as the explanation or the compensation for the evil which is accounted for or bemoaned. None of the ancient philosophies or theologies are avowedly and consistently pessimistic except that of Buddhism, which formally teaches that all the present forms of existence are only evil, and that the only good conceivable is in Nirvana. What this may be is not so clear as might be desired: whether the termination of conscious and sentient existence, or the actual cessation of all forms of active desire and hope, which work conflict or disappointment.

With the exception named, all the older philosophies and theologies are in theory optimistic, so far as they all resolve the existence of physical evil into some permanent or preponderating good, under the conduct of one supreme Deity or reason, or many subordinate deities, who in some way were supposed to bring greater good out of abounding evil. Even the theory of Lucretius cannot be said to be pessimistic. The temper in which  the great thinkers and the leading philosophers of antiquity regarded the economies of the universe and the ordering of human affairs varies with the greater or less hopefulness of the times in which they wrote, and the clearness and firmness with which they held to faith in divine guidance and the divine goodness. It is worthy of observation that the universe and the condition of man never seemed darker nor more hopeless, in the judgment of reflecting and sympathizing thinkers, than a little before and after Christianity made its appearance in the world, offering the solutions and the comforts which it brought as pre-eminently a religion of contentment, thankfulness, and hope.

But with all the consolation and hope which Christianity afforded to man, it did not put to rest all speculation and misgiving in respect to the mystery of evil. Indeed, it is no more than the truth to say that Christianity brought special difficulties of its own, which, according to some interpretations made of its teachings, have seemed to darken the mystery of evil, and to complicate the explanation of its existence. It is no part of our duty to recite the theories of Christian philosophy in respect to the existence of physical and moral evil. It is enough that we call attention to the fact that their theories are in form or in fact optimistic. They all find the explanation of evil in some greater and superabounding good, of which this evil in its infliction or permission is the condition or the means. They all recognize the existence of a wise and benevolent Ruler of the universe, who from seeming evil is ever educing good, and whose wisdom and goodness will be amply justified when the reasons of his administration are fully understood. In theory and in fact, no theistic theory of the universe can be conceived of as pessimistic.

With the denial of theism, pessimism is possible, but not necessary. Spinoza seems to be an optimist when he asserts that finite evil and good are only relative conceptions; that what seems to be evil is the necessary manifestation or outworking of the universal substance. Logically considered, his argument is not valid, for, in order to make it such, it must be assumed or proved that the existence of the universal substance or God is itself a good. The philosophy of Hegel found in the necessary evolution of the absolute a place for every form of evil as a necessary stage in the process by which the idea at last comes to self-consciousness in man, and thus marks the steps of its advancement or evolution in the history of each individual, and in the progress of the race. But in order to justify the occurrence of these transient evils, this development of the lower into the  higher must be assumed to be good. Pessimism is by no means excluded by this theory of Hegel, except by the assumption that an outcome of preponderating evil in the universe would be unreasonable, and unreason is evil only, and cannot be actual. But this solution only illustrates a fundamental weakness or limitation of the system itself in its conceptions of good and evil.

Schopenhauer makes the two elements or factors of the universe to be will — i.e. force and thought; i.e. Vorstellung; conceiving, however, of neither nor of both as implying a personal God. He does, indeed, make the force which is blind when it begins to work to come at the end of its operations to a consciousness of itself and of its work; but the discovery which it makes of both is anything rather than satisfactory. As soon as the blind will comes to the clear knowledge of the unsatisfactory character of its work, it recoils with horror, and strives for self-annihilation. Schopenhauer gives his reasons for holding that all life is only suffering: 1. The constitution of the human individual; 2. The nature of enjoyment; 3. The consequents of possession and gratification; 4. The relation of man to the external world; 5. The aimless operation of history. From these data he concludes that the universe is the worst possible, arguing that if it were a shade worse it could not possibly exist. The only transitory happiness which man can find or should value are the passionless pleasures of science and art. These have as little as possible of the elements of feeling and impulse, and therefore are liable to the least possible alloy.

Hartmann contends that the universe as a whole is uncontrolled by design. Each part is adapted to every other, but no design controls the whole. This he argues from the unsatisfactory results of the universe, with which he contends no reasonable being could possibly be content, and therefore the universe as a whole is neither reasonable nor good. In proof, he cites

(1) The law of nervous exhaustion;

(2) The pleasure found in relief from pain does not usually outweigh the pain;

(3) The most of our pleasures are unobtrusive; the contrary is true of pains;

(4) All gratifications are usually brief, while sufferings are enduring.  The remedy which Hartmann proposes is to elevate and strengthen the will to a passionless indifference to existence and its evils, and a passionless enjoyment of its blessings. SEE STOICISM.

The affinity of these philosophical theories with the hypotheses of blind evolutionism and the survival of the fittest, as taught by many modern expounders of natural history, is too obvious to need exposition. The moment we abandon the position that design controls the universe, and that the tendency of its forces and movements authorizes us to believe in the goodness of a personal God, it is impossible to set aside the reasonings which lead to the hopeless and repulsive conclusions of pessimism. In literature pessimism is nearly allied to nihilism, or that faithless and hopeless view of life's duties and life's activities which is the result of the overstimulated and the overindulged curiosity and tastes that characterize most of our modern life. Indeed, it is in this practical form only that pessimism is likely to be current or dangerous. There are comparatively few men who will be attracted by this doctrine as an abstract theory of the universe. Its assumptions are too remote and doubtful, and the deductions are too attenuated. But there are multitudes in this our own cultivated age who have found life so empty, and the gratification of passion so unsatisfying, and even the pursuit of art and literature so unrewarding, as to be ready to accept the conclusion that the universe is badly ordered, and human existence is only vanity and vexation of spirit. Theoretic pessimism is, on the one hand, compatible with the grossest debauchery, the most shameless self-seeking, and the most cruel oppression; and on the other with stoic indifference for one's personal sufferings, and passionless unsympathy for the sorrows of others. No influence can be more unfriendly to individual or national character than the absence of faith in God and man which such n theory implies or engenders. No heroism nor self-sacrifice nor self-culture in its highest forms can flourish in a community of educated men who have persuaded themselves that their life is a burden, that the universe is false to its promises, and that their very nature is necessarily in conflict with the impulses and hopes which impel it to action. Neither art nor literature nor philosophy can escape the blight which pessimism, as a philosophy of the universe or a theory of life, must of necessity bring upon all that is noble and aspiring in man and his achievements. See Huber, Der Pessimismus (Munich, 1876); Volkelt, Das Unbewusste und der Pessimismus: Studien zur modernen Geistesbewegung (Berlin, 1873); Taubert, Der Pessimismus und seine Gegner; Von  Hartmann, Ist der pessimistische Monismus trostlos? Gesammeltephil. Abhandlungen (Berlin, 1872); Pfleiderer, Der Pessimismus (Berlin, 1875); Christlieb, Infidelity, v. 40; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philosophy (see Index); Christian Quar. April, 1874, p. 284-88; North Amer. Rev. July, 1873, art. 2.

## Pessos[[@Headword:Pessos]]

             a small black stone which held the place of a statue in the temple of Cybele, the great goddess of the Phrygians. It was probably an aerolite, having been represented as falling from heaven.

## Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich]]

             the father of modern educational ideas, or, as he has been aptly called, “the schoolmaster of the human race,” was one of the greatest philanthropists of the world. He was born at Zurich, Switzerland, Jan. 12, 1746. His father, a physician, died when Pestalozzi was about six years old; but his mother, with the assistance of some relatives, procured him a good education. He studied divinity, but soon tired of it, and turned aside to fit himself for the profession of law; but, instead of entering either the clerical or legal ranks, he married, at the age of twenty-three, the daughter of a merchant of Zurich, purchased a small landed property which he named Neuhof, and went to reside upon it and cultivate it. Why this man of scholarly tastes and pious life should so suddenly turn his attention to farming was a mystery to many of his friends. But Pestalozzi himself had a far-reaching purpose in this step.

The reading of Rousseau's Emile had drawn his attention to the subject of education. He had long noticed the degraded and unhappy condition of the laboring classes, the great mass of the population, and he was seeking — led by motives of Christian benevolence and sympathy — to provide means best suited to promote their elevation. He finally became convinced that by means of a sound education a remedy might be found for the many evils by which society was infected. He regarded their ignorance as the principal cause of their misery, and thought that by a proper and advantageous use of their political rights they could be raised from the state of stupidity and brutality into which they had sunk, and given devoted hearts and manly intellects. He proposed to effect this result not simply by instruction, but by a judicious blending of industrial, intellectual, and moral training. He rightly saw that it was not enough to impart instruction to children, but that their moral nature should be particularly cared for, and  habits of activity instilled into them through agricultural and industrial labors. To his way of thinking, the great drawback on the side of industry was the weakening of the natural affections and the development of the mercantile spirit, without having the moral resources and consolations afforded by rural occupations. For this reason he preferred to withdraw to a farm, there to gather about him the children of the poor, and to foster in the. coming men and women the taste for domestic life and the sentiment of human dignity. He began in 1775 to carry his views into practice by turning his farm into a farm-school for instructing the children of the poorer classes of the vicinity in industrial pursuits, as well as in reading and writing.

He was, however, unsuccessful in his operations. and at the end of two years his school was broken up, and he became involved in debt. In order to relieve himself from his encumbrances, and to procure the means of subsistence, he produced his popular novel of Lienhardt und Gertrud (Basle, 1781, 4 vols.), in which, under guise of depicting actual peasant life, he sought to show the neglected condition of the peasantry, and how by better teaching they might be improved both morally and physically. It was read with general interest, and the Agricultural Society of Berne awarded him for it a gold medal, which, however, his necessities compelled him at once to sell. It was followed by Christoph und Else (Zurich, 1782). During 1782-83 he edited a periodical entitled Das Schweizer-Blatt furi das Volk, which was collected in 2 vols. and published as Nachnforschungen uber den Gang der Natur in der Eintwickelung des Menschengeschlechts (Zurich, 1797). He wrote also other works of less importance. Not until 1798 did Pestalozzi's opportunity come again to test his theories by practice. In this year he established, with the assistance of the Swiss Directory, a school for orphan children in a convent which had belonged to the Ursuline nuns at Stanlz, in the canton of Unterwalden. Stanz had been sacked by a French army, and the children were such as were left without protectors to wander about the country. In the bare and deserted convent he had, without assistance and without books. to teach about eighty children of from four to ten years of age. He was thus driven by necessity to set the elder and better-taught children to teach the younger and more ignorant; — and thus struck out the monitorial or mutual- instruction system of teaching which, just about the same time, Lancaster was under somewhat similar circumstances led to adopt in England. In less than a year Pestalozzi's benevolent labors were suddenly interrupted by the Austrians, who converted his orphan-house into a military hospital. But the feasibility of his theory had become so evident that he could no longer be  discouraged or turned back by any obstacle.

He promptly removed to Burgdorf, eleven miles north-east from Berne, and there founded another school of a somewhat higher grade, and produced his educational works, Wie Gertrud uhre Kinder lehrt (Berne, 1801): — Buch der Mitter (ibid. 1803), and some others. In 1802 the people of the canton of Berne sent him as their deputy to an educational conference summoned by Bonaparte, then first consul, at Paris. His establishment at Burgdorf was prosperous, became celebrated. and was resorted to from all parts of Europe by persons interested in education; some came for instruction, others for inspection. In 1804 he removed his establishment to Munichen-Buchsee near Hofwol, in order to operate in conjunction with Fellenberg. who had a similar establishment at the latter place; but the two educational reformers disagreed, and in the same year Pestalozzi removed to Yverdun, in the canton of Vaud, where the government appropriated to his use an unoccupied castle. This establishment became even more prosperous and more. celebrated than the one at Burgdorf, and had a still greater number of pupils and of visitors. Unfortunately dissensions arose among the teachers, in which Pestalozzi himself became implicated, and thus the latter years of his life were embittered. The number of pupils rapidly diminished, the establishment became a losing concern, and Pestalozzi was again involved in debt, which the proceeds of the completed edition of his works, Pestalozzi's Sammtliche Werke (Stuttgard and Tubingen, 1819-26, 15 vols.), hardly sufficed to liquidate. (This edition was the result of a subscription got up in 1818 for the publication of his works, the names of the emperor of Russia, the king of Prussia, and the king of Bavaria standing at the head of the list.) In 1825 Pestalozzi retired from his laborious duties to Neuhof, where his grandson resided. Here he wrote his Schwanengesang (1826), and Mieine Lebensschicksale als Vorsteher mneiner Erziehungsanstaltene in Burgdoif und Iferten (ibid.), in which he recounts his disappointments in a most desponding mood. He died Feb. 17,1827, at Brugg, in the canton of Aargau, and over his grave a monument was erected by a grateful generation, which, though it had always failed to reward him as he deserved in life, yet failed not to honor him when his work was done.

The great idea which lay at the basis of Pestalozzi's method of intellectual instruction was. that nothing should be treated of except in a concrete way. Objects themselves became in his hands the subject of lessons tending to the development of the observing and reasoning powers — not lessons  about objects. His special attention was directed to the moral and religious TRAINING of the children, as distinct from their mere INSTRUCTION; and here, too, graduation and a regard to the nature and susceptibilities of children were conspicuous features of his system.. His aim was to impart to the school the character of an educating family, into which the ease and pleasure of home should be introduced Without books and without apparatus, he directed his attention to those natural elements which are found in the mind of every child. He taught numbers instead of figures; living sounds, instead of dead characters; deeds of faith and love, instead of abstruse creeds; substance instead of shadow; realities instead of signs. Whatever may be thought of his system as a whole, the present generation cannot afford to ignore its great indebtedness to Pestalozzi for the fresher thoughts and experiments which his plans suggested. What Rousseau (q.v.) attempted with a simulated pupil was realized, though with modifications, by Pestalozzi upon real men; and that which was already existing in scattered ideas was collected by him into a focus. Besides. it is the great distinction of Pestalozzi to be among the first benefactors of the poor-the first to claim for their squalid children the full advantage of all that is impressive in art and beautiful in nature-the first to share his bread with them, and to dwell among them as a poor man himself, in order, as he expressed it, that he might “teach those harassed with poverty to live as men.”

It now remains for us to notice more distinctly Pestalozzi's relation to Christianity, and especially to Protestantism. It was the practice in his day and country to teach the child the Catechism, and forget altogether the deeper lesson of real faith and true love. As one has aptly put it, the Christianity of Pestalozzi's generation was a lazy Christianity of memory and form,” or, as Pestalozzi himself was accustomed to designate it, “a paper-science.” Pestalozzi took issue with such a course. He was a Protestant, in whom the essence of Christianity took the place of the form, and in whom the spirit preponderated over the letter. True, he put revealed religion as auxiliary to natural religion, and only instructed his pupils in the latter when the former had been mastered; but whatever may be thought of the method, it is certain that Pestalozzi was a firm believer in the salvation of the world by Christianity. The humble man shrank from professions; he found that he might cause his pupils to stumble if they looked to him for a pattern, and we do not wonder that in the midst of his trials with the world he is led to cry out, “I do not think that there are many men naturally fitted  to be Christians;” and in shame and confusion confesses that he does not really think himself a Christian, because he does not find himself endowed with a capacity to arrive at religious excellence by the conquest of himself. His life will bear the closest scrutiny, and if ever there has been a striving after perfection, Pestalozzi sought for it in Christianity. In the hour of death his hope for salvation was in his Savior. See Krisi, Pestalozzi: his Life, Work, and Influence (Cincinnati. 1870); and the article in Kiddle and Schem's (Encyclop. of Education, p. 693-95; also Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries, 2:154 sq.; Hurst, Rationalism, p. 188 sq.

## Pestilence[[@Headword:Pestilence]]

             is the invariable rendering in the A.V. (except in Exo 9:3, “murrain,” and in Hos 13:14, “plagues”) of the Heb. דֶּבֶר, deber (Sept. usually θάνατος), which originally seems to mean simply destruction, but is regularly applied to that common Oriental epidemic the plague (q.v.). The same term is also used in the Hebrew Scriptures for all epidemic or contagious diseases (Lev 26:25). The writers everywhere attribute it either to the agency of God himself or of that legate or angel whom they denominate מלא, malak; hence the Sept. renders the word דבר, deber, or pestilence, in Psa 91:6, by δαιμόνιον μεσήμβρινον, “the daemon of noonday,” and Jonathan also renders the same word in the Chaldee Targum (Hab 3:5) by the Chaldee word לא, angel or messenger. The prophets usually connect together sword, pestilence, and famine, being three of the most grievous inflictions of the Almighty upon a guilty people (2Sa 24:19). In the N.T. the term rendered “pestilence” is λοιμός (Mat 24:7; Luk 21:11; “pestilent fellow,” Act 24:5). SEE DISEASE.

## Pestle[[@Headword:Pestle]]

             (עֵַלי, eli, so called either as being round or lifted up), the instrument used for triturating in a mortar (Pro 27:22). It is supposed, from the above passage, not that the wheat was pounded to meal instead of being ground, but that it was pounded to be separated from the husk. The Jews very probably used wheat in the same manner as rice is now used in the East, that is, boiled up in pillaus variously prepared, which required that it should, like rice, be previously disengaged from the husk. SEE MORTAR.

## Petach[[@Headword:Petach]]

             SEE PETHACH.

## Petachia(s), Moses Ben-Jacob[[@Headword:Petachia(s), Moses Ben-Jacob]]

             a learned rabbi who flourished towards the latter half of the 12th century (Regensburg), is the author of the סַבּוּב הָעוֹלָם, also called סַבּוּב רִ פְּתִחְיָה, in which he relates his travels, made between 1075 and 1090 through Poland, Russia, Tartary, Syria, Mesopotamia, ancient Syria, Persia, etc., and wherein he describes the manners and usages of his co- religionists. It was first printed at Prague (1595), and reprinted by Wagenseil, entitled Itinerarium cum versione Wagenseilii, in his Sex exercitationes varii argumenti (Altorf, 1687; Zolkiew, 1792). It has been translated into French, with notes, by E. Carmoly, Tour de Monde de Petachia de Ratisbonne, traduit en Francais et accompagne du texte et des notes historiques, geographiques, et litteraires (Paris, 1831); into German by D. Ottensosser, with a Hebrew commentary (Furth, 1844); into English by Dr. A. Benisch. See First Bibl. Jud. 3:79 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:888; 3:956; Basnage, Histoire d s Juifs, page 655 (Taylor's English transl.); Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 6:259, 424; Zunz, Zir Geschichte u. Literatur, page 166; the same author in Asher's edition of Tudela's Itinerary, volume 2, No. 40, 43, 44, 47; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Lit. page 214; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, page 187. (B.P.)

## Petani[[@Headword:Petani]]

             a sort of cakes used anciently in Athens in making libations to the gods. They were substituted for animal sacrifices by the command of Cecrops.

## Petavel, Alfred F[[@Headword:Petavel, Alfred F]]

             a Swiss Protestant clergyman of note, was born near the close of the last century. He studied at the university in Berlin, and was the first recipient from that high school of the doctorate in philosophy. He was greatly instrumental in the establishment of the Swiss Missionary Society, and subsequently took no inconsiderable share in the doings of the Evangelical Alliance. The principal work, however, to which he devoted his best time, his talents, his energies, and his whole heart, was to bring the Jewish people into a more intimate personal contact with the Christians, and it is especially in this respect that his influence has extended beyond his little  country. He was a zealous member of the Universal Israelitish Alliance and of the Evangelical Alliance. He did not, at first, impress one as a pastor, a missionary, an apostle, a father of the Church, but rather as one of those individials described in the book of Genesis, who walked with God, who communed with him, like a patriarch or a seer. He died at the age of eighty. The addresses which he delivered were collected under the title of Discourses on Education. His Daughter of Zion, his Letter to the Synagogues of France, and many other writings, will always remain as imperishable records of the zeal which animated him for the re- establishment of the Jews as a people.

## Petavius, Dionysius[[@Headword:Petavius, Dionysius]]

             (also called DENIS PETAU), one of the most celebrated of French scholars, and iifluential in the councils of the Jesuits, to whose order he belonged, was born at Orleans Aug. 21, 1583. His father, who was a man of learning, seeing strong parts and a genius for letters in his son, took all possible means to improve them to the utmost. He used to tell his son that he ought to qualify himself so as to be able to attack and confound "the giant of the Allophylae;" meaning the redoubtable Joseph Scaliger, whose abilities and learning were supposed to have done such service to the Reformed. Young Petavius seems to have entered into his father's views; for he studied very intensely, and afterwards levelled much of his erudition against Scaliger. He joined the study of mathematics with that of belles- lettres; and then applied himself to a course in philosophy, which he began in the College of Orleans, and finished at Paris. After this he maintained theses in Greek and in Latin, which he is said to have understood as well as his native language, the French. In maturer years he had free access to the king's library, which he often visited in order to consult Latin and Greek manuscripts. Among other advantages which accompanied his literary pursuits was the friendship of Isaac Casaubon, whom Henry IV called to Paris in 1600. It was at his instigation that Petavius, young as he was, undertook an edition of The Works of Synesius; that is, to correct the Greek from the manuscripts, to translate that part which yet remained to be translated into Latin, and to write notes upon the whole. He was but nineteen when he was made professor of philosophy in the University of Bourges; and spent the two following years in studying the ancient philosophers and mathematicians. In 1604, when Morel, professor of Greek at Paris, published The Works of Chrysostom, some part of Petavius's labors on Synesius was added to them. (From the title of this  work we learn that he then Latinized his name Poetus, which he afterwards changed into Petavius. His own edition of The Works of Syneius did not appear till 1612.) He entered the Society of the Jesuits in 1605, and did great honor to it afterwards by his vast and profound erudition. He became zealous for the Roman Catholic Church; and there was no way of serving it more agreeable to his humor than by criticising and abusing its adversaries. Scaliger was the person he was most bitter against; but he did not spare his friend Casaubon whenever he came in his way.

There is no occasion to enter into detail about a man whose whole life was spent in reading and writing books, and in performing the several offices of his order. The history of a learned man is the history of his works; and by far the greater part of Petavius's writings were to support popish doctrines and discipline. But it must be confessed that in order to perform his task well he made himself a universal scholar. He died at Paris December 11, 1652. In 1633 he published an excellent work entitled Rationale Temporum; it is an abridgment of universal history, from the earliest times down to 1632, digested in chronological order, and supported all the way by references to proper authorities. It went through several editions; many additions and improvements have been made to it, both by Petavius himself, and by Perizonius and others after his death; and Le Clerc published an abridgment of it as far down as to 800, under the title of Compendium Historiae Universalis, in 1697 (12mo). Petavius's chef-d'oeuvre is his "Opus de Theologicis Dogmatibus, nunc primum septem voluminibus comprehensum, in meliorem ordinem redactum, auctoris ipsius vita, ac libris quibusdam numquam in hoc opere editis locupletatum, Francisci Antonii Zachariae ex eadem Societate Jesu extensium principum Bibliothecae Praefecti dissertationibus, ac notis uberrimis illustratum" (Ven. 1757, 7 volumes, fol.). It is full of choice erudition, but unfortunately his death cut it short, and it lacks completeness. Besides other services, Petavius deserves to be acknowledged as the first theologian who brought into proper relations history and dogmatics. Muratori regards him as the restorer of dogmatic theology. In the opinion of Gassendus (Vit. Pereschii) Petavius was the most consummate scholar the Jesuits ever had; and indeed we cannot suppose him to have been inferior to the first scholars of any order, while we consider him waging war, as he did frequently with success, against Scaliger, Salmasius, and other like chiefs in the republic of letters. His judgnent, as may easily be conceived, was inferior to his learning; and his controversial writings are full of that sourness and spleen which appears so manifest in all the prints of his countenance. Bayle has  observed that Petavius did the Socinians great service, though unawares and against his intentions. The Jesuit's original design, in the second volume of his Dogmata Theologica, was to represent ingenuously the doctrine of the first three centuries. Having no particular system to defend, he did not carefully state the opinions of the fathers, but only gave a general account of them. By this means he unawares led the public to believe that the fathers entertained false and absurd notions concerning the mystery of the Three Persons; and, against his intentions, furnished arguments and authorities to the Antitrinitarians. When made aware df this, and being willing to prevent the evil consequences which he had not foreseen, he wrote his Preface, in which he labored solely to assert the orthodoxy of the fathers, and thus was forced to contradict what he had advanced in the Dogmata. (Comp. Bull, On the Trinity.) See Werner, Geschichte der apologet. und polem. Literatur, volume 4; idem, Geschichte der katholischen Theologie (Munich, 1866); Dupin, Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs ecclesiastiques, s.v.; Simon, Hist. crit. des principaux Commentateurs; Alzog, Kirchengeschichte, 2:435; Christian Remembrancer, 55:484. (J.H.W.)

## Peter[[@Headword:Peter]]

             (Πέτρος, a rock, for the Aram. כֵּיפָא), originally SIMON SEE SIMON (see below), the leader among the personal disciples of Christ, and afterwards the special apostle to the Jews. We shall treat this important character first in the light of definite information from the New Testament and early Church historians, and disputed questions under a subsequent head, relegating many minor details to separate articles elsewhere.

I. Authentic History. —

1. His Early Life. — The Scripture notices on this point are few, but not unimportant, and enable us to form some estimate of the circumstances under which the apostle's character was formed, and how he was prepared for his great work. Peter was the son of a man named Jonas (Mat 16:17; Joh 1:43; Joh 21:16), and was brought up in his father's occupation, a fisherman on the sea of Tiberias. The occupation was of course an humble one, but not, as is often assumed, mean or servile, or incompatible with some degree of mental culture. His family were probably in easy circumstances (see below). He and his brother Andrew were partners of John and James, the sons of Zebedee, who had hired servants; and from  various indications in the sacred narrative we are led to the conclusion that their social position brought them into contact with men of education. In fact the trade of fishermen, supplying some of the important cities on the coasts of that inland lake, may have been tolerably remunerative, while all the necessaries of life were cheap and abundant in the singularly rich and fertile district where the apostle resided. He did not live, as a mere laboring man, in a hut by the sea-side, but first at Bethsaida, and afterwards in a house at Capernaum belonging to himself or his mother-in-law, which must have been rather a large one, since he received in it not only our Lord and his fellow-disciples, but multitudes who were attracted by the miracles and preaching of Jesus. It is certain that when he left all to follow Christ, he made what he regarded, and what seems to have been admitted by his Master, as being a considerable sacrifice (Mat 19:27). The habits of such a life were by no means unfavorable to the development of a vigorous, earnest, and practical character, such as he displayed in after- years. The labors, the privations, and the perils of an existence passed in great part upon the waters of that beautiful but stormy lake, the long and anxious watching through the nights, were calculated to test and increase his natural powers, his fortitude, energy, and perseverance. In the city he must have been brought into contact with men engaged in traffic, with soldiers and foreigners, and may have thus acquired somewhat of the flexibility and geniality of temperament all but indispensable to the attainment of such personal influence as he exercised in after-life. It is not probable that he and his brother were wholly uneducated. The Jews regarded instruction as a necessity, and legal enactments enforced the attendance of youths in schools maintained by the community. SEE EDUCATION.

The statement in Act 4:13, that "the council perceived they (i.e., Peter and John) were unlearned and ignorant men," is not incompatible with this assumption. The translation of the passage in the A.V. is rather exaggerated, the word rendered "unlearned" (ἰδιῶται ) being nearly equivalent to "laymen," i.e., men of ordinary education, as contrasted with those who were specially trained in the schools of the rabbins. A man might be thoroughly conversant with the Scriptures, and yet he considered ignorant and unlearned by the rabbins, among whom the opinion was already prevalent that "the letter of Scripture was the mere shell, an earthen vessel containing heavenly treasures, which could only be discovered by those who had been taught to search for the hidden cabalistic meaning." Peter and his kinsmen were probably taught to read .the Scriptures in childhood. The history of their country, especially of the  great events of early days, must have been familiar to them as attendants at the synagogue, and their attention was there directed to those portions of Holy Writ from which the Jews derived their anticipations of the Messiah.

The language of the apostles was of course the form of Aramaic spoken in Northern Palestine, a sort of patois, partly Hebrew, but more nearly allied to the Syriac. Hebrew, even in its debased form, was then spoken only by men of learning, the leaders of the Pharisees and Scribes. The men of Galilee were, however, noted for rough and inaccurate language, and especially for vulgarities of pronunciation (Mat 26:73). It is doubtful whether our apostle was acquainted with Greek in early life. It is certain, however, that there was more intercourse with foreigners in Galilee than in any district of Palestine, and Greek appears to have been a common, if not the principal, medium of communication. Within a few years after his call Peter seems to have conversed fluently in Greek with Cornelius, at least there is no intimation that an interpreter was employed, while it is highly improbable that Cornelius, a Roman soldier, should have used the language of Palestine. The style of both of Peter's epistles indicates a considerable knowledge of Greek; it is pure and accurate, and in grammatical structure equal to that of Paul. That may, however, be accounted for by the fact, for which there is very ancient authority, that Peter employed an interpreter in the composition of his epistles, if not in his ordinary intercourse with foreigners. There are no traces of acquaintance with Greek authors, or of the influence of Greek literature upon his mind, such as we find in Paul. nor could we expect it in a person of his station, even had Greek been his mother-tongue. It is on the whole probable that he had some rudimental knowledge of Greek in early life, which may have afterwards been extended when the need was felt, but not more than would enable him to discourse intelligibly on practical and devotional subjects. That he was an affectionate husband, married in early life to a wife who accompanied him in his apostolic journeys, are facts inferred from Scripture, while very ancient traditions, recorded by Clement of Alexandria (whose connection with the Church founded by Mark gives a peculiar value to his testimony), and by other early but less trustworthy writers, inform us that her name was Perpetua, that she bore a daughter, and perhaps other children, and suffered martyrdom. (See below.)

2. As a Disciple merely. — It is uncertain at what age Peter was called by our Lord. The general impression of the fathers is that he was an old man at the date of his death, A.D. 64, but this need not imply that he was much  older than our Lord. He was probably between thirty and forty years of age at the date of his first call, A.D. 26. That call was preceded by a special preparation. He and his brother Andrew, together with their partners, James and John, the sons of Zebedee, were disciples of John the Baptist (Joh 1:35). They were in attendance upon him when they were first called to the service of Christ. From the circumstances of that call, which are recorded with graphic minuteness by St. John, we learn some important facts touching their state of mind and the personal character of our apostle. Two disciples, one named by the evangelist Andrew, the other in all probability St. John himself, were standing with the Baptist at Bethany on the Jordan, when he pointed out Jesus as he walked, and said, Behold the Lamb of God! that is, the antitype of the victims whose blood (as all true Israelites, and they more distinctly under the teaching of John, believed) prefigured the atonement for sin. The two at once followed Jesus, and upon his invitation abode with him that day. Andrew then went to his brother Simon, and said to him, We have found the Messias, the Anointed One, of whom they had read in the prophets. Simon went at once, and when Jesus looked on him he said, "Thou art Simon the son of Jona; thou shalt be called Cephas." The change of name is of course deeply significant. As son of Jona (a name of doubtful meaning, according to Lampe equivalent to Johmnan or John, i.e., grace of the Lord; according to Lange, who has some striking but fanciful observations, signifying dove) he bore as a disciple the name Simon, i.e., hearer; but as an apostle, one of the twelve on whom the Church was to be erected, he was hereafter (κληθήσῃ) to be called Rock or Stone. It seems a natural impression that the words refer primarily to the original character of Simon: that our Lord saw in him a man firm, steadfast, not to be overthrown, though severely tried; and such was generally the view taken by the fathers. But it is perhaps a deeper and truer inference that Jesus thus describes Simon, not as what he was, but as what he would become under his influence — a man with predispositions and capabilities not unfitted for the office he was to hold, but one whose permanence and stability would depend upon union with the living Rock. Thus we may expect to find Simon, as the natural man, at once rough, stubborn, and mutable, whereas Peter, identified with the Rock, will remain firm and immovable to the end. (See below.)

This first call led to no immediate change in Peter's external position. He and his fellow-disciples looked henceforth upon our Lord as their teacher, but were not commanded to follow him as regular disciples. There were  several grades of disciples among the Jews, from the occasional hearer to the follower who gave up all other pursuits in order to serve a master. At the time a recognition of his Person and office sufficed. They returned to Capernaum, where they pursued their usual business, waiting for a further intimation of his will.

The second call is recorded by the other three evangelists. It took place on the Sea of Galilee near Capernaum, where the four disciples, Peter and Andrew, James and John, were fishing, A.D. 27. Peter and Andrew were first called. Our Lord then entered Simon Peter's boat, and addressed the multitude on the shore; after the conclusion of the discourse he wrought the miracle by which he foreshadowed the success of the apostles in the new but analogous occupation which was to be theirs — that of fishers of men. The call of James and John followed. From that time the four were certainly enrolled formally among his disciples, and although as yet invested with no official character, accompanied him in his journeys, those especially in the north of Palestine.

Immediately after that call our Lord went to the house of Peter, where he wrought the miracle of healing on Peter's wife's mother, a miracle succeeded by other manifestations of divine power which produced a deep impression upon the people. Some time was passed afterwards in attendance upon our Lord's public ministrations in Galilee, Decapolis, Peraea, and Judaea — though at intervals the disciples returned to their own city, and were witnesses of many miracles, of the call of Levi, and of their Master's reception of outcasts, whom they in common with their zealous but prejudiced countrymen had despised and shunned. It was a period of training, of mental and spiritual discipline preparatory to their admission to the higher office to which they were destined. Even then Peter received some marks of distinction. He was selected, together with the two sons of Zebedee, to witness the raising of Jarius's daughter.

The special designation of Peter and his eleven fellow-disciples took place some time afterwards, when they were set apart as our Lord's immediate attendants, and as his delegates to go forth wherever he might send them, as apostles, announcers of his kingdom, gifted with supernatural powers as credentials of their supernatural mission (see Mat 10:2-4; Mar 3:13-19, the most detailed account; Luk 6:13). They appear then first to have formally received the name of Apostles, and from that time Simon bore publicly, and as it would seem all but exclusively, the name Peter,  which had hitherto been used rather as a characteristic appellation than as a proper name.

From this time there can be no doubt that Peter held the first place among the apostles, to whatever cause his precedence is to be attributed. There was certainly much in his character which marked him as a representative man; both in his strength and in his weakness, in his excellences and his defects he exemplified the changes which the natural man undergoes in the gradual transformation into the spiritual man under the personal influence of the Savior. The precedence did not depend upon priority of call, or it would have devolved upon his brother Andrew, or that other disciple who first followed Jesus. It seems scarcely probable that it depended upon seniority, even supposing, which is a mere conjecture, that he was older than his fellow-disciples. The special designation by Christ alone accounts in a satisfactory way for the facts that he is named first in every list of the apostles, is generally addressed by our Lord as their representative, and on the most solemn occasions speaks in their name.

Thus when the first great secession took place in consequence of the offence given by our Lord's mystic discourse at Capernaum (see Joh 6:66-69), "Jesus said unto the twelve, Will ye also go away? Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life: and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Thus again at Caesarea Philippi, soon after the return of the twelve from their first missionary tour, Peter (speaking as before in the name of the twelve, though, as appears from our Lord's words, with a peculiar distinctness of personal conviction) repeated that declaration, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The confirmation of our apostle in his special position in the Church, his identification with the rock on which that Church is founded, the ratification of the powers and duties attached to the apostolic office, and the promise of permanence to the Church, followed as a reward of that confession. The early Church regarded Peter generally, and most especially on this occasion, as the representative of the apostolic body — a very distinct theory from that which makes him their head or governor in Christ's stead. Even in the time of Cyprian, when connection with the bishop of Rome as Peter's successor for the first time was held to be indispensable, no powers of jurisdiction or supremacy were supposed to be attached to the admitted precedency of rank. Primus inter pares Peter held no distinct office, and certainly never claimed any powers which did not belong equally to all his fellow-apostles. (See below.)

This great triumph of Peter, however, brought other points of his character into strong relief. The distinction which he then received, and it may be his consciousness of ability, energy, zeal, and absolute devotion to Christ's person, seem to have developed a natural tendency to rashness and forwardness bordering upon presumption. On this occasion the exhibition of such feelings brought upon him the strongest reproof ever addressed to a disciple by our Lord. In his affection and self-confidence Peter ventured to reject as impossible the announcement of the sufferings and humiliation which Jesus predicted; and he heard the sharp words — "Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art an offence unto me — for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." That was Peter's first fall; a very ominous one: not a rock, but a stumbling-stone; not a defender, but an antagonist and deadly enemy of the faith, when the spiritual should give place to the lower nature in dealing with the things of God. It is remarkable that on other occasions when Peter signalized his faith and devotion he displayed at the time, or immediately afterwards, a more than usual deficiency in spiritual discernment and consistency. Thus a few days after that fall he was selected together with John and James to witness the transfiguration of Christ, but the words which he then uttered prove that he was completely bewildered, and unable at the time to comprehend the meaning of the transaction. Thus again, when his zeal and courage prompted him to leave the ship and walk on the water to go to Jesus (Mat 14:29), a sudden failure of faith withdrew the sustaining power; he was about to sink when he was at once reproved and saved by his Master.

Such traits, which occur not unfrequently, prepare us for his last great fall, as well as for his conduct after the resurrection, when his natural gifts were perfected and his deficiencies supplied by "the power from on high." We find a mixture of zeal and weakness in his conduct when called upon to pay tribute-money for himself and his Lord, but faith had the upper hand, and was rewarded by a significant miracle (Mat 17:24-27). The question which about the same time Peter asked our Lord as to the extent to which forgiveness of sins should be carried, indicated a great advance in spirituality from the Jewish standpoint, while it showed how far as yet he and his fellow-disciples were from understanding the true principle of Christian love (Mat 18:21). We find a similar blending of opposite qualities in the declaration recorded by the synoptical evangelists (Mat 19:27; Mar 10:28; Luk 17:28), "Lo, we have left all and followed thee." It certainly bespeaks a consciousness of sincerity, a spirit of self-devotion and selfsacrifice, though  it conveys an impression of something like ambition; but in that instance the good undoubtedly predominated, as is shown by our Lord's answer. He does not reprove Peter, who spoke, as usual, in the name of the twelve but takes the opportunity of uttering the strongest prediction touching the future dignity and paramount authority of the apostles, a prediction recorded by Matthew only.

Towards the close of our Lord's ministry (A.D. 29) Peter's characteristics become especially prominent. Together with his brother and the two sons of Zebedee he listened to the last awful predictions and warnings delivered to the disciples in reference to the second advent (Mat 24:3; Mar 13:3, who alone mentions these names; Luk 21:7). At the last supper Peter seems to have been particularly earnest in the request that the traitor might be pointed out, expressing of course a general feeling, to which some inward consciousness of infirmity may have added force. After the supper his words drew out the meaning of the significant, almost sacramental act of our Lord in washing his disciples' feet — an occasion on which we find the same mixture of goodness and frailty, humility and deep affection, with a certain taint of self-will, which was at once hushed into submissive reverence by the voice of Jesus. Then too it was that he made those repeated protestations of unalterable fidelity, so soon to be falsified by his miserable fall. That event is. however, of such critical import in its bearings upon the character and position of the apostle, that it cannot be dismissed without a careful, if not an exhaustive discussion. Judas had left the guest-chamber when Peter put the question, Lord, whither goest thou? words which modern theologians generally represent as savoring of idle curiosity or presumption, but in which the early fathers (as Chrysostom and Augustine) recognised the utterance of love and devotion. The answer was a promise that Peter should follow his Master, but accompanied with an intimation of present unfitness in the disciple. Then came the first protestation, which elicited the sharp and stern rebuke, and distinct prediction of Peter's denial (Joh 13:36-38).

From comparing this account with those of the other evangelists (Mat 26:33-35; Mar 14:29-31; Luk 22:33-34), it seems evident that with some diversity of circumstances both the protestation and warning were thrice repeated. The tempter was to sift all the disciples, our apostle's faith was to be preserved from failing by the special intercession of Christ, he being thus singled out either as the representative of the whole body, or, as seems more probable, because his character was one which had special  need of supernatural aid. Mark, as usual, records two points which enhance the force of the warning and the guilt of Peter, viz. that the cock would crow twice, and that after such warning he repeated his protestation with greater vehemence. Chrysostom, who judges the apostle with fairness and candor, attributes this vehemence to his great love, and more particularly to the delight which he felt when assured that he was not the traitor, yet not without a certain admixture of forwardness and ambition such as had previously been shown in the dispute for pre-eminence. The fiery trial soon came. After the agony of Gethsemane, when the three, Peter, James, and John, were, as on former occasions, selected to be with our Lord, the only witnesses of his passion, where also all three had alike failed to prepare themselves by prayer and watching, the arrest of Jesus took place.

Peter did not shrink from the danger. In the same spirit which had dictated his promise he drew his sword, alone against the armed throng, and wounded the servant (τὸν δοῦλον, not a servant) of the highpriest, probably the leader of the band. When this bold but unauthorized attempt at rescue was reproved, he did not yet forsake his Master, but followed him with John into the focus of danger, the house of the highpriest. There he sat in the outer hall. He must have been in a state of utter confusion: his faith, which from first to last was bound up with hope, his special characteristic, was for the time powerless against temptation. The danger found him unarmed. Thrice, each time with greater vehemence, the last time with blasphemous asseveration, he denied his Master. The triumph of Satan seemed complete. Yet it is evident that it was an obscuration of faith, not an extinction. It needed but a glance of his Lord's eye to bring him to himself. His repentance was instantaneous and effectual. The light in which he himself regarded his conduct is clearly shown by the terms in which it is related by Mark, who in some sense may be regarded as his reporter. The inferences are weighty as regards his personal character, which represents more completely perhaps than any in the New Testament the weakness of the natural and the strength of the spiritual man — still more weighty as bearing upon his relations to the apostolic body, and the claims resting upon the assumption that he stood to them in the place of Christ.

On the morning of the resurrection we have proof that Peter, though humbled, was not crushed by his fall. He and John were the first to visit the sepulchre; he was the first who entered it. We are told by Luke (in words still used by the Eastern Church as the first salutation on Easter Sunday) and by Paul that Christ appeared to him first among the apostles — he who  most needed the comfort was the first who received it, and with it, as may be assumed, an assurance of forgiveness. It is observable, however, that on that occasion he is called by his original name, Simon, not Peter; the higher designation was not restored until he had been publicly reinstituted, so to speak, by his Master. That reinstitution took place at the Sea of Galilee (John 21), an event of the very highest import. We have there indications of his best natural qualities, practical good sense, promptness, and energy; slower than John to recognise their Lord, Peter was the first to reach him: he brought the net to land. The thrice-repeated question of Christ, referring doubtless to the three protestations and denials, was thrice met by answers full of love and faith, and utterly devoid of his hitherto characteristic failing, presumption, of which not a trace is to be discerned in his later history. He then received the formal commission to feed Christ's sheep; not certainly as one endued with exclusive or paramount authority, or as distinguished from his fellow-disciples, whose fall had been marked by far less aggravating circumstances; rather as one who had forfeited his place, and could not resume it without such an authorization. Then followed the prediction of his martyrdom, in which he was to find the fulfilment of his request to be permitted to follow the Lord.

With this event closes the first part of Peter's history. It was a period of transition, during which the fisherman of Galilee had been trained, first by the Baptist, then by our Lord, for the great work of his life. He had learned to know the person and appreciate the offices of Christ; while his own character had been chastened and elevated by special privileges and humiliations, both reaching their climax in the last recorded transactions. Henceforth he with his colleagues were to establish and govern the Church founded by their Lord, without the support of his presence.

3. Apostolical Career. — The first part of the Acts of the Apostles is occupied by the record of transactions in nearly all of which Peter stands forth as the recognised leader of the apostles; it being, however, equally clear that he neither exercises nor claims any authority apart from them, much less over them. In the first chapter it is Peter who points out to the disciples (as in all his discourses and writings drawing his arguments from prophecy) the necessity of supplying the place of Judas. He states the qualifications of an apostle, but takes no special part in the election. The candidates are selected by the disciples, while the decision is left to the searcher of hearts. The extent and limits of Peter's primacy might be inferred with tolerable accuracy from this transaction alone. To have one  spokesman, or foreman, seems to accord with the spirit of order and humility which ruled the Church, while the assumption of power or supremacy would be incompatible with the express command of Christ (see Mat 23:10). In the second chapter again, Peter is the most prominent person in the greatest event after the resurrection, when on the day of Pentecost the Church was first invested with the plentitude of gifts and powers. Then Peter, not speaking in his own name, but with the eleven (see Mat 23:14), explained the meaning of the miraculous gifts, and showed the fulfilment of prophecies (accepted at that time by all Hebrews as Messianic) both in the outpouring of the Holy Ghost and in the resurrection and death of our Lord. This discourse, which bears all the marks of Peter's individuality, both of character and doctrinal views, ends with an appeal of remarkable boldness. It is the model upon which the apologetic discourses of the primitive Christians were generally constructed. The conversion and baptism of three thousand persons,who continued steadfast in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, attested the power of the Spirit which spake by Peter on that occasion.

The first miracle after Pentecost was wrought by Peter (Acts 3); and John was joined with him in that, as in most important acts of his ministry; but it was Peter who took the cripple by the hand, and bade him "In the name of Jesus of Nazareth rise up and walk," and when the people ran together to Solomon's porch, where the apostles, following their Master's example, were wont to teach, Peter was the speaker: he convinces the people of their sin, warns them of their danger, points out the fulfilment of prophecy, and the special objects for which God sent his Son first to the children of the old covenant. This speech is at once strikingly characteristic of Peter and a proof of the fundamental harmony between his teaching and the more developed and systematic doctrines of Paul; differing in form, to an extent utterly incompatible with the theory of Baur and Schwegler touching the object of the writer of the Acts; identical in spirit, as issuing from the same source. The boldness of the two apostles, of Peter more especially as the spokesman, when "filled with the Holy Ghost" he confronted the full assembly headed by Annas and Caiaphas, produced a deep impression upon those cruel and unscrupulous hypocrites: an impression enhanced by the fact that the words came from comparatively ignorant and unlearned men. The words spoken by both apostles, when commanded not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus, have ever since been the watchwords of martyrs (Act 4:19-20).  This first miracle of healing was soon followed by the first miracle of judgment. The first open and deliberate sin against the Holy Ghost — a sin combining ambition, fraud, hypocrisy, and blasphemy — was visited by death, sudden and awful as under the old dispensation.

Peter was the minister in that transaction. As he had first opened the gate to penitents (Act 2:37-38), he now closed it to hypocrites. The act stands alone, without a precedent or parallel in the Gospel; but Peter acted simply as an instrument, not pronouncing the sentence, but denouncing the sin, and that in the name of his fellow-apostles and of the Holy Ghost. Penalties similar in kind, though far different in degree, were inflicted or commanded on various occasions by Paul. Peter appears, perhaps in consequence of that act, to have become the object of a reverence bordering, as it would seem, on superstition (Act 5:15), while the numerous miracles of healing wrought about the same time, showing the true character of the power dwelling in the apostles, gave occasion to the second persecution. Peter then came in contact with the noblest and most interesting character among the Jews, the learned and liberal tutor of Paul, Gamaliel, whose caution, gentleness, and dispassionate candor stand out in strong relief contrasted with his colleagues, but make a faint impression compared with the steadfast and uncompromisiing principles of the apostles, who, after undergoing an illegal scourging, went forth rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for the name of Jesus. Peter is not specially named in connection with the appointment of deacons, an important step in the organization of the Church; but when the Gospel was first preached beyond the precincts of Judaea, he and John were at once sent by the apostles to confirm the converts at Samaria, a very important statement at this critical point, proving clearly his subordination to the whole body, of which he was the most active and able member.

Up to this time it may be said that the apostles had one great work, viz. to convince the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah; in that work Peter was the master builder, the whole structure rested upon the doctrines of which he was the principal teacher; hitherto no words but his are specially recorded by the writer of the Acts. Henceforth he remains prominent, but not exclusively prominent, among the propagators of the Gospel. At Samaria he and John established the precedent for the most important rite not expressly enjoined in Holy Writ, viz. confirmation, which the Western Church has always held to belong exclusively to the functions of bishops as successors to the ordinary powers of the apostolate. Then also Peter  was confronted with Simon Magus, the first teacher of heresy. SEE SIMON MAGUS.

As in the case of Ananias he had denounced the first sin against holiness, so in this case he first declared the penalty due to the sin called after Simon's name. About three years later (comp. Act 9:26 and Gal 1:17-18) we have two accounts of the first meeting of Peter and Paul. In the Acts it is stated generally that Saul was at first distrusted by the disciples, and received by the apostles upon the recommendation of Barnabas. From the Galatians we learn that Paul went to Jerusalem especially to see Peter; that he abode with him fifteen days, and that James was the only other apostle present at the time. It is important to note that this account, which, while it establishes the independence of Paul, marks the position of Peter as the most eminent of the apostles, rests not on the authority of the writer of the Acts, but on that of Paul — as if it were intended to obviate all possible misconceptions touching the mutual relations of the apostles of the Hebrews and the Gentiles. This interview was preceded by other events marking Peter's position — a general apostolical tour of visitation to the churches hitherto established (διερχόμενον δεὰ πάντων, Act 9:32), in the course of which two great miracles were wrought on AEneas and Tabitha, and in connection with which the most signal transaction after the day of Pentecost is recorded, the baptism of Cornelius. A.D. 32. That was the crown and consummation of Peter's ministry.

Peter, who had first preached the resurrection to the Jews, baptized the first converts, confirmed the first Samaritans, now, without the advice or cooperation of any of his colleagues, under direct communication from heaven, first threw down the barrier which separated proselytes of the gate from Israelites, thus establishing principles which in their gradual application and full development issued in the complete fusion of the Gentile and Hebrew elements in the Church. The narrative of this event, which stands alone in minute circumstantiality of incidents and accumulation of supernatural agency, is twice recorded by Luke. The chief points to be noted are, first, the pecaliar fitness of Cornelius, both as a representative of Roman force and nationality, and as a devout and liberal worshipper, to be a recipient of such privileges; and, secondly, the state of the apostle's own mind. Whatever may have been his hopes or fears touching the heathen, the idea had certainly not yet crossed him that they could become Christians without first becoming Jews. As a loyal and believing Hebrew, he could not contemplate the removal of Gentile disqualifications without a distinct assurance that the enactments of the law which concerned them were  abrogated by the divine Legislator. The vision could not therefore have been the product of a subjective impression. It was, strictly speaking, objective, presented to his mind by an external influence. Yet the will of the apostle was not controlled, it was simply enlightened. The intimation in the state of trance did not at once overcome his reluctance. It was not until his consciousness was fully restored, and he had well considered the meaning of the vision, that he learned that the distinction of cleanness and uncleanness in outward things belonged to a temporary dispensation. It was no mere acquiescence in a positive command, but the development of a spirit full of generous impulses, which found utterance in the words spoken by Peter on that occasion — both in the presence of Cornelius, and afterwards at Jerusalem. His conduct gave great offence to all his countrymen (Act 11:2), and it needed all his authority, corroborated by a special manifestation of the Holy Ghost, to induce his fellowapostles to recognise the propriety of this great act, in which both he and they saw an earnest of the admission of Gentiles into the Church on the single condition of spiritual repentance. The establishment of a Church, in great part of Gentile origin, at Antioch, and the mission of Barnabas, between whose family and Peter there were the bonds of near intimacy, set the seal upon the work thus inaugurated by Peter.

This transaction was followed, after an interval of several years, by the imprisonment of our apostle. A.D. 44. Herod Agrippa, having first tested the state of feeling at Jerusalem by the execution of James, one of the most eminent apostles, arrested Peter. The hatred which at that time first showed itself as a popular feeling may most probably be attributed chiefly to the offence given by Peter's conduct towards Cornelius. His miraculous deliverance marks the close of this second great period of his ministry. The special work assigned to him was completed. He had founded the Church, opened its gates to Jews and Gentiles, and distinctly laid down the conditions of admission. From that time we have no continuous history of Peter. It is quite clear that he retained his rank as the chief apostle, equally so that he neither exercised nor claimed any right to control their proceedings. At Jerusalem the government of the Church devolved upon James the brother of our Lord. In other places Peter seems to have confined his ministrations to his countrymen — as apostle of the circumcision. He left Jerusalem, but it is not said where he went. Certainly not to Rome, where there are no traces of his presence before the last years of his life; he probably remained in Judaea, visiting and confirming the  churches; some old but not trustworthy traditions represent him as preaching in Caesarea and other cities on the western coast of Palestine; three years later we find him once more at Jerusalem when the apostles and elders came together to consider the question whether converts should be circumcised. Peter took the lead in that discussion, and urged with remarkable cogency the principles settled in the case of Cornelius. Purifying faith and saving grace (Act 15:9; Act 15:11) remove all distinctions between believers.

His arguments, adopted and enforced by James, decided that question at once and forever. It is, however, to be remarked that on that occasion he exercised no one power which Romanists hold to be inalienably attached to the chair of Peter. He did not preside at the meeting; he neither summoned nor dismissed it; he neither collected the suffrages nor pronounced the decision. It is a disputed point whether the meeting between Paul and Peter of which we have an account in the Galatians (Gal 2:1-10) took place at this time. The great majority of critics believe that it did, but this hypothesis has serious difficulties. Lange (Das apostolische Zeitalter, 2:378) fixes the date about three years after the council. Wieseler has a long excursus to show that it must have occurred after Paul's second apostolic journey. He gives some weighty reasons, but wholly fails in the attempt to account for the presence of Barnabas, a fatal objection to his theory. (See Der Brief an die Galater, Excursus, page 579.) On the other side are Theodoret, Pearson, Eichhorn, Olshausen, Meyer, Neander, Howson, Schaff, etc. The only point of real importance was certainly determined before the apostles separated, the work of converting the Gentiles being henceforth specially intrusted to Paul and Barnabas, while the charge of preaching to the circumcision was assigned to the elder apostles, and more particularly to Peter (Gal 2:7-9).

This arrangement cannot, however, have been an exclusive one. Paul always addressed himself first to the Jews in every city; Peter and his colleagues undoubtedly admitted and sought to make converts among the Gentiles. It may have been in full force only when the old and new apostles resided in the same city. Such at least was the case at Antioch, where Peter went soon afterwards. There the painful collision took place between the two apostles; the most remarkable, and, in its bearings upon controversies at critical periods, one of the most important events in the history of the Church. Peter at first applied the principles which he had lately defended, carrying with him the whole apostolic body, and on his arrival at Antioch ate with the Gentiles thus showing that he believed all ceremonial distinctions to be abolished by the Gospel — in that he went far beyond the  strict letter of the injunctions issued by the council. That step was marked and condemned by certain members of the Church of Jerusalem sent by James. It appeared to them one thing to recognise Gentiles as fellow- Christians, another to admit them to social intercourse, whereby ceremonial defilement would be contracted under the law to which all the apostles, Barnabas and Paul included, acknowledged allegiance. Peter, as the apostle of the circumcision fearing to give offence to those who were his special charge, at once gave up the point, suppressed or disguised his feelings, and separated himself not from communion, but from social intercourse with the Gentiles. Paul, as the apostle of the Gentiles, saw clearly the consequences likely to ensue, and could ill brook the misapplication of a rule often laid down in his own writings concerning compliance with the prejudices of weak brethren. He held that Peter was infringing a great principle, withstood him to the face, and, using the same arguments which Peter had urged at the council, pronounced his conduct to be indefensible. The statement that Peter compelled the Gentiles to Judaize probably means, not that he enjoined circumcision, but that his conduct, if persevered in, would have that effect, since they would naturally take any steps which might remove the barriers to familiar intercourse with the first apostles of Christ. Peter was wrong, but it was an error of judgment: an act contrary to his own feelings and wishes, in reference to those whom he looked upon as representing the mind of the Church; that he was actuated by selfishness, national pride, or any remains of superstition, is neither asserted nor implied in the strong censure of Paul. Nor, much as we must admire the earnestness and wisdom of Paul, whose clear and vigorous intellect was in this case stimulated by anxiety for his own special charge, the Gentile Church, should we overlook Peter's singular humility in submitting to public reproof from one so much his junior, or his magnanimity both in adopting Paul's conclusions (as we must infer that he did from the absence of all trace of continued resistance) and in remaining on terms of brotherly communion (as is testified by his own written words) to the end of his life (1Pe 5:10; 2Pe 3:15-16). SEE PAUL.

From this time until the date of his Epistles we have no distinct notices in Scripture of Peter's abode or work. The silence may be accounted for by the fact that from that time the great work of propagating the Gospel was committed to the marvellous energies of Paul. Peter was probably employed for the most part in building up and completing the organization  of Christian communities in Palestine and the adjoining districts. There is, however, strong reason to believe that he visited Corinth at an early period; this seems to be implied in several passages of Paul's first epistle to that Church, and it is a natural inference from the statements of Clement of Rome (First Epistle to the Corinthians, c. 4). The fact is positively asserted by Dionysius, bishop of Corinth (A.D. 180 at the latest), a man of excellent judgment, who was not likely to be misinformed, nor to make such an assertion lightly in an epistle addressed to the bishop and Church of Rome. The reference to collision between parties who claimed Peter, Apollos, Paul, and even Christ for their chiefs, involves no opposition between the apostles themselves, such as the fabulous Clementines and modern infidelity assume. The name of Peter as founder, or joint founder, is not associated with any local Church save those of Corinth, Antioch, and Rome, by early ecclesiastical tradition. That of Alexandria may have been established by Mark after Peter's death. That Peter preached the Gospel in the countries of Asia mentioned in his First Epistle appears from Origen's own words (κεκηρυκέναι ἔοικεν) to be a mere conjecture (Origen, ap. Euseb. 3:1, adopted by Epiphanius, Haer. 27, and Jerome, Catal. c. 1), not in itself improbable, but of little weight in the absence of all positive evidence, and of all personal reminiscences in the Epistle itself. From that Epistle, however, it is to be inferred that towards the end of his life Peter either visited or resided for some time at Babylon, which at that time, and for some hundreds of years afterwards, was a chief seat of Jewish culture.

This of course depends upon the assumption, which on the whole seems most probable, that the word Babylon is not used as a mystic designation of Rome, but as a proper name, and that not of an obscure city in Egypt, but of the ancient capital of the East. There were many inducements for such a choice of abode. The Jewish families formed there a separate community; they were rich, prosperous, and had established settlements in many districts of Asia Minor. Their language, probably a mixture of Hebrew and Nabathaean, must have borne a near affinity to the Galileean dialect. They were on far more familiar terms with their heathen neighbors than in other countries, while their intercourse with Judaea was carried on without intermission. Christianity certainly made considerable progress at an early time in that and the adjoining districts; the great Christian schools at Edessa and Nisibis probably owed their origin to the influence of Peter; the general tone of the writers of that school is what is now commonly designated as Petrine. It is no unreasonable supposition that the establishment of Christianity in those districts may have been specially  connected with the residence of Peter at Babylon. At that time there must have been some communication between the two great apostles, Peter and Paul, thus stationed at the two extremities of the Christian world. Mark, who was certainly employed about that time by Paul, was with Peter when he wrote the Epistle. Silvanus, Paul's chosen companion, was the bearer, probably the amanuensis of Peter's Epistle — not improlably sent to Peter from Rome, and charged by him to deliver that epistle, written to support Paul's authority, to the churches founded by that apostle on his return. SEE PETER, EPISTLES OF

More important in its bearings upon later controversies is the question of Peter's connection with Rome. It may be considered as a settled point that he did not visit Rome before the last year of his life. Too much stress may perhaps be laid on the fact that there is no notice of Peter's labors or presence in that city in the Epistle to the Romans; but that negative evidence is not counterbalanced by any statement of undoubted antiquity. The date given by Eusebius rests upon a miscalculation, and is irreconcilable with the notices of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. He gives A.D. 42 in the Chronicon (i.e., in the Armenian text), and says that Peter remained at Rome twenty years. In this he is followed by Jerome, Catal. c. 1 (who gives twenty-five years), and by most Roman Catholic writers. Protestant critics, with scarcely one exception, are unanimous upon this point, and Roman controversialists are far from being agreed in their attempts to remove the difficulty. The most ingenious effort is that of Windischmann (Vindicae Petrinae, page 112 sq.). He assumes that Peter went to Rome immediately after his deliverance from prison (Acts 12), i.e., A.D. 44, and left in consequence of the Claudian persecution between A.D. 49 and 51. (See below.)

The fact, however, of Peter's martyrdom at Rome rests upon very different grounds. The evidence for it is complete, while there is a total absence of any contrary statement in the writings of the early fathers. We have in the first place the certainty of his martyrdom in our Lord's own prediction (Joh 21:18-19). Clement of Rome, writing before the end of the first century, speaks of it, but does not mention the place, that being of course well known to his readers. Ignatius, in the undoubtedly genuine Epistle to the Romans (ch. iv), speaks of Peter in terms which imply a special connection with their Church. Other early notices of less weight coincide with this, as that of Papias (Euseb. 2:15), and the apocryphal Praedicatio Petri, quoted by Cyprian. In the second century, Dionysius of Corinth, in  the Epistle to Soter, bishop of Rome (ap. Euseb. H.E. 2:25), states, as a fact universally known, and accounting for the intimate relations between Corinth and Rome, that Peter and Paul both taught in Italy, and suffered martyrdom about the same time. Irenaeus, who was connected with the apostle John, being a disciple of Polycarp, a hearer of that apostle, and thoroughly conversant with Roman matters, bears distinct witness to Peter's presence at Rome (Adv. Her. 3:1 and 3). It is incredible that he should have been misinformed. In the next century there is the testimony of Caius, the liberal and learned Roman presbyter (who speaks of Peter's tomb in the Vatican), that of Origen, Tertullian, and of the ante- and post- Nicene fathers, without a single exception. In short, the churches most nearly connected with Rome, and those least affected by its influence, which was as yet but inconsiderable in the East, concur in the statement that Peter was a joint founder of that Church, and suffered death in that city. What the early fathers do not assert, and indeed implicitly deny, is that Peter was the sole founder or resident head of that Church, or that the See of Rome derived from him any claim to supremacy: at the utmost they place him on a footing of equality with Paul. That fact is sufficient for all purposes of fair controversy. The denial of the statements resting on such evidence seems almost to indicate an uneasy consciousness, truly remarkable in those who believe that they have, and who in fact really have, irrefragable grounds for rejecting the pretensions of the papacy. Coteler has collected a large number of passages from the early fathers, in which the name of Paul precedes that of Peter (Pat. Apost. 1:414; see also Valesius, Euseb. H.E. 3:21). Fabricius observes that this is the general usage of the Greek fathers. It is also to be remarked that when the fathers of the 4th and 5th centuries — for instance, Chrysostom and Augustin — use the words οΑ῾᾿πόστολος, or Apestolus, they mean Paul, not Peter — a very weighty fact.

The time and manner of the apostle's martyrdom are, less certain. The early writers imply,or distinctly state, that he suffered at or about the same time (Dionysius, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν) with Paul, and in the Neronian persecution. All agree that he was crucified, a point sufficiently determined by our Lord's prophecy. Origen (ap. Euseb. 3:1), who could easily ascertain the fact, and, though fanciful in speculation, is not inaccurate in historical matters, says that at his own request he was crucified κατὰ κεφάλης; probably meaning by the head, and not, as generally understood, with his head downwards. (See below.) This statement was generally  received by Christian antiquity; nor does it seem inconsistent with the fervent temperament and deep humility of the apostle to have chosen such a death — one, moreover, not unlikely to have been inflicted in mockery by the instruments of Nero's wanton and ingenious cruelty. The legend found in St. Ambrose is interesting. and may have some foundation in fact. When the persecution began, the Christians at Rome, anxious to preserve their great teacher, persuaded him to flee, a course which they had scriptural warrant to recommend and he to follow; but at the gate he met our Lord. "Lord, whither goest thou?" asked the apostle. "I go to Rome," was the answer, "there once more to be crucified." Peter well understood the meaning of those words, returned at once and was crucified. See Tillemont, Mem. 1:187, 555. He shows that the account of Ambrose (which is not to be found in the Bened. edit.) is contrary to the apocryphal legend. Later writers rather value it as reflecting upon Peter's want of courage or constancy. That Peter, like all good men. valued his life and suffered reluctantly, may be inferred from our Lord's words (John 21); but his flight is more in harmony with the principles of a Christian than wilful exposure to persecution. Origen refers to the words then said to have been spoken by our Lord, but quotes an apocryphal work (On St. John, tom. 2).

Thus closes the apostle's life. Some additional facts, not perhaps unimportant, may be accepted on early testimony. From Paul's words it may be inferred with certainty that he did not give up the ties of family life when he forsook his temporal calling. His wife accompanied him in his wanderings. Clement of Alexandria, a writer well informed in matters of ecclesiastical interest, and thoroughly trustworthy, says (Strom. 3, page 448) that "Peter and Philip had children, and that both took about their wives, who acted as their coadjutors in ministering to women at their own homes; by their means the doctrine of the Lord penetrated without scandal into the privacy of women's apartments." Peter's wife is believed, on the same authority, to have suffered martyrdom, and to have been supported in the hour of trial by her husband's exhortation. Some critics believe that she is referred to in the salutation at the end of the First Epistle of Peter. The apostle is said to have employed interpreters. Basilides, an early Gnostic, professed to have derived his system from Glaucias. one of these interpreters. This shows at least the impression that the apostle did not understand Greek, or did not speak it with fluency. Of far more importance is the statement that St. Mark wrote his Gospel under the teaching of Peter, or that he embodied in that Gospel the substance of our apostle's  oral instructions. This statement rests upon such an amount of external evidence, and is corroborated by so many internal indications, that they would scarcely be questioned in the absence of a strong theological bias. (Papias and Clem. Alex., referred to by Eusebius, H.E. 2:15; Tertullian, c. Marc. 4, c. 5; Irenseus, 3:1; 4:9. Petavius [on Epiphanius, page 428] observes that Papias derived his information from John the Presbyter. For other passages, see Fabricius [Bibl. Gr. 3:132]. The slight discrepancy between Eusebius and Papias indicates independent sources of information.) The fact is doubly important, in its bearings upon the Gospel, and upon the character of our apostle. Chrysostom, who is followed by the most judicious commentators, seems first to have drawn attention to the fact that in Mark's Gospel every defect in Peter's character and conduct is brought out clearly, without the slightest extenuation, while many noble acts and peculiar marks of favor are either omitted or stated with far less force than by any other evangelist. Indications of Peter's influence, even in Mark's style, much less pure than that of Luke, are traced by modern criticism (Gieseler, quoted by Davidson).

II. Discussion of Particular Points. — We subjoin a closer examination of certain special questions touched upon in the above history.

1. Peter's Name. — His original appellation Cephas (Κηφᾶς) occurs in the following passages: Joh 1:42; 1Co 1:12; 1Co 3:22; 1Co 9:1; 1Co 15:5; Gal 2:9; Gal 1:18; Gal 2:10; Gal 2:14 (the last three according to the text of Lachmann and Tischendorf). Cephas is the Chaldee word Keyphia, כֵּיפָא, itself a corruption of or derivation from the Hebrew Keph, כֵּŠ, "a rock," a rare word, found only in Job 30:6 and Jer 4:29. It must have been the word actually pronounced by our Lord in Mat 16:18, and on subsequent occasions when the apostle was addressed by him or other Hebrews by his new name. By it he was known to the Corinthian Christians. In the ancient Syriac version of the N.T. (Peshito), it is uniformly found where the Greek has Πέτρος. When we consider that our Lord and the apostles spoke Chaldee, and that therefore (as already remarked) the apostle must always have been addressed as Cephas, it is certainly remarkable that throughout the Gospels, no less than ninety-seven times, with one exception only, the name should be given in the Greek form, which was of later introduction, and unintelligible to Hebrews, though intelligible to the far wider Gentile world among which the Gospel was about to begin its course. Even in Mark, where more Chaldee words  and phrases are retained than in all the other Gospels put together, this is the case. It is as if in our English Bibles the name were uniformly given,not Peter, but Rock; and it suggests that the meaning contained in the appellation is of more vital importance, and intended to be more carefully seized at each recurrence, than we are apt to recollect. The commencement of the change from the Chaldee name to its Greek synonym is well marked in the interchange of the two in Gal 2:7-9 (Stanley, Apostolic Age, page 116).

The apostle in his companionship with Christ, and up to the time of the Lord's ascension, seems to have borne the name of Simon; at least he is always so called by Jesus himself (Mat 17:25; Mar 14:37; Luk 22:31; Joh 21:15), and apparently also by the disciples (Luk 24:34; Act 15:14). But after the extension of the apostolic circle and its relations (comp. Act 10:5; Act 10:18), the apostle began to be known, in order to distinguish him from others called Simon, as Simon Peter; the name of Peter, which had at first been given him as a special mark of esteem, being added, as that of a father often was in other cases; and, in the course of time, it seems that the latter name superseded the former. Hence the evangelists call the apostle Peter oftener than Simon Peter. As to the epistles of Paul, he is always called Cephas in 1 Corinthians, but in the other epistles often Peter. As above suggested, the appellation thus bestowed seems to have had reference to the disciple individually and personally. Attaching himself to Christ, he would partake of that blessed spiritual influence whereby he would be enabled, in spite of the vacillations of his naturally impulsive character, to hold with persevering grasp the faith he now embraced. He would become rooted and grounded in the truth, and not be carried away to destruction by the various winds of false doctrine and the crafty assaults of Satan. The name imposed was continually to remind him of what he ought to be as a follower of Christ. Compare Wieseler, Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters, page 581.

2. Peter's Domestic Circumstances. — Of the family and connections of our apostle we know but little. His father is named in the Gospel history, and his mother's name seems to have been Joanna (see Coteler, Ad Const. Apostol. 2:63). It appears from John 21 that he did not entirely give up his occupation as a fisherman on his entrance into the body of Christ's disciples. Luk 4:38 and 1Co 9:5 seem to show that he was married, and so the Church fathers often affirm (comp. Coteler, ad Clem. Recogn. 7:25; Grabe, Ad Spicil. Patr. § 1, page 330). But the tradition of  the name of his wife varies between Concordia and Perpetua (see Meyer, De Petri Conjugio, Viteb. 1684). It is said that she suffered martyrdom before Peter (Clem. Alex. Stromn, 7:p. 312). Some affirm that he left children (ibid. 3, page 192; Euseb. 3, 30), among whom a daughter, Petronilla, is named (comp. Acta Sanct. 30; Mai, 7:420 sq.). More recently Ranch (Neues krit. Journ. f. Theol. 8:401) strives to find a son of Peter mentioned in 1Pe 5:13, and Neander (Pflanz. 2:520) follows him, supposing that the "elected together with you" (the word church in the English version is not in the original) refers to the wife of the apostle.. The personal appearance of Peter at the time of his martyrdom is described in Malalae Chronogr. 10, page 256, in an absurd passage, of which the sense appears to be this: He was an old man, two thirds of a century old; bald in front, knob-haired (?κονδόθριξ), with gray hair and beard; of clear complexion, somewhat pale, with dark eyes, a large beard, long nose, joined eyebrows, upright in posture; intelligent, impulsive, and timid. Comp. the description in Niceph. H.E. 2:37, page 165; and Faggini, De Rom. P. Itin. Exerc. 20, page 453 sq.

3. Peter's Prominence as an Apostle. — From such passages as Mat 17:1; Mar 9:1; Mar 14:33, there can be no doubt that Peter was among the most beloved of Christ's disciples; and his eminence among the apostles depended partly on the fact that he had been one of the first of them, and partly on his own peculiar traits. Sometimes he speaks in the name of the twelve (Mat 19:27; Luk 12:41). Sometimes he answers when questions are addressed to them all (Mat 16:16; Mar 8:29); sometimes Jesus addresses him in the place of all (Mat 26:40). But that he passed, out of the circle of the apostles, as their representative, cannot be certainly inferred from Mat 17:24, even if it be supposable in itself. This position of Peter becomes more decided after the ascension of Jesus, and perhaps in consequence of the saying in Joh 21:15 sq. Peter now becomes the organ of the company of apostles (Act 2:15; Act 2:14 sq.; Act 4:8 sq.; Act 5:27 sq.), his word is decisive (Act 15:7 sq.), and he is named with "the other apostles" (Act 2:37; Act 5:29. Comp. Chrysost. on John, Horn. 88, page 525). The early Protestant polemic divines should not have blinded themselves to this observation. (See Baumgarten, Polem. 3:370 sq.) The case is a natural one, when we compare Peter's character with that of the other apostles, and contributes nothing at all to fixing the primacy in him, after the view of the Roman Church. It may even be granted that the custom of looking upon  Peter as the chief of the apostles was the cause of his always having the first place in the company of apostles in the Church traditions. The old account that Peter alone of the apostles was baptized by Jesus himself agrees well with this view. (Comp. Coteler, Ad Herm. Past. 3:16.)

As to the meaning of the passage Mat 16:18, there is much dispute. The accounts which have been given of the precise import of this declaration may be summed up under these heads:

(1.) That our Lord spoke of himself, and not of Peter, as the rock on which the Church was to be founded. This interpretation expresses a great truth, but it is irreconcilable with the context, and could scarcely have occurred to an unbiassed reader, and certainly does not give the primary and literal meaning of our Lord's words. It has been defended, however, by candid and learned critics, as Glass and Dathe.

(2.) That our Lord addresses Peter as the type or representative of the Church, in his capacity of chief disciple. This is Augustine's view, and it was widely adopted in the early Church. It is hardly borne out by the context, and seems to involve a false metaphor. The Church would in that case be founded on itself in its type.

(3.) That the rock was not the person of Peter, but his confession of faith. This rests on much better authority, and is supported by stronger arguments. Our Lord's question was put to the disciples generally. Although the answer came through the mouth of Peter, always ready to be the spokesman, it did not the less express the belief of the whole body.

So in other passages (noted below) the apostles generally, not Peter by himself, are spoken of as foundations of the Church. Every one will acknowledge that Christ, as before suggested, is pre-eminently the first foundation, THE Rock, on which every true disciple, on which Peter himself, must be built. It was by his faithful confession that he showed he was upon the rock. He was then Peter indeed, exhibiting that personal characteristic in the view of which Christ had long before given him the name. Such an interpretation may seem to accord best with our Lord's address, "Thou art Peter" — the firm maintainer of essential truth, a truth by the faithful grasping of which men become Christ's real disciples, living stones of his Church (Joh 17:3; Rom 10:9; 1Co 3:11). Thus it was not the personal rock Peter, but the material rock of Gospel truth, the adherence to which was the test of discipleship. This  view, that it was Peter's confession on which Christ would build his Church, has been held by many able expositors. For instance, Hilary says, "Super hanc igitur confessionis petram ecclesiae sedificatio est" (De Trin. lib. 6:36, Op. [Par. 1693], col. 903; comp. lib. 2, 23, col. 800). See also Cyril of Alexandria (De Sanct. Trin. dial. 4, Op. [Lut. 1638], tom. 5, parsi, page 507); Chrysostom (In Matthew hom. 54, Op. [Par. 1718-38], 7:548); and the writer under the name of Nyssen (Test. de Advent. Dom. adv. Jud. in Greg. Nyssen. Op. [Par. 1638], 2:162). Yet it seems to have been originally suggested as an explanation, rather than an interpretation, which it certainly is not in a literal sense.

(4.) That Peter himself was the rock on which the Church would be built, as the representative of the apostles, as professing in their name the true faith, and as intrusted specially with the duty of preaching it, and thereby laying the foundation of the Church. Many learned and candid Protestant divines have acquiesced in this view (e.g. Pearson, Hammond, Bengel, Rosenmüller, Schleusner, Kuinol, Bloomfield, etc.). It is borne out by the facts that Peter on the day of Pentecost, and during the whole period of the establishment of the Church, was the chief agent in all the work of the ministry, in preaching, in admitting both Jews and Gentiles, and laying down the terms of communion. This view is wholly incompatible with the Roman theory, which makes him the representative of Christ, not personally, but in virtue of an office essential to the permanent existence and authority of the Church. Passaglia, the latest and ablest controversialist, takes more pains to refute this than any other view; but wholly without success: it is clear that Peter did not retain, even admitting that he did at first hold, any primacy of rank after completing his own special work; that he never exercised any authority over or independently of the other apostles; that he certainly did not transmit whatever position he ever held to any of his colleagues after his decease. At Jerusalem, even during his residence there, the chief authority rested with St. James; nor is there any trace of a central power or jurisdiction for centuries after the foundation of the Church. The same arguments, mutatis mutandis, apply to the keys. The promise was literally fulfilled when Peter preached at Pentecost, admitted the first converts to baptism, confirmed the Samaritans, and received Cornelius, the representative of the Gentiles, into the Church. Whatever privileges may have belonged to him personally died with him. The authority required for the permanent government of the  Church was believed by the fathers to be deposited in the episcopate, as representing the apostolic body, and succeeding to its claims. SEE ROCK.

The passage is connected with another in the claims of the papacy, namely, "Unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven," etc. (Mat 16:19). The force of both these passages is greatly impaired for the purpose for which Catholics produce them, by the circumstance that whatever of power or authority they may be supposed to confer upon Peter must be regarded as shared by him with the other apostles, inasmuch as to them also are ascribed in other passages the same qualities and powers which are promised to Peter in those under consideration. If by the former of these passages we are to understand that the Church is built upon Peter, the apostle Paul informs us that it is not on him alone that it is built, but upon all the apostles (Eph 2:20); and in the book of Revelation we are told that on the twelve foundations of the New Jerusalem (the Christian Church) are inscribed "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb" (Act 21:14). As for the declaration in the latter of these passages, it was in all its essential parts repeated by our Lord to the other disciples immediately before his passion, as announcing a privilege which, as his apostles, they were to possess in common (Mat 18:18; Joh 20:23).

It is, moreover, uncertain in what sense our Lord used the language in question. In both cases his words are metaphorical; and nothing can be more unsafe than to build a theological dogma upon language of which the meaning is not clear, and to which, from the earliest ages, different interpretations have been affixed. Finally, even granting the correctness of the interpretation which Catholics put upon these verses, it will not bear out the conclusion they would deduce from them, inasmuch as the judicial supremacy of Peter over the other apostles does not necessarily follow from his possessing authority over the Church. On the other side, it is certain that there is no instance on record of the apostle's having ever claimed or exercised this supposed power; but, on the contrary, he is more than once represented as submitting to an exercise of power upon the part of others, as when, for instance, he went forth as a messenger from the apostles assembled in Jerusalem to the Christians in Samaria (Act 8:14), and when he received a rebuke from Paul, as already noticed. This circumstance is so fatal, indeed, to the pretensions which have been urged in favor of his supremacy over the other apostles, that from a very early age attempts have been made to set aside its force by the hypothesis that it is not of Peter the apostle, but of  another person of the same name, that Paul speaks in the passage referred to (Euseb. Hist. Ecc 1:13).

This hypothesis, however, is so plainly contradicted by the words of Paul, who explicitly ascribes apostleship to the Peter of whom he writes, that it is astonishing how it could have been admitted even by the most blinded zealot (Ecc 1:8-9). While, however, it is pretty well established that Peter enjoyed no judicial supremacy over the other apostles, it would, perhaps, be going too far to affirm that no dignity or primacy whatsoever was conceded to him on the part of his brethren. His superiority in point of age, his distinguished personal excellence, his reputation and success as a teacher of Christianity, and the prominent part which he had ever taken in his Master's affairs, both before his death and after his ascension, firnished sufficient grounds for his being raised to a position of respect and of moral influence in the Church and among his brother apostles. To this some countenance is given by the circumstances that he is called "the first" (πρῶτος) by Matthew (Mat 10:2), and this apparently not merely as a numerical, but as an honorary distinction; that when the apostles are mentioned as a body, it is frequently by the phrase "Peter and the eleven," or "Peter and the rest of the apostles," or something similar; and that when Paul went up to Jerusalem by divine revelation, it was to Peter particularly that the visit was paid. These circumstances, taken in connection with the prevalent voice of Christian antiquity, would seem to authorize the opinion that Peter occupied some such position as that of προεστώς, or president in the apostolical college, but without any power or authority of a judicial kind over his brother apostles (Campbell, Eccles. Hist. lect. 5 and 12; Barrow, ubi sup., etc.; Eichhorn, Einleit. 3:599; Hug, Introd. page 635, Fordick's transl.; Home, Introd. 4:432; Lardner, Works, volume 4, 5, 6, ed. 1788; Cave, Antiquitates Apostolcae, etc.). SEE PRIMACY.

4. Peter's Character. — However difficult it might be to present a complete sketch of the apostle's temper of mind, there is no dispute as to some of the leading features; devotion to his Master's person (Joh 13:37), which even led him into extravagance (Joh 13:9), and an energetic disposition, which showed itself sometimes as resolution, sometimes as boldness (Mat 14:29), and temper (Joh 18:10). His temperament was choleric, and he easily passed from one extreme to another (Joh 13:8. For a parallel between Peter and John, see Chrysost. in Johan. hom. 67:522). But how could such a man fall into a repeated denial of his Lord? This will always remain a difficult  psychological problem; but it is not necessary on this account to refer to Satan's power (Olshausen, Bibl. Comment. 2:482 sq.). When Jesus predicted to Peter his coming fall, the apostle may have thought only of a formal inquiry; and the arrest of Christ drove from his mind all recollection of Christ's warning words. The first denial was the hasty repulse of a troublesome and curious question. Peter thought it not worth while to converse with a girl at such a moment, when all his thoughts were taken up with the fate of his Master; and his repulse would be the more resolute, the more he wished to avoid being driven by the curious and pressing crowd out of the vicinity of the beloved Savior. The second and third questions compelled him still to deny, unless he would confess or leave the place; but the nearness of the Lord held him fast. Besides they are the questions only of curious servants, and he is in danger, if he acknowledges his Lord, of becoming himself the butt of ridicule to the coarse multitude, and thus of failing in his purpose. Thus again and again, with increasing hesitation, he utters his denial. Now the cock-crowing reminds him of his Master's warning, and now at length he reflects that a denial, even before such unauthorized inquiries, is yet really a denial. In this view some think that Peter's thoughts were continually on his Master. and that possibly the fear of personal danger had no part in influencing his course. The expression fall of Peter, often used, is in any case rather strong. For various views of this occurrence, see Luther, on John 18; Niemeyer, Charakter, 1:586 sq.; Rau, Praeterita ad narration. Evang. de summa P. temeritate (Erlangen, 1781); Paulus, Comment. 3:647 sq.; Henneberg, Leidensgesch. page 159 sq.; Miscellen eines Landpredigers (Glogau, 1799), page 3 sq.; Greiling, Leben Jesu, page 381 sq.; Rudolph, in Winer's Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. i, 109 sq.; and Bellarmine, Controv. de Benit. 2:16; Martin, Diss. de Petri Denegatione (Monaster, 1835).

5. Paul's Dispute with Peter. — With reference to the occurrence mentioned in Gal 2:11, from which some have inferred that Peter was not wholly free from the servile fear of men, we may remark that the case is altogether different from the preceding, and has much to do with the apostle's dogmatic convictions. It is known that the admission of the heathen to the Church was strange to Peter at first, and that he could only be induced to preach to them by a miraculous vision (Act 10:10; Act 11:4 sq.). Then he was the first to baptize heathen, and announced in unmistakable language that the yoke of the Mosaic law must not be placed on the Gentile converts (Act 15:7 sq.). But it is quite supposable that  he was still anxious for Christianity to be first firmly rooted among the Jews, and thus he seems after this occurrence to have turned his preaching exclusively to the Jews (comp. Gal 2:7), his first epistle also being intended only for Jewish readers. The affair at Antioch (Gal 2:12) seems to show that he still wavered somewhat in the conviction expressed in Act 15:7 sq.; if, indeed, as appears to be the case, it was later than the latter. For even if Peter found it necessary to respect the prejudices of the party of James, still the necessity of firmness and consistency cannot be denied; although, on the other hand, we must not confound Peter's position with that of Paul. It is known (comp. Euseb. 1:12, 1) that in the early Church many referred the entire statement to another Cephas, one of the seventy disciples, who afterwards became bishop of Iconium, and nearly all the Catholic interpreters adopt this expedient. See Molkenbuhr, Quod Cephas Gal 2:11 non sit Petrus Ap. (Monaster, 1803). See against this view Deyling, Observatt. 2:520 sq. On another view of the church fathers, see Neander, Pflanz. 1:292, note. It appears from the fact that at Corinth a party of Judaizing Christians called themselves by his name, that Peter was afterwards recognised as head of this class, in distinction from the Pauline Christians.

6. As to the time of Peter's journey to Rome, the Church fathers do not quite agree. Eusebius says in his Chron. (1:42) that Peter went to Rome in the second year of Claudius Caesar, after founding the first Church in Antioch; and Jerome, in his version, adds that he remained there twenty- five years, preaching the Gospel, and acting as bishop of the city (comp. also Jerome, Script. Eccl. page 1). Yet this statement appears very doubtful, for three reasons:

(1) Because, although we learn from Act 12:17 that Peter left Jerusalem for a time after the death of James the elder, yet he certainly cannot have left Palestine before the events recorded in Acts 15.

(2) Because the mention of the origin of the Church in Antioch, connected by the fathers with Peter's journey to Rome, cannot easily be reconciled with Act 11:19 sq.

(3) Because, if Peter had been bishop in Rome when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans, and afterwards when he was prisoner in Rome, we should expect the former to contain words of greeting to Peter, and the epistles written from Rome similar messages from Peter; the more as these epistles are very rich in such messages; but nothing of the kind appears. We may  well doubt, too, whether, if Peter had been bishop or even founder of the Roman Church, Paul's principles and method (see Rom 15:20; Rom 15:23 sq.; 2Co 10:16) would have allowed him to write this epistle to Rome at all. Eusebius seems to have drawn his account from Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius (Euseb. H.E. 2:15), the former of whom quoted from a remark of Justin Martyr (Apol. 2:69), which rests upon an accidental error of language; this father referring to Simon the Magician an inscription which belonged to the SabineRomish deity Semo (Hug, Einleit. 2:69 sq.; Credner, Einleit. 1:529 sq. Comp. Schulrich, De Simonis M. fatis Roman. Misen. 1844). Now Peter had once publicly rebuked this Simon (Act 8:18 sq.); this fact, connected with the inscription, gave rise to the story of Peter's residence in Rome under Claudius, in whose reign the inscription originated. After this detection of the occasion which produced the record in Eusebius, it is truly wonderful that Bertholdt (Einleit. 5:2685) should defend the account, and found a critical conjecture upon it. Further, the Armenian Chronicle of. Eusebius refers this statement to the third year of Caius Caligula.

But the account found in Irenaeus (Haer. 3:1) differs materially from that above noticed. He tells us that Peter and Paul were in Rome, and there founded a Church in company; and Eusebius (2:25, in a quotation from Dionysius, bishop of Corinth) adds that they suffered martyrdom together (Peter being crucified, according to Origen, in Euseb. 3:1; Niceph. 2:36). Eusebius in his Chronicle places their martyrdom, according to his reckoning of twenty-five years for Peter's episcopacy, in the fourteenth year of Nero's reign, which extended from the middle of October, A.D. 67, to the same time in A.D. 68. This joint martyrdom of Paul and Peter (without however any special mention of the manner of Peter's crucifixion, comp. Neander, Pflanz. 2:514) is also mentioned by Tertullian (Praescript. Hceret. 36) and Lactantius (Mort. Persec. 2; Institut. Div. 4:21).

The graves of both apostles were pointed out in Rome as early as the close of the second century (Euseb. 2:25). Yet the whole story rests ultimately on the testimony of Dionysius alone, who must have died about A.D. 176. (The passages in Clemens Romanus, to 1 Corinthians 5, and Ignatius, to the Romans , 5, settle nothing.) Thus, on the one hand, we are not at liberty to reject all doubt as to the truth of this account with Bertholdt (loc. cit.) as hypercritical, or with Gieseler (Ch. Hist. 1:92 sq. 3d ed.) as partisan polemics; nor, on the other, can we suppose it to have sprung from the interpretation of 1Pe 5:13, where at an early day Babylon was  understood to stand for Rome (Euseb. 15:2; Niceph. H.E. 2:15. Comp. Baur, page 215). The genetic development of the whole story attempted by Baur (in the Tubingen Zeitschrift. f. Theol. 1831, 4:162 sq. Comp. his Paulus, page 214 sq., 671 sq.) deserves close attention. But compare Neander, Pflanz. 2:519 sq.; and further against any visit to Rome by Peter, see M. Velenus, Lib. quo Petrum Romam non venisse asseritur (1520); Vedelius, De tempore utriusque Episcopatus Petri (Geneva, 1624); Spanheim, De facta profectione Petri Ap. in erbem Rom. (Lug. Bat. 1679; also in his Opera, 2:331 sq.); also an anonymous writer in the Biblioth. fur theol. Sckrifikunde, volume 4, No. 1 (extract in the Leipz. Lit. Zeit. 1808, No. 130); Mayerhoff, Einl. in d. Petrin. Schriften, page 73 sq.; Reiche, Erklar. des Briefes an d. Rimer, 1:39 sq.; Von Ammon, Fortbild. 4:322 sq.; Ellendorf, Ist Petrus in Rom. u. Bischof d. Rim. Kirche gewesen? (Darmstadt, 1841; translated in the Bibliotheca Sacra, July 1858; January 1859; answered by Binterim, Disseldorf, 1842). On the other side of the question, the older writings are enumerated by Fabricius, Lux Evang. page 97 sq. The usual arguments of the Catholics are given by Bellarmine, Controv. de Rom. Pontif. lib. 2. But the chief work on that side is still that of Cortesius, De Romano itinere gestisque princip. Apostol. lib. 2 (Venice, 1573; revised by Constaltinus, Rom. 1770). Comp. esp. Foggini, De Romano Petri itinere, etc. (Flor. 1741). On the same side in general, though with many modifications, are the following later writers: Mynster, Kleine theol. Schrifien, page 141 sq., who holds that Peter was in Rome twice. See contra, Baur, Op. cit. page 181 sq.; Herbst, in the Tubinger Kathol. theol. Quartalschr. 1820, 4:1, who places Peter in Rome at least during the last years of Nero's reign, though but for a short time. See, however, Baur, Op. cit. page 161 sq.; Olshausen, Studien u. Krit. 1838, page 940 sq., in answer to Baur; Stenglein, in the Tubinger Quartalschr. 1840, 2d and 3d parts, who makes Peter to have visited Rome in the second year of Claudius; to have been driven away by the well-known edict of that emperor; and at length to have returned under Nero. Comp. also Iaiden, De itinere P. Romano (Prag. 1761), and Windischmann, Vindiciae Petri (Ratisb. 1836). It is not in the least necessary for those who oppose the Romish Church, which makes Peter first bishop of Rome (see Van Til, De Petro Romer martyre non pontficae [Lug. Bat. 1710]), and grounds on this the primacy of the pope (Matthaeucci, Opus dogmat. adversus Hetherodox [sic !], page 212 sq.; Bel. larmine, Controv. de Rom. Pontif. 2:3, and elsewhere), to be influenced in the question of Peter's journey by these views, inasmuch as this primacy, when all the historical evidences  claimed are allowed, remains, in spite of every effort to defend it, without foundation (Butschang, Untersuch. der Vorzyge des Ap. P. [Hamb, 1788]; Baumgarten, Polem. 3:370 sq.; Paulus, in Sophroniz. 3:131 sq.). The first intimation that Peter had a share in founding the Roman Church, and that he spent twenty-five years there as bishop, appears in Eusebius (Chron. ad secund. ann. Claud.) and Jerome (Script. Ecclesiastes 1); while Eusebius (H.E. 3:2) tells us that after the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, Linus was made the first bishop of the Church of the Romans; a most remarkable statement, if Peter had been bishop before him (comp. 3:4). Epiphanius (27:6) even calls Paul the bishop (ἐπίσκοπος) of Christianity in Rome.

7. Mode of Peter's Death. — The tradition of this apostle's being crucified with his head downwards is probably to be relegated to the regions of the fabulous. Tertullian, who is the first to mention Peter's crucifixion, says simply (De Praeser. Haeres. 36), "Petrus passioni Dominicae adaequatur;" which would rather lead to the conclusion that he was crucified in the usual way, as our Lord was. The next witness is Origen, whose words are, ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφάλης οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν (ap. Euseb. H.E. 3:1); and these are generally cited as intimating the peculiarity traditionally ascribed to the mode of Peter's crucifixion. But do the words really intimate this? Allowing that the verb may mean "was crucified," can κατὰ κεφάλης mean "with the head downwards?" No instance, we believe, can be adduced which would justify such a translation. The combination κατὰ κεφάλης occurs both in classical and Biblical Greek (see Plato, Rep. 3:398; Plut. Apoph. de Scipione Jun. 13; Mar 14:3; 1Co 11:4), but in every case it means "upon the head" (comp. κατὰ κόῤῥης πατάξαι, Lucian, Gall. c. 30, and κατὰ κόῤῥης παίειν, Catapl. c. 12). According to analogy, therefore, Origen's words should mean that the apostle was impaled, or fastened to the cross upon, i.e., by, the head. When Eusebius has to mention the crucifying of martyrs with the head downwards, he says distinctly οἱ δὲ ἀνάπαλιν κατωκάρα προσηλωθέντες (H.E. 8:8). It is probably to a misunderstanding of Origen's words that this story is to be traced and it is curious to see how it grows as it advances. First, we have Origen's vague and doubtful statement above quoted; then we have Eusebius's more precise statement: Πέτρος κατὰ κεφάλης σταυροῦται (Dem. Ev. 3:116, c.); and at length, in the hands of Jerome, it expands into "Affixus cruci martyrio coronatus est capite ad terram verso et in sublime pedibus elevatis, asserens se indignum  qui sic crucifigeretur ut Dominus suns" (Catal. Script. Ecclesiastes 1). SEE CRUCIFY.

8. Spurious Writings attributed to Peter. — Some apocryphal works of very early date obtained currency in the Church as containing the substance of the apostle's teaching. The fragments which remain are not of much importance, but they demand a brief notice. SEE APOCRYPHA.

(1.) The Preaching (κήρυγμα) or Doctrine (διδαχή) of Peter, probably identical with a work called the Preaching of Paul, or of Paul and Peter, quoted by Lactantius, may have contained some traces of the apostle's teaching, if, as Grabe, Ziegler, and others supposed, it was published soon after his death. The passages, however, quoted by Clement of Alexandria are for the most part wholly unlike Peter's mode of treating doctrinal or practical subjects. Rufinus and Jerome allude to a work: which they call "Judicium Petri;" for which Cave accounts by a happy conjecture, adopted by Nitzsche Mayerhoff, Reuss, and Schliemann, that Rufinus found καμα for κήρυγμα, and read κρίμα. Epiphanius also names Περιοδοι Πετρου as a book among the Ebionites (Haeres. 30:15). It is probably only a different name for the foregoing (Schwegler, Nach-apost. Zetalt. 2:30). SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS

(2.) Another work, called the Revelation of Peter (ἀποκάλυψις Πέτρου), was held in much esteem for centuries. It was commented on by Clement of Alexandria, quoted by Theodotus in the Eclogae, named together with the Revelation of John in the Fragment on the Canon published by Muratori (but with the remark, "Quam quidam ex nostris legi in Ecclesia nolunt"), and according to Sozomen (Hist. Ecc 7:19) was read once a year in some churches of Palestine. It is said, but not on good authority, to have been preserved among the Coptic Christians. Eusebius looked on it as spurious, but not of heretical origin. From the fragments and notices it appears to have consisted chiefly of denunciations against the Jews, and predictions of the fall of Jerusalem, and to have been of a wild, fanatical character. The most complete account of this curious work is given by Lücke in his general introduction to the Revelation of John, page 47. SEE REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS

There are traces in ancient writers of a few other writings attributed to the apostle Peter, but they seem to have wholly perished (see Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog. 3:221 sq.). SEE ACTS, SPURIOUS.  The legends of the Clementines are wholly devoid of historical worth; but from those fictions, originating with an obscure and heretical sect, have been derived some of the most mischievous speculations of modern rationalists, especially as regards the assumed antagonism between St. Paul and the earlier apostles. It is important to observe, however, that in none of these spurious documents, which belong undoubtedly to the first two centuries, are there any indications that our apostle was regarded as in any peculiar sense connected with the Church or see of Rome, or that he exercised or claimed any authority over the apostolic body of which he was the recognised leader or representative (Schliemann, Die Clementinen nebst den verwandten Schriften, 1814). SEE CLEMENTINES.

Among other legends which have come down to us concerning Peter is that relating to his contention at Rome with Simon Magus. This seems to have no better foundation than a misunderstanding of an inscription on the part of Justin Martyr (Apol. 1:26). SEE SIMON MAGUS.

III. Literature. — In addition to the works copiously cited above, we may here name the following on this apostle personally, reserving for the following articles those on his writings specially. Blunt, Lectures on the Hist. of Peter (Lond. 1833, 1860. 2 volumes, 12mo); Thompson, Life- Work of Peter the Apostle (ibid. 1870, 8vo); Green, Peter's Life and Letters (ibid. 1873, 8vo); Morich, Leben und Lehre Petri (Braunsch. 1873, 8vo). Among the old monographs we may name Mever, Nut Christus Petrum baptizaverit (Leips. 1672); Walch, De Claudo a Petro sanato (Jen. 1755); and on his denials of his Master, those cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum. page 58; and in Hase, Lebenz Jes., page 202; also the Jour. of Sac. Lit. July 1862; on his dispute with Paul, Volbeding, page 85. SEE APOSTLE

## Peter (Pierre) OF Dresden[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre) OF Dresden]]

             a German reformer, was born at Dresden in the latter part of the 14th century. Driven from that city for having spread the doctrines of the Vaudois, Pierre sought refuge in Prague, where, in order to subsist, he opened a small school for children. Some time after he attracted to himself one of his friends called Jacobel, with whom he published his opinions. Pierre inveighed especially against the communion in one kind. "To his influence." says Gillett, "is to be attributed in large measure the origin of that discussion in respect to the communion of the cup which almost revolutionized Bohemia, and brought down upon it the energies of crusading Christendom." He was evidently a man of superior talent, and one who possessed great power over the minds of others. At Prague, among the thousands congregated at its university, he had large opportunity for insinuating his peculiar views. The very fact that he was instrumental in shaping the enlarged views of Jacobel suffices to rescue his name and memory from oblivion. He afterwards united with the Hussites against the primacy of the pope, and propagated their ideas upon the nature of the Church. To establish his doctrines he wrote several works now completely forgotten. He died at Prague in 1440. See Eneas Sylvius,  Bohemr. chapter 5; Bonfinius, Hist. Bohem.; Moreri, Dict. Hist.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon; Gillett, Huss and the Hussites, 1:38, 483, 519. (J.H.W.)

## Peter (Pierre) Of Baume[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre) Of Baume]]

             (Lat. Petrus de Palma), general of the Dominicans, was born at Baume (county of Bourgogne) in the latter part of the 13th century. Having early embraced the rule of St. Dominic, he was sent in 1321 to Paris, and there gave public lessons upon the Livre des Sentences of Pierre Lombard. In 1343 he was elected general of his order by a unanimity of votes. He died in Paris March 1, 1345. He wrote Postillae in quatuor Evangelia, some copies of which are preserved at Basle and at Tours, and two Lettres Encycliques, which have not been printed. See Quetif et Echard, Script. ord. Praedic. 1:614. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:198.

## Peter (Pierre) Of Chartres[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre) Of Chartres]]

             a French ecclesiastic who flourished in the first half of the 10th century, died about 1039. The authors of the Histoire Litteraire de la France attribute to him several works. We mention only Manuale Ecclesiasticum, Manuale de Mysteriis Eoclesiae, and Speculunm Ecclesie. This last treatise, which offers us curious details upon the origin or meaning of liturgical usages, is unpublished; but we indicate three manuscript copies in the Imperial Library of Saint-Victor, under the numbers 513, 724, 923. Number 923 has one chapter more than the other two. Jean Garet, canon of Louvain, Gesner, Possevin, and after them the authors of the Histoire Litteraire, designate also among the works of our chancellor a Paraphrase of the Psalms, likewise unpublished. There is, finally, in the library of Molht-Saint-Michel, Glossae in Job, secundum Petrum, cancellarium Carnuteisem. See Gesner, Bibl. Universalis, page 669; Possevin, Apparatus, 2:246; Hist. Litt. de la France, 7:341. — Hoefer, Nouv, Biog. Generale, 40:184.

## Peter (Pierre) Of Maillezais[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre) Of Maillezais]]

             a French chronicler of the 11th century, was, according to Dom Rivet, a man of talent, of merit, and learning. He embraced the monastic rule in the early part of the 11th century, and flourished uinder Goderanne, abbd of Maillezais, in Bas-Poitou. We have an interesting article of his upon the history of his time, particularly that of the counts de Poitiers and the abbe' of Maillezais. Father Labbd has comprised it (Malleacense Chronicon) in the monuments that he collected for the history of Aquitaine. What concerns the translation of Saint Riomer has been detached from it and published again by Mabillon and the Bollandists. See Hist. Litt. de la Friance, 5:599. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:187.

## Peter (Pierre) Of Poitiers[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre) Of Poitiers]]

             was a modern Latin poet, who died after 1141. All that we learn of his life is that, having made a profession of the rule of St. Benedict in a monastery of Aquitaine, he was chosen by Peter the Venerable as secretary, and accompanied him first to Clugny, in 1134, then to Spain in 1141. His principal works are poems in elegiac verse, which, for verses of the 12th century, lack neither fluency nor elegance. Yet Peter the Venerable surpasses even the limit of hyperbole when he compares these verses with those of Horace and Virgil. The poems of Peter of Poitiers have been collected by the editors of the Biblioth. de Cluni. We find in the same collection, among the letters of Peter the Venerable, three letters written to this abbe by his secretary. A fourth letter from Peter of Poitiers to Peter the Venerable, published by Martene in his Amplissima Collectio (2:11), contains this curious information, that Peter of Poitiers, being in Spain, contributed some part to the translation of the Koran demanded by the abbe of Clugny. See Hist. Litt. de la France, 12:349. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:187.

## Peter (Pierre) Of St. Andre[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre) Of St. Andre]]

             (known also as Jean Antoine Rampalle), a French ecclesiastic, was born in 1624 at L'Isle (comte Venaissin). After having taken in 1640 the garb of the barefoot Carmelites under the name of Pier re de St. Andre, he taught  philosophy and theology; became about 1667 general definitor of his order, and died at Rome, in the exercise of these duties, November 29, 1671. Although he left only some odes in praise of St. Theresa, father Cosmo de Villiers claims that he had so much facility in Latin poetry that he was regarded as a second Baptiste Mantouan. We have of his works, Historia generalis Fratrum Miscalceatorum ord. de Monte-Carmelo (Rome, 1668- 1671, 2 volumes, fol.); this history is the continuation of that undertaken by father Isidore de St. Joseph, who died in 1666: — Le Religieux dans la Solitude (Lyons, 1668, 12mo): — La Vie du B. Jean de la Croix (Aix, 1675, 8vo). He has translated into French the Voyage a l'Orient (1659, 8vo), and the Vie du Pere Dominique de Jesus-Marie, two works of Esprit Julien, as well as the Madeleine penitente et convertie, and the Alexis of father Brignole-Sale. A Traite de la Physionomie naturelle and two sacred tragedies are also attributed to him, which, in all probability, are by an homonymous poet, Antoine Rampalle, known by a verse from the A rt Poetique of Boileau (chapter 4, verse 35). See De Villiers, Biblioth. Carmelitana, 2:545; Achard, Dict. Hist. de la Provence; Barjavel, Biog. du Vancluse, 2:295.-Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:198.

## Peter (Pierre) Tudebode[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre) Tudebode]]

             a French chronicler, was born at Civray (Poitou) near the beginning of the 11th century. Like so many other priests who engaged in the first crusade, he departed in 1096 with Hugues de Lusignan, lord of Civray; his two brothers, Herve and Arnaud, chevaliers (optimi milites), took the cross at the same time with himself, and were both killed in the East. Peter was present at the siege of Nice, and followed Bohemond when the crusaders were divided into three different bodies. He shared equally the fatigues that the long siege of Antioch cost the Christians, and assisted at the taking of Jerusalem. After that period no more mention is made of him. He died at the close of the year 1099. "The history of the first crusade which he has left," says Dom Rivet, "carries with it all the characteristics of an authentic,  true, and sincere writing. He had been present at almost all that he re.lates, and seems to have written it upon the spot. . . . Raimond d'Agiles has made use of it. There is found so much conformity between these two historians that one can scarcely believe that they did not comrmunicate their productions to each other." This narrative is given in a simple but rude style; it is divided into five books (1096-1099), and is entitled Historia de Hierosolymitano itinere; the most correct edition is that by Duchesne, in volume 4 of the Historiens de France. See Hist. Litt. de la France, 8:629- 640. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:187.

## Peter (Pierre), Son Of Bechin[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre), Son Of Bechin]]

             was a French historian, who died in the 12th century. It is supposed that he was canon of St. Martin of Tours. He left a Chaonique, which begins with the creation of the world and ends with 1137. For ancient times, it is a compilation from Eusebius, from St. Jerome, Isidore of Seville, Gregory of Tours; for modern times, from Frddegaire, St. Odon, etc. However, some passages from this Chronique, relative to St. Martin of Tours, to the abbey of Cormery, and to the counts of Anjou, are not without interest. It has never been published elitire. Short fragments of it may be found in the Recueil of Duchesne (3:365-372), and in that of Bouquet (3:5, 6:8:10:11:12); but M. Salmon has recently published the best part of it in his Chroniques de Touraine, after three MSS., one from the Imperial Library, two from the Vatican. See Hist. Litt. de la France, 12:80; 13:57; Andre Salmon, Notices sur les Chroniques de Touraine. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:191.

## Peter (Pierre), archbishop Of Narbonne[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre), archbishop Of Narbonne]]

             the son of Ameli, was born in the last half of the 12th century. He was at first clerk of Saint-Nazaire of Beziers; canon, chamberlain, grand archdeacon of Narbonne; then elected archbishop in the month of March, 1226. The extermination of the Albigenses having ended the war so long prosecuted against these people, Peter used all his efforts to pacify his diocese. But observing the method practiced in his time, he seized, according to that custom, all the goods which had belonged to the heretics, made all the inhabitants of Narbonne take oath to massacre any one who should dare in the future to separate himself from the Roman orthodoxy, and in order to watch over, discover, and point out all the dissenters, introduced in 1231 into the city of Narbonne the St. Dominican friars. But the Albigenses were conquered, not subdued. An occasion having offered in 1234, the inhabitants rose in insurrection, and drove out their archbishop. Vainly he excommunicated them. In order to return to his metropolis, after about a year's exile, Peter was obliged to descend to conditions. The insurgents imposed upon him, among others, that of expelling from their city the Brother Preachers, and under his eyes, for greater safety, they invaded the convent of these brothers and put them to flight. Peter dared not recall them. Yet he was a prelate energetic in his designs, courageous in his conduct, who had the tem, perament of a man of arms, and who oftener faced perils than turned his back upon them. In 1238 he made a campaign against the Moors with Jayme I, king of Aragon, and, according to the Chronique of Albaric, he took an active part in the  battles fought under the walls of Valence. The following year he raised other troops, and at their head went to drive from Carcassonne Raymond de Tancarvel and some other lords in revolt against the king of France. He was less fortunate in his attempt against Aimeric; the latter drove him from Narbonne in 1242. Finally, in 1243, we see the archbishop Peter making the siege of the chateau of Montsegur, and taking it from the heretics. This was the last exploit of this belligerent prelate. He died at Narbonne May 20, 1245. See Gallia Christiana, volume 6, col. 65; Hist. Litt. de la France, 18:331; Vaissette, Hist. du Languedoc, 3:352; Alberic, Chronicon, ad ann. 1239; Gulielmus de Podio, Hist. bellor. adversus Albigenses, c. 39, 40 sq. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:195.

## Peter (Pierre),prior of St. John Of Sens[[@Headword:Peter (Pierre),prior of St. John Of Sens]]

             was born in the latter part of the 11th century. In 1111, Stephen, provost of the church of Sens, having resolved to restore the ancient monastery of Saint-Jean, called to it some regular canons, and confided the government of this house to our Peter. The authors of the Gallia Christiana give the highest praise to the knowledge and piety of this prior. He died after 1144. We have several of his Letters, published by Du Saussay in his Annales de l'Eglise d'Orlians, and by Severt, in his Chronique des Archeveques de Lyon. Peter is, besides, considered the author of several letters of kings, princes, and bishops, who had required, in delicate affairs, the aid of his experienced pen. See Gallia Christ. 12, col. 195; Hist. Litt. de la France, 12:230. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:188.

## Peter (Saint), Festivals Of[[@Headword:Peter (Saint), Festivals Of]]

             I. Depositio Petri in Catacombas et Pauli in via Ostiensi. The Catalogus Liberianus (354) first mentions the entombment of the bones of Peter and Paul as having taken place in the year of the consuls Tuscus and Bassus (258), and gives the date as III. Cal. Julii, that is, June 29. A festival in commemoration of that day is recorded in the Latin Church by Prudentius in the 4th century, by Augustine (Seram. 295-299), Maxim. of Turin (ibid. 66-69), and Leo the Great (ibid. 82-84) in the 5th; after the 6th it is noticed in all martyr chronicles. In the Greek Church it is stated by Theodorus Lector, in his Church history (ii, 16), as having been celebrated in Constantinople towards the close of the reign of Anastasius I (518); after the 7th century it is given in all calendars, even those of Copts, Ethiopians, and Armenians. In 1743 Benedict XIV decreed a celebration of eight days for the city of Rome; and in 1867, the eighteenth centenary, it was renewed with great magnificence by Pius IX.

II. Festum Cathedrae Petri Antiodienae, for February 22, mentioned in the Calendarium Liberianum, and celebrated in commemoration of the accession of the apostle Peter to the episcopal chair, without, however, specifying the locality of the chair. The same is the case with the Calendariumnt of Polemius Silvius (448). In the Ambrosian Liturgy, and in the Sacramentarium of Gelasius I, the festival is omitted altogether; but is found again in the Sacramentarium of Gregory, and after his time always.

III. Festum Cathedrae Petri Romanae, January 18, was generally confounded with II, but became independently established in the 8th century, and formally fixed during the Carlovingian age, to which time,  also, belongs the final recognition of the tradition of the double episcopacy of St. Peter.

IV. Festum Sanctum Petri ad Vincula or in Vinculis, also called Festum. Catenarum Petri, August 1, is not mentioned until the 9th century, in Wandalbert's Martyrologium, and Pseudo-Beda's Homil. doe Vinculis Sancti Petri (Bedme, Opp. 3:96). In the Greek Church it is celebrated, Jan. 16, in the Armenian February 22. The latter Church also celebrated a festival of “the finger of the apostle Peter" (Assemani, F£u/chol. Eccles. Orient.), and the Abyssiunians commemorate on July 31 a festival in honor of St. Peter (Ludolf, Hist. AEthiops. page 424), but the origin and signification of the latter is not known. See Augusti, Denckwurdigkeiten, 3:175 sq.; Sinker, in Smith's Dict. of Christ. Antiq. 2:16-23-1628; Nilles, Kalendariums Muale Utriusque Ecclesiae, Orient. et Occident. volume 2; Zclkler, in Plitt-Herzog, Real Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Peter (St.) Exorcista and Marcellinus[[@Headword:Peter (St.) Exorcista and Marcellinus]]

             (It. SS. Pietro e Marcellino), two Romish saints always represented together, flourished during the last persecutions under Diocletian, about the opening of the 4th century. Their religious convictions, openly avowed, brought them to jail, and it so happened that even there they were sorely tried. Their jailer, Artemius, had a daughter, Paulina, who was sick. Peter promised to restore her to health if Artemius would believe in God. Then the jailer ridiculed him, saying, "If I put thee into the deepest dungeon, and load thee with heavier chains, will thy God then deliver thee?" To this Peter replied that it mattered little to God whether he believed or not, but that Christ might be glorified he desired that it should be done. And it was so; and in the night Peter and Marcellinus, dressed in shining white garments, came to Artemius in his own chamber. Then he believed, and was baptized with all his family, and three hundred others. When they were to die, it was ordered that the executioner should take them to a forest three miles from Rome, in order that the Christians should not know of their burial-place. So when they were come to a solitary place, and the executioner pointed it out as the spot where they were to die, they themselves cleared a space and dug their grave, and died encouraging each other. In the paintings of the churches they are represented in priestly habits bearing palms. They are commemorated by the Romish Church on June 2.

## Peter (St.) Martyr (1)[[@Headword:Peter (St.) Martyr (1)]]

             a Roman Catholic saint of the Dominican order, is greatly beloved in the Romish fold, and in his own order ranks next to the fbunder himself. He was born at Verona about 1205. His parents were Catharists, but Peter early became orthodox in sentiment, and sought his education at the conventual schools of the Church. At the age of fifteen he united with the order by the persuasion of Dominic. He soon became a public character by reason of his piety and oratorical power. He turned against his own sect. and so severely persecuted the Catharists that he was universally regarded as intolerant. When the Inquisition needed an uncompromising head, Peter was made its general by approval of pope Honorius III. His high-handed disposal of the lives and property of people under him made him a general object of hatred. Two Veronian noblemen whom he had accused, and whose property was confiscated, resolved to be revenged on him. They hired assassins, who watched that they might kill him in a forest where they knew he would pass unaccompanied save by a single monk. When he appeared one of the murderers struck him down with an axe. They then pursued and killed his attendant. When they returned to Peter he was  reciting the Apostles' Creed, or, as others say, was writing it on the ground with his blood, when the assassins completed their cruel work. This event occurred on April 28, A.D. 1252. In the various paintings of this saint he is represented in the habit of his order, and bears the crucifix and palm. His more peculiar attribute is either the axe stuck in his head or a gash from which the blood trickles. Fra Bartolomeo painted the head of his beloved Jerome Savonarola as St. Peter Martyr. He is also known as St. Peter of Verona. (J.H.W.)

## Peter (St.) Martyr (2)[[@Headword:Peter (St.) Martyr (2)]]

             a Romish saint of the 15th century, was born at Arena in 1455, and was probably educated at the university in Salamanca, where he taught for many years with great success. He had a part in the wars against the Moors, and in 1505 took holy orders. As prior of Granada lie was frequently employed in very important missions by queen Isabella the Catholic. His travels in diplomatic interests he described in De legatione Babylonica. He died in 1525. His Epistola de rebus Hispanicis was published at Alcala in 1530, and at Amsterdam in 1670.

## Peter (St.) Nolasco[[@Headword:Peter (St.) Nolasco]]

             (Sp. San Pedro Nolasco), a Romish saint, noted as the founder of "the Order of Our Lady of Mercy," flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He was the son of a noble of Languedoc, and became a convert of St, John de Matha. He was much cultivated, and greatly esteemed for his learning and application, and was made a tutor of the young king James of Aragon. As the needs of the crusaders called for help from various directions, Peter brought about the formation of the order above referred to. At first it was military, and consisted of knights and gentlemen. The king himself was placed at the head, and his arms served as a device or badge. Soon, however, the order became very popular, and extended itself  on all sides. Peter Nolasco was the superior, and spent his life in expeditions to the provinces under the Moors, from which he brought back hundreds of redeemed captives. In time the order changed its character from that of a military to that of a religious institution, and as such exerted a wide influence. Peter himself, when he was old, was taken from his cell by angels, so the legend goes, and borne to and from the altar, where he received the holy Eucharist. In the paintings of the saints he is represented as old, with a white habit, and the shield of king James on his breast. His death is said to have occurred January 15, 1258. (J.H.W.)

## Peter (St.) Of Tarentaise[[@Headword:Peter (St.) Of Tarentaise]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1102 at Saint-Maurier de l'Exile, diocese of Vienne. He was one of the first monks of the abbey founded in 1117 at Bonnevaux by Gui de Bourgogne, archbishop of Vienne. The abbe Jean, his superior, sent him in 1132 to found in Savoy the abbey of Tamie, which he governed for ten years, at the end of which he was called, by the advice of St. Bernard, to the bishopric of Tarentaise, now Moutiers (1142). After having worked thirteen years to repress grave disorders in this diocese, Peter went in 1155 to conceal himself in a monastery of his order in Germany, where he hoped to live unknown; but he was soon discovered, and constrained to return to his Church. He employed himself fortunately in extinguishing the war which had arisen between Humbert III, count of Savoy, and Alphonse Taillefer, son of Alphonse Jourdain, count of Toulouse; and, although a vassal of the emperor Frederick, he sustained the part of pope Alexander III without quarrelling with that prince. This pope brought him to Italy, where he acquired great influence, and employed him to negotiate peace between the young Henry, crowned king of England, and king Henry his father. Peter died May 3,1174, at Belleveaux, diocese of Besancon. The Church honors his memory May 8, Celestin III having canonized him in 1191. See Fontenay, Hist. de l'Eglise Gallic. volume 9; Acta Sanctorum, May; Baillet, Vies des Saints, 8 Mai; Lenain, Hist. de Citeaux, 2:83. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:139.

## Peter Bernardinus[[@Headword:Peter Bernardinus]]

             an Italian reformer, the intimate companion of Savonarola, was a Florentine by birth and of humble descent. He was attracted by the teaching of the great Italian reformer, and after the execution of Savonarola frequently met his followers secretly, and encouraged them in steadfastness to the faith. He finally became a leader among the Italian reformed, and as such forbade all participation in the sacraments of the Church of Rome, favored communistic life, diligence in prayer, and simplicity in dress. Pursued by the Church and by the State, he fled with all his family to the home of count Picus de Mirandola, but on the way he was captured and, after a hasty trial, was condemned to be burned.

## Peter Chrysolanus[[@Headword:Peter Chrysolanus]]

             an Italian prelate, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. He was raised to the archbishopric of Milan in 1110, having previously held some less important see. He was sent by pope Paschal II on a mission to the emperor Alexius I Comnenus, and engaged eagerly in the controversy on the procession of the Holy Spirit. His principal work is, Ad Imperatorem Dominum Alexium Conzenum Oratio, etc., designed to prove the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son as well as from the Father, published in the Graecia Orthodoxa of Allatius, 1:379, etc. (Rome, 1 652, 4to), and given in a Latin version by Baronius, Annal. Eccles. ad ann. 1116, volume 8, etc.

## Peter Chrysologus, St[[@Headword:Peter Chrysologus, St]]

             an Italian prelate, was born at Imola, in the northern part of Italy, towards the close of the 4th century. He was educated by Cornelius, a bishop, and received ordination as deacon from the same prelate. In 433 he was consecrated archbishop of Rav:enna by pope Sixtus III, who knew all his merit. He labored to reform several abuses which had been introduced into his diocese, and to extirpate the remnants of pagan superstition. In A.D. 448 St. Germain d'Auxerre having come to Ravenna, Peter received him with marks of the most profound veneration. Shortly afterwards the heresiarch Eutyches wrote to him complainiqg of the condemnation passed on him by Flavianus of Constantinople, and Peter replied to him in June, 449, expressing his grief to see that the disputes upon the mystery of the incarnation were not ended. He died December 2, 450. His zeal for the instruction of his flock is shown by one hundred and seventy-six Sermones, collected in 708 by Felix, archbishop of Ravenna, under the title, Divi Petri Chrysologi archiepiscopi Ravennatis, viri eruditissimi atque sanctissimi, insigne et pervetustum opus Homiliarum nunc primum in lucem editum (Par. 1544, 12mo), which have frequently been reprinted. They appear in the seventh volume of the Lyons edition of the Bibliotheca Patrum (1677, fol.): — Epistola Petri Ravennatis Episcopi ad Eutychem Abbatem. This letter was published by Gerard Vossius in the original Greek, with a Latin version, at the end of the works of Gregory Thaumaturgus (Mayence, 1604, 4to). It is reprinted in the Concilia (volume 4, col. 36, ed. Labbe; volume 2, col. 21, ed. Hardouin). See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 3:222; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:138.

## Peter Collivacinus[[@Headword:Peter Collivacinus]]

             (also called Morra), an ecclesiastical character of the 13th century, flourished as teacher of canonical law at Bologna; was then secretary to Innocent III, by whose order he collected the decretals of that pope during the first eleven years of his reign, and published them in 1210 by the help of the so-called Compilatio Romana of Bernhard of Compostella. This collection was approved by the University of Bologna, and received the name Compilatio tertia. (The socalled Compilatio secunda is younger, but contains older material. See Richter, Kirchenrecht, § 74.) Later, Peter was cardinal legate, and as such labored to restore order to the Church of South France, in his day so greatly broken up by the wars of the Albigenses (q.v.).

## Peter Fullo[[@Headword:Peter Fullo]]

             (also called Cnapheus, i.e., the Fuller), a patriarch of Antioch, was born near the commencement of the 5th century. He was abbot of a monastery at or near Constantinople, but various accusations (including heresy) being  made against him, he fled to Antioch, accompanying Zeno, son-in-law of the emperor Leo I, who was sent thither. Peter appears to have held the doctrine of the Monophysites, the controversy concerning which was at that time agitating the entire Eastern Church. On his arrival at Antioch, the patriarchate of which city was held by Martyrius, a supporter of the Council of Chalcedon, he determined to attempt the usurpation of that office, engaging Zeno and a number of those who favored the Monophysite doctrine in the enterprise. Great tumult and confusion ensued, one cause of which was that Peter added to the sacred hymn called the Trisagion the words "who wast crucified for us" — which constituted one of the tests of the Monophysites — and anathematized all who did not sanction the alteration. Martyrius, unable to maintain order, went to Constantinople, where he was kindly received by Leo I, through whose influence he hoped to be able, on his return to Antioch, to quell the disturbance. Failing in this, and disgusted with his failure, he abdicated the patriarchate, which was immediately assumed by Peter. Leo, however, at the instigation of Gennadius, patriarch of Constantinople, promptly expelled the intruder, in whose place Julian was elected, with general approval.

Peter was banished to Upper Egypt, but, contriving to escape from his exile, he returned to Constantinople and obtained refuge in a monastery, where he remained until the revolt of Basiliscus against Zeno, having bound himself by oath to abstain from exciting further troubles. The revolt succeeding, and Zeno being driven from Constantinople, Basiliscus exerted himself to gain the Monophysites, and issued an encyclical letter to the various prelates of the Church, anathematizing the decrees of the Synod of Chalcedon. Peter gave formal assent to this letter, and was immediately restored to the patriarchate of Antioch (A.D. 476). Julian soon after died of grief, and Peter, resuming authority, restored the obnoxious clause "who wast crucified for us;" and by repeating his anathemas excited fresh tumults, which resulted in plunder and murder. Zeno, however, recovering the imperial power, a synod was assembled and Peter was deposed, chiefly through the agency of one of his own partisans, John Codonatus, whom he had made a bishop. He was banished to Pityus, from whence he escaped, and, going to Euchaita, obtained refuge in the church of St. Theodore. After a period of nine years, during which time numerous changes had been made in the patriarchate, the Monophysites, again in the ascendant, persuaded Zeno to consent to the restoration of Peter upon his signing the emperor's "Henoticon," or decree for the unity of the Church. This event is placed by Theophanes in A.D. 485. The Western Church, which had  maintained its allegiance to the Council of Chalcedon, assembled in council at Rome, and hurled its anathemas at Peter, but to no purpose. Protected by Zeno and the strength of his party, he retained the patriarchate during the remainder of his life. Theophanes charges him with various offences against ecclesiastical rule, and with many acts of oppression after his restoration; which charges are, unfortunately, corroborated by the previous character of the man. One of the latest manifestations of his ambition was the attempt to add the island of Cyprus to his patriarchate. He was succeeded by Palladius, a presbyter of Seleucia. His death is variously stated to have occurred in A.D. 488, 490, 491.

## Peter Mogilas[[@Headword:Peter Mogilas]]

             SEE MOGILAS.

## Peter Mongus[[@Headword:Peter Mongus]]

             a Monophysite, flourished as patriarch of Alexandria in the 5th century. Liberatus gives him also the surname of the Stammerer. He was ordained deacon by Dioscorus, successor of Cyril, who held the patriarchate for seven years (A.D. 444-451). Peter was the ready participator in the violences of Dioscorus, and earnestly embraced his cause when he was deposed by the Council of Chalcedon, withdrawing from the communion of the successor of Dioscorus, Proterius, who supported the cause of the council, and uniting in the opposition raised by Timothy LElurus and others. Peter was consequently sentenced, apparently by Proterius, to deposition and excommunication. Whether he was banished, as well as Timothy AElurus, is not clear, but he seems to have accompanied Timothy to Alexandria, and to have been his chief supporter when, after the death of  the emperor Marcian, he returned, and either murdered Proterius or excited the tumults that led to his death, A.D. 457. Timothy AElurus was immediately raised to the patriarchate by his partisans, but was shortly after banished by the emperor Leo I, the Thracian, who had succeeded Marcian. Peter also was obliged to flee. Another Timothy, surnamed Salofaciolus, a supporter of the Council of Chalcedon, was appointed to succeed Proterius in the patriarchate. When, in the following reign of Zeno, or rather during the short usurpation of Basiliscus, Timothy AElurus was recalled from exile (A.D. 475), and was sent from Constantinople to Alexandria to re- occupy that see, he was joined by Peter and his party, and with their support drove out his competitor Salofaciolus, who took refuge in a monastery at Canopus. On the downfall of Basiliscus and the restoration of Zeno, Timothy AElurus was allowed, through the emperor's compassion for his great age, to retain his see; but when on his death (A.D. 477) the Monophysite bishops of Egypt, without waiting for the emperor's directions, elected Peter (who had previously obtained the rank of archdeacon) as his successor, the emperor's indignation was so far aroused that he determined to put the new prelate to death. His anger, however, somewhat abated, and Peter was allowed to live, but was deprived of the patriarchate, to which Timothy Salofaciolus was restored. On the death of Salofaciolus, which occurred soon after, John of Tabenna, surnamed Talaia, was appointed to succeed him; but he was very shortly deposed by order of Zeno, on some account not clearly ascertained, and Peter Mongus was unexpectedly recalled from Euchaita in Pontus, whither he had been banished, and was (A.D. 482) restored to his see.

His restoration appears to have been part of the policy of Zeno to unite, if possible, all parties; a policy which Peter, whose age and misfortunes appear to have abated the fierceness of his party spirit, was ready to adopt. He consequently subscribed the Henoticon of the emperor, and readmitted the Proterian party to communion on their doing the same. John of Tabenna had meanwhile fled to Rome, where the pope, Simplicius, who, with the Western Church, steadily supported the Council of Chalcedon, embraced his cause, and wrote to the emperor in his behalf. Felix II or III, who succeeded Simplicius (A.D. 483), was equally zealous on the same side. Peter had some difficulty in maintaining his position. In order to recover the favor of his Monophysite friends, whom his subservience to Zeno's policy had alienated, he anathematized the Council of Chalcedon; and then, to avert the displeasure of Acacius of Constantinople and of the court, to whose temporizing course this decisive step was adverse, he denied that he  had done so. Evagrius has preserved the letter he wrote to Acacius on this occasion, which is the only writing of Peter now extant. By this tergiversation he preserved his see, and was enabled to brave the repeated anathemas of the Western Church. When, however, to recover the attachment of the Monophysites, he again anathematized the Council of Chalcedon, and Euphemius, the newly elected patriarch of Constantinople, forsaking the policy of his predecessors, took part with the Western Church against him, his difficulties became more serious. What result this combination against him might have produced cannot now be known; death removed him from the scene of strife A.D. 490, shortly before the death of Zeno. He was succeeded in the see of Alexandria by another Monophysite, Athanasius II. See Cave, Hist. Litt. 1:455; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 11:336; Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, volume 2, col. 416, etc.; Tillemont, Memoires Ecclesiastiques, volume 16.

## Peter OF Alcantara, St[[@Headword:Peter OF Alcantara, St]]

             was born in the place after which he is surnamed in 1499, studied at the university in Salamanca. and when sixteen years old became a Franciscan monk. In 1519 he became prior at Badajoz, and in 1524 priest. For several years he lived in retirement, but in 1538 he was made general-superior of his order in Estremadura. In 1555 he founded, with the consent of pope Julius III, a separate reformed congregation, called the Observantists (q.v.), and assisted St. Theresa in her reforms of the Carmelites. He died in 1562, and was canonized in 1569. His work De oratione et meditatione was long and widely circulated. The De animi pace seu tranquillitate is not genuine. According to the legend, Peter walked on the sea by faith. In a picture in the Munich gallery, he not only walks himself, but a lay brother goes with him, whom Peter seems to encourage by pointing to heaven. See Acta Sanctorum, volume 8.

## Peter OF Alexandria (1)[[@Headword:Peter OF Alexandria (1)]]

             the first of that name in the list of bishops, and noted for the part he took against the Meletian schism, was born in the 3d century. He was placed over the see of Alexandria after the death of Theonas, which occurred April 9, 300. Peter had not occupied the position quite three years when the persecution commenced by the emperor Diocletian, and continued by his successors, broke out in 304. Peter was obliged to hide himself, and fled from one place to another, as we learn from a discourse said to have been delivered by him in prison, in which he states that he found shelter at different times in Mesopotamia, in Phoenicia, in Palestine, and in various islands. Cave conjectures that he was imprisoned during the reign of Diocletian or Maximian Galerius, but, if so, Peter must have obtained his release before the schism in the Egyptian churches. In 306 he assembled a council, which passed upon the misdemeanors of Meletius, bishop of Lycopolis. This prelate, in publishing calumnies against Peter and his council, finally created a schism in the Church of Alexandria, which lasted 150 years. Peter was obliged to seek his safety in flight. In the ninth year of the persecution he was, suddenly and contrary to all expectation, again arrested by order of Maximin Daza, and, without any distinct charge be. ing brought against him, was beheaded November 25, 311. Eusebius speaks with the highest admiration of his piety and his attainments in sacred literature, and he is revered as a saint and martyr both in the Eastern and Western churches. His memory is now celebrated by the Latin and Greek churches on the 26th, except in Russia, where the more ancient computation, which placed it on the 25th, is still followed. Peter wrote several works, of which there are very scanty remains:

(1.) Sermo de Paenitentia: —

(2.) Sermo in Sanctum Pascha. These discourses are not extant in their original form, but fifteen canons relating to the lapsi, or those who in time of persecution had fallen away — fourteen of them from the Sermo de Poenitentia (λόγος περὶ μετανοίας), the fifteenth from the Sermo in Sanctum Pascha — are contained in all the Canonumn Collectiones. They were published in a Latin version in the Micropresbyticon (Basle, 1550); in the Orthodoxographa of Heroldus (ibid. 1555), and of Grynaeus (ibid. 1569); in the first and second editions of De la Bigne's Bibliotheca Patrum (Paris, 1575 and 1589), and in the Cologne edition (1618). They are given  also in the Concilia. It is only in some MSS. and editions that the separate source of the fifteenth canon is pointed out: —

(3.) Liber de Divinitate s. Deitate. There is a citation from this treatise in the Acta Concilii Ephesini; it occurs in the Actio prima, and a part of it is again cited in the Defensio Cyrilli, which is given in the sequel of the Acta: —

(4.) Homilia de Adventu Salvatoris s. Christi. A short citation from this occurs in the Latin version of the work of Leontius of Byzantium, Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos, lib. 1: —

(5, 6.) Two fragments, one described, Ex primo Sermone, de eo quod nec praeexistit Anima, nec cum peccasset propterea in Corpus missa est, the other as Ex Mystagogia quam fecit ad Ecclesiam cum Martyrii Coronam suscepturus esset, are cited by the emperor Justinian in his Epistola ad Mennam CPolitanum adversus Origenem, given in the Acta Concilia CPolitani II s. OEcunenici V (Concilia, volume 5, col. 652, ed. Labbe; volume 3 col. 256, 257, ed. Hardouin). Another fragment of the same discourse is contained in the compilation Leontii et Joannis Rerum Sacrarum lib. 2, published by Mai in the above-cited Collectio, 7:85: —

(7.) Epistola S. Petri Episcopi ad Ecclesiam Alexandrinam, noticing some irregular proceedings of the schismatic Meletius. This letter, which is very short, was published in a Latin version by Scipio Maffei in the third volume of his Observazione Letterarie (Veronae, 1737-40, 6 volumes, 12mo): —

(8.) Doctrina. A fragment of this work is cited by Leontius and Joannes. and was published by Mai (ibid. page 96). The published fragments of Peter's works, with few exceptions, are given in the fourth volume of Galland's Bibliotheca Patrum, page 91, etc. See Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 7:32; 8:13; 9:6, cum notis Valesii; Athanasius, Apolog, contra Arianos, c. 59; Epiphanius, 1.c.; Concilia, 1.c.: Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 301, 1:160 (Oxford ed. 1740-43) Tillemont, Memoires, 5:436, etc.; Fabricius, Biblioth Graec. 9:316, etc.; Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs sacres e ecclesiastiques, 4:17 sq.; Dupin, Bibliotheque des Auteurs eccles.; Galland, Biblioth. Patrum, proleg. ad volume 4, c. 6. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 3:219. Comp. Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:138; Dorner, Christologie, 1:810; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 1:327 sq.; Schaff, Church Hist. volume 1.

## Peter Of Alexandria (2)[[@Headword:Peter Of Alexandria (2)]]

             another patriarch of that see, was born near the beginning of the 4th century, during the life of Athanasius, whom he for many years accompanied, sharing his variable fortunes, as presbyter of the Church at Alexandria. He was designated by Athanasius as his successor, and upon the death of that celebrated Church father (A.D. 373) was appointed to the place, to the great satisfaction of the orthodox among the people, and with the approval of the neighboring bishops. The Arians, however, who had, either from fear or reverence, conceded quiet possession to Athanasius, were by no means disposed to acquiesce in the appointment of an orthodox successor; and Peter was at once deposed and imprisoned. Making his escape, he fled to Rome, where he was kindly received by pope Damasus I, leaving his Arian competitor, Lucius, in possession of the Church of Alexandria. After five years' absence, Peter returned with letters from the pope confirming his title to the see, and regained possession of the church by favor of the people, who deposed Lucius, and forced him to flee to Constantinople. Peter enjoyed the highest esteem of his contemporaries, but survived his restoration only a short time. He died February 14, 381, and was succeeded by his brother Timothy. Valesius speaks of him as the abettor of Maximus the Cynic in his usurpation of the see of Constantinople in place of St. Gregory (Nazianzen), but this is scarcely probable, since Gregory himself eulogizes him. Theodoret ascribes this act to Timothy. Of the writings of Peter, parts of two letters have been preserved to us by Theodoret and Facundus; the first giving an account of the persecutions and acts of violence perpetrated by Lucius and the Arians; the second, Epistola ad Episcopos et Presbyteros atque Diacones pro vera Fide in exsilio constitutes, s. ad Episcopos, Presbyteros, atque Diacones qui sub Valente Imperatorae Diocaesaream fuerant exules missi. See Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs sacres et eccles. 8:464 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:138; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 3:220.

## Peter Of Amiens[[@Headword:Peter Of Amiens]]

             SEE PETER THE HERMIT.

## Peter Of Anolo[[@Headword:Peter Of Anolo]]

             a Swiss theologian of the 15th century, flourished at Basle as doctor and professor of canon law. He wrote about 1460, Libellus de Caesarum Monarchia ad Fridericum, etc. (under the title De Imperio Romano, edited by Faber, Strasburg, 1603; Nuremb. 1657). The work takes the ground that the German empire is the continuance of the Roman imperium (a view in very recent times espoused by Freeman in his Comparative Politics). All princes are subordinate to the emperor; the emperor is the subordinate of the pope, who has received his authority from God.

## Peter Of Antioch (1)[[@Headword:Peter Of Antioch (1)]]

             SEE PETER FULLO.

## Peter Of Antioch (2)[[@Headword:Peter Of Antioch (2)]]

             the third patriarch of that name in the current tables of the occupants of that see, which commence with the apostle Peter, was born near the beginning of the 11th century. Contemporary with Michael Cerularius, patriarch of Constantinople, and Leo of Achridia, he united with them in hostility to the Latin Church. According to Cave, Peter bitterly inveighed  against the lives and doctrines of the Latin clergy, and especially against the addition of the word Jilioque to the creed; while, according to Le Quien, he preserved a more impartial tone, and showed everywhere "a disposition averse to schism." Peter obtained the patriarchate in the year 1053, and in the same year he sent synodical letters to the patriarchs of Alexandria, Jertusalem, and Constantinople, and to pope Leo IX, signifying his accession. Cave states that he sent to the pope "a profession of his faith," but it is probable that he has applied this term to the synodical letter, of which a Latin version appears among the letters of Leo IX. Le Quien, who had in his possession the Greek text of these synodical letters, complains of the great discrepancy between the Greek text and the Latin version. Two letters of Peter appear in Greek. with a Latin version, in the Monumenta Ecclesiae Graecae of Cotelerius (2:112, 145). The first is entitled Epistola ad Doeminicum Gradensem, and is an answer to Dominicus Gradensis s. Venetus, patriarch of Venice or Aquileia, whose letter, in the collection of Gotelerius, precedes that of Peter; the second is addressed to Michael Cerularius (Epistola ad Michaelem Cerularium), and is preceded by a letter of Michael to Peter, to which it is the answer. A considerable part of this letter had previously been published by Leo Allatius, in his De Consensu Ecclesiarum Orient. et Occident. lib. 3, c. 12, § 4. There is extant in MS. at Vienna another letter of Peter, Petri Epistola ad Joannem Tranensem in Apulia Episcopum, relating to the matters in dispute between the Eastern and Western churches. See Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 1040, 2:132; Oudin, Comment. de Scriptorib. et Scriptis Eccles. 2:605; Lambec, Comment. de Biblioth. Caesaraea; Le Quien, Oriens Christian. 2:754.

## Peter Of Blois[[@Headword:Peter Of Blois]]

             SEE BLEISEN, PETER.

## Peter Of Blois (Petrus Blesensis)[[@Headword:Peter Of Blois (Petrus Blesensis)]]

             so called from the place of his birth, a learned ecclesiastical writer, flourished in the 12th century. He studied at Paris, Bologna, and Oxford, and there was so interested in scholastic pursuits that he became a student of John of Salisbury. In 1167 he was appointed the teacher and secretary of young king William II of Sicily. Fear of assassination, prompted by jealousy of his success, made him leave Italy, and he remained for a while in France. In 1168 he was invited to England by Henry II; was nominated archdeacon of Bath, and afterwards became chancellor of Canterbury and archdeacon of London. For the space of fourteen years he was one of the  most influential men in England, both as a politician and a churchman. He died in 1200. He is said to have first used the word transubstantiation. His letters are very interesting; they are admired for their elegance and perspicuity of language. Besides, Peter of Blois deserves to be pointed out as one of those ecclesiastics of the Middle Ages who dared to speak out against the abuses in school, Church, and State. He complains bitterly of the superficial ways of the clergy, who were then the educators of the world. He reproaches those who moot questions respecting time and space, and the nature of universals (universalia), before they had learned the elements of science. These charlatans strove after high things, and neglected the doctrines of salvation. Peter of Blois's writings have been collected under the title, Opera omnia, nunc prinum in Anglia ope codicum manuscriptorum editionumque optinzarum, edidit J.A. Giles, LL.D. (4 volumes, 8vo). See Wright, Biog. Brit. Litter. 2:366 sq.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. volume 2, s.v.; Baur, Dogmengesch.; Hardwick, Ch. Hist. of the Middle Ages; Neander, Hist. of Christian Dogmas. (J.H.W.)

## Peter Of Bruys (Pierre de Brois)[[@Headword:Peter Of Bruys (Pierre de Brois)]]

             a French ecclesiastic of the 12th century, is noted as the representative of those anti-hierarchical tendencies which so generally prevailed in Southern France. He was a priest, but resigned his orders, preferring to become a leader of the people against the corruptions of the Church, about 1104. Peter of Clugny, whose pastoral epistles to the bishops of the south of France are the principal source of information concerning Peter of Bruys, reproaches him with heretical opinions; and, although the account of an enemy is always to be read with suspicion, the high and disinterested character of the abbot of Clugny gives more than ordinary value to his narrative. The time of the composition of the preface to the refutation (the body of which was of early date) was shortly after the death of De Bruys, which took place about A.D. 1125. At this time, the author tells us, the heresy had been flourishing for twenty years. Peter of Bruys seems to have rejected infant baptism, because he felt that baptism without faith was of no avail, and with Abelard he rebaptized adults. He also rejected all public divine service, for God, he argued, "ante altare vel ante stabulum invocatus" — is heard as well in the inn as in the church. The crosses he would burn, and not honor, for that is a reproach to the sufferings of the Saviour. Peter of Bruys even maintained that the Supper was not instituted by Christ as a rite of perpetual observation; that he only once distributed his body and blood among his disciples. This expression is obscure:  perhaps he meant to say that Christ had observed this rite once for all. He also rejected the mass and sacrifices for the dead. He found many followers, known as the Petrobrusians (q.v.). Peter of Bruys was burned at St. Gilles on Still Friday, in 1124, in the Arelatensia diocese, by a mob, in an emeute caused by his preaching, and probably instigated by the Romish ecclesiastics. See Gieseler, Kirchengesch. volume 2, part 2, page 536; Engelhardt, Dogmengesch. volume 2, chapter 3, page 51 sq.; Munscher, Dogmengesch. (edit. by Cohn), page 209, 210. (J.H.W.)

## Peter Of Cellxe (Petrus Cellensis)[[@Headword:Peter Of Cellxe (Petrus Cellensis)]]

             a French prelate of some note, flourished in the second half of the 12th century. He was abbot at Moutier la Celle from 1150; in 1162 he filled a like office at St. Remis, near Rheims; and in 1181 was made bishop of Chartres. He died in 1183. Peter of Cellae left mystical interpretations of the Scriptures, and letters to the popes and bishops and many princes, who highly esteemed him. He had reformatory ideas, and did not hesitate to express them. His works have been collected and published several timnes. One edition is by Sirmond (Par. 1613; Ven. 1728).

## Peter Of Edessa[[@Headword:Peter Of Edessa]]

             a Syrian by birth, and a presbyter of the Church at Edessa, and an eminent preacher, wrote Tractatus variarum Causarum, treatises on various subjects, and composed Psalms in metre like those of Ephrem the Syrian. Trithemius ascribes to him Commentarii in Psalmos, and says that he wrote in Syriac. All his works have perished.

## Peter Of Nicomedia[[@Headword:Peter Of Nicomedia]]

             an Eastern ecclesiastic, was born in the early part of the 7th century. He was one of the prelates who, with certain deacons and monks, had to clear themselves in the third Constantinopolitan, or sixth oecumenical, council (A.D. 680), from the suspicion of holding the Monothelite heresy, by oath and solemn written confessions of their belief in the orthodox doctrine of two wills in Christ. The confessions were of considerable length, and all exactly alike, and are given in the original Greek with a considerable hiatus; but completely iin a Latin version in the Acta Concilii CPolitani III, Actio 10.; or, according to one of the Latin versions of the A cta given by Hartiouin, in Actio 9. See Concilia, volume 6, col. 784, 842, ed. Labbd; volume 3, col. 1202, 1248, 1537, 1561, ed. Hardouin; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 680, 1:595.

## Peter Of Remigius[[@Headword:Peter Of Remigius]]

             also known as Petrus Cellensis, flourished in the fourth quarter of the 12th century as abbot of St. Remigius, and afterwards as bishop of Chartres. He published his Opera, containing Sermones, Liber depanibus, Mosaici tabernaculi mystica et moralis expositio, De conscientia, De disciplina  claustrali, Epistolarum libri 9 (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 23:636), Tractatus de disciplina claustrali (D'Achery, Spicil. 1:452), Epistolarum libri 9 (Sirmondi Opera Varia, 3:659).

## Peter Of Sebaste[[@Headword:Peter Of Sebaste]]

             an Eastern prelate, was born at Caesarea, in Cappadocia. before A.D. 349. He was the youngest of the ten children of Basil and Emmelia, who numbered among their children those eminent fathers of the Church, Basil the Great and Gregory of Nyssa. Peter's early education was conducted by his sister, St. Macrina, who, in the emphatic phrase of Gregory of Nyssa. "was everything to him — father, teacher, attendant, and mother." The quickness of the boy enabled him readily to acquire anything to which his attention was directed; but his education appears to have been conducted on a very narrow system, profane learning being disregarded. If, however, his literary culture was thus narrowed, his morals were preserved pure; and if he fell short of his more eminent brothers in variety of attainments, he equalled them in holiness of life.

The place of his education appears to have been a nunnery at Annesi, or Annesa, on the river Iris, in Pontus, established by his mother and sister; and with them, or in the monastery which his brother Basil had established on the other side of the river, much of his life was passed. In a season of scarcity (A.D. 367, 368 ?), such was his benevolent exertion to provide for the destitute, that they flocked to him from all parts, and gave to the thinly peopled neighborhood in which he resided the appearance of a populous town. His mother's death appears to have occurred about the time of Basil's elevation to the bishopric of the Cappadocian Caesarea, about A.D. 370; soon after which, apparently, Peter received from Basil ordination to the office of presbyter, probably of the Church of Csesarea; for Basil appears to have employed his brother as his confidential agent in some affairs. A passage of Theodoret (H.E. 4:30) shows that he took an active part in the struggle carried on during the reign of Valens by the bishops of the orthodox party against Arianism. It was probably after the death both of Basil and Macrina, about the year 380, as Tillemont judges, that Peter was raised to the bishopric of Sebaste (now Siwas), in the Lesser Armenia. His elevation preceded the second general council, that of Constantinople, A.D. 380-381, in which he took part. In what year he died is not known, but it was probably after A.D. 391, and certainly before the death of his brother, Gregory of Nyssa (who survived till A.D. 394, or later), for Gregory was present at Sebaste at the first celebration of his brother's memory, i.e., the anniversary of his death,  which occurred in hot weather, and therefore could not have been in January or March, where the martyrologies place it. The only extant writing of Peter is a letter prefixed to the Contra Eunomium Libri of Gregory of Nyssa, and published with the works of that father. It is entitled Sancti Patris nostri Petri Episcopi Sebasteni ad S. Gregorium Nyssenum suum Epistola. Peter does not appear to have been ambitious of authorship, and probably felt the disqualification arising from his restricted education. Some of the works of his brother Gregory were, however, written at his desire, such as the above-mentioned treatises against Eunomius and the Expicatio Apologetica in Hexaemeron. The De Hominis Opificio is also addressed to him by Gregory, who, both in this treatise and in the Explicatio in Hexaemeron, speaks of him in the highest terms. See Greg. Nyssen. De Vita S. Macrinae; Basil, Maritimis Episcopis Epistola, 203, ed. Bened.; Tillemont, Mimoires, 9:572, Le Quien, Oriens Christianus, volume 1, col. 424; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 370, 1:246.

## Peter Regulato (St.)[[@Headword:Peter Regulato (St.)]]

             a mediaeval saint, appears in the later Italian and Spanish paintings of the Franciscans, to whose order he belonged. He is noted in ecclesiastical annals for his "sublime gift of prayer." He died March 30, 1456.

## Peter The Deacon (1)[[@Headword:Peter The Deacon (1)]]

             flourished near the beginning of the 6th century. In the controversy excited by the monks whom ecclesiastical writers call Scythae, who came from the diocese of Torni, on the south bank of the Danube, Peter took a prominent part. He had accompanied the delegates sent to Rome by the monks, and while in the Eternal City united with his colleagues in addressing to Fulgentius, and the other African bishops who were then in exile in Sardinia, a work entitled De Incarnatione et Gratia Domini nostri Jesu Christi Liber. To this Fulgentius and his companions replied in another treatise on the same subject. The work of Peter, which is in Latin, was published in the Monumenta SS. Patrum Orthodoxographa of Grynaeus (Basle, 1569), and has been reprinted in various editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum. It is in the ninth volume of the Lyons edition of Galland (Ven. 1776, fol.).

## Peter The Deacon (2)[[@Headword:Peter The Deacon (2)]]

             a learned Benedictine of Monte-Cassino, of a Roman patrician family, was born about the close of the 11th century, in the reign of Alexius I Comnenus. In the Jus Graeco-Romanum of Leunclavius (lib. 6:395-397) are given Interrogationes quas solvit reverendissimus Chartularius, Dominus Petrus. idemque Diaconus Majoris Ecclesiae (sc. of St. Sophia at Constantinople), A.M. 6600=A.D. 1092. We learn from this title when the author lived, and that he held the offices described. He seems to have been admitted into the Benedictine Order at the very early age of fifteen. In a controversy of his convent with pope Innocent II, he defended the  monastic interests to great advantage before the emperor Lothaire in 1138, while he was in South Italy. So well pleased was the emperor with Peter that he was made chartularius and chaplain of the Roman realm. Later he was intrusted by pope Alexander with the management of the convent of Monte-Cassino, where he died after the middle of the 12th century. The following of his writings are instructive for the contemporaneous history of the Church, De vita et obitu Justorum Coenobii Casinensis: — Lib. illustrium virorum Casinensis Archisterii: — Lib. de locis sanctis: — and De Novissinis temporibus. There are, or were, extant in MS. in the king's library at Paris, Petrus Diaconus et Philosophus de Cyclo et Indictione, and Petri Diaconi et Philosophi Tractatus de Sole, Luna, et Sideribus (Codd. CMXXIX, No. 7, and MMMLXXXV), but whether this Petrus Diaconus is the canonist is not clear.-Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 3:223; Potthast, Bibl. Med. AEvi, page 490; Fabricius, Bib. Graeca, 11:334 sq.; Cave, Hist. Litt. 2:161.

## Peter The Dominican[[@Headword:Peter The Dominican]]

             SEE PETER MARTYR.

## Peter The Hermit[[@Headword:Peter The Hermit]]

             an ecclesiastical character of the 11th century, is of very little significance except as the monks of the Church of Rome have given him importance by crediting him with the movement of the Christian Church against the Saracens, known as the First Crusade, for which the credit is by most competent critics awarded to pope Urban II. Von Sybel, in his Geschichte des ersten Kreuzzuges (Dusseldorf, 1841), examines the history of the first crusaders, and in consequence of a most searching review of all the records pronounces Peter of Amiens an apocryphal character, and his reputed efforts for the first crusade the invention of Greek legendaries of the 12th century. Even William of Tyre, who is the principal source of the history of the Crusades of all the Middle-Age historians, knows (in his Belli sacri historiae about 1188) of Peter of Amiens only that he is a persona contemptibilis, whose fate was that of the other crusaders. The Jesuit OEltreman has made the life of Peter of Amiens the subject of a sacred romance, which is often mistaken for history. The whole scheme is intended to wrest the honor of the first Crusade from the papacy and to give it to the monks.

According to these questionable sources, Peter the Hermit was a native of Amiens, where he was born about the middle of the 11th century. He was educated first at Paris, and afterwards in Italy, and then became a soldier. After serving in Flanders without much distinction, he retired from the army, married, and had several children; but on the death of his wife he became religious, and exhausted, without satisfying the cravings of his religious zeal, all the ordinary excitements — the studies, the austerities and mortifications, the fasts and prayers — of a devout life. Still yearning for more powerful emotions, he retired into the solitude of the strictest and  severest cloister. Not even content with this life of a recluse, he ultimately became a hermit. But even this failed to satisfy him, and he would not rest contented with himself until lie had projected a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. For this he set out about 1093. On his visit to the East he saw with a bleeding heart that the Holy Sepulchre was in the hands of the infidel, and beheld the oppressed condition of the Christian residents or pilgrims under the Moslem rule: "his blood turned to fire," and the hermit made his vow that with the help of God these things should cease. In an interview with the patriarch Simeon he declared that the natives of the West should take up arms in the Christian cause. On his return to the West he spoke so earnestly on the subject to pope Urban II that the pontiff warmly adopted his views, and, however selfish may have been the promptings of his zeal in the cause-he foreseeing probably that, whatever might be the result to the warriors of the cross, his own power would thenceforth rest on more solid foundationsUrban eagerly bestowed his blessing on the fervent enthusiast, and commissioned him to preach throughout the West an armed confederation of Christians for the deliverance of the Holy City.

Mean in figure and diminutive in stature, and gifted only with an eloquence that was as rude as it was ready, his deficiencies were more than made up by the earnestness which gave even to the glance of his eye a force more powerful than speech. His enthusiasm lent him a power which no external advantages of form could have commanded. He was filled with a fire which would not stay, and the horrors which were burnt in upon his soul were those which would most surely stir the conscience and rouse the wrath of his hearers. His fiery appeals carried everything before them. "He traversed Italy," writes the historian of Latin Christianity, "crossed the Alps, from province to province, from city to city. He rode on a mule, with a crucifix in his hand, his head and feet bare: his dress was a long robe, girt with a cord, and a hermit's cloak of the coarsest stuff. He preached in the pulpits, on the roads, in the marketplaces. His eloquence was that which stirs the heart of the people, for it came from his own — brief, figurative, full of bold apostrophes; it was mingled with his own tears, with his own groans; he beat his breast: the contagion spread throughout his audience. His preaching appealed to every passion — to valor and shame, to indignation and pity, to the pride of the warrior, to the compassion of the man, the religion of the Christian, to the love of the brethren, to the hatred of the unbeliever aggravated by his insulting tyranny, to reverence for the Redeemer and the saints, to the desire of expiating sin, to the hope of eternal life." The results are well known as among those moral marvels of  enthusiasm of which history presents occasional examples. All France especially was stirred from its very depths; and just at the time when the enthusiasm of that country had been enkindled to its full fervor, it received a sacredness and an authority from the decree of a council held at Clermont, in which Urban himself was present, and in which his celebrated harangue was but the signal for the outpouring, through all Western Christendom, of the same chivalrous emotions by which France had been borne away under the rude eloquence of the Hermit. To understand this success, we must take into account the poverty of the masses, and the alluring prospect of a residence in Eastern lands, the scenes of which were painted in glowing colors by the apostle of the holy war. Thousands of outcasts had always been ready to follow the princes in their marauding expeditions or political wars, and how much more in a war which enlisted the highest sympathies of their nature in its behalf, which received the sanction of the ministers of religion, and was regarded as the will of God! For the details of the expedition,

We must refer to the article CRUSADES SEE CRUSADES, our sole present concern being with the personal history of Peter. Of the enormous but undisciplined army which assembled from all parts of Europe, one portion was committed to his conduct; the other being under the command of a far more skilful leader, Walter (q.v.) the Penniless. Peter, mounted upon an ass, with his coarse woollen mantle and his rude sandals, placed himself at the head of his followers. On the march through Hungary they became involved in hostilities with the Hungarians, and suffered a severe defeat at Semlin, whence they proceeded with much difficulty to Constantinople. There the emperor Alexius, filled with dismay at the want of discipline which they exhibited, was but too happy to give them supplies for their onward march; and near Nice they encountered the army of the sultan Soliman, from whom they suffered a terrible defeat. Peter accompanied the subsequent expedition under Godfrey; but worn out by the delays and difficulties of the siege of Antioch, he was about to withdraw from the expedition, and was only retained in it by the influence of the other leaders, who foresaw the worst results from his departure. Accordingly he had a share, although not marked by any signal distinction, in the siege and capture of the Holy City in 1099, and the closing incident of his history as a crusader was an address to the victorious army delivered on the Mount of Olives. He returned to Europe, and founded a monastery at Huy, in the diocese of Liege, where he died, July 7, 1115. The movement which had been inaugurated continued to agitate Europe for nearly two centuries, and its general effect upon the march of civilization  may well be pronounced incalculable. See Milman, Hist. of Lat. Christianity, 4:25 sq.; Cox, The Crusades (N.Y. 1874, 18mo), page 26 sq.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, chapter 33.

## Peter The Lombard[[@Headword:Peter The Lombard]]

             SEE LOMBARD, PETER

.

## Peter The Patrician (1)[[@Headword:Peter The Patrician (1)]]

             was a Byzantine historian of the 6th century. He was born at Thessalonica, in the province of Macedonia, then included in the prefecture of Illyricum. He settled at Constantinople, where he acquired distinction as a rhetor or advocate, a profession for which his cultivated mind, agreeable address, and natural powers of persuasion were admirably adapted. These qualifications pointed him out to the discernment of the emperor Justinian I as suited for diplomatic life, and he was sent by him (A.D. 534) as ambassador to Amalasuntha, regent of the kingdom of the Ostrogoths. Before arriving in Italy Peter learned the death of the young king Athalaric, the marriage of Amalasuntha and Theodotus, one of the principal chiefs of the Ostrogoths, their exaltation to the throne of Italy, and of their subsequent dissensions and the imprisonment of Amalasuntha. Peter then received instructions to vindicate the cause of the imprisoned queen; but his arrival at Ravenna was speedily followed by the murder of Amalasuntha. Procopius charges Peter with instigating Theodotus to commit the murder; being secretly commissioned to do so by the jealousy of Theodora, Justinian's wife, who held out to him as an inducement to comply with her desire the hope of great advancement. Whether he was an abettor to the crime or not, Peter, in conformity to the orders of Justinian, demanded reparation for it, and declared war against Theodotus. The latter, terrified, commissioned him to convey to Justinian the most humble propositions of peace, and even, if necessary, the offer of his abdication. The last offer only was accepted; but when Peter returned to communicate the will of the emperor to Theodotus, the latter was not disposed to accept it. The king of the Ostrogoths even violated the law of nations by imprisoning the Byzantine ambassadors. Peter and his colleague remained in captivity until Belisarius, by detaining some Ostrogothic ambassadors, compelled Vitiges, who had succeeded Theodotus, to release him about the  end of A.D. 538.

On his return Peter received, as Procopius intimates, by Theodora's interest, and as a reward for his participation in procuring Amalasuntha's death, the high appointment of magister officiorum, but incurred general odium by the part he had acted. He exercised his authority with the most unbridled rapacity; for although he was, according to Procopius, naturally of a mild temper, and by no means insolent, he was at the same time the most dishonest of all mankind, κλεπτίστατος δὲ ανθρώπων ἁπάντων. Several years afterwards (about A.D. 550) Peter, who retained his post of magister offciorum, and had in addition acquired the dignity of patrician, was sent by Justinian to negotiate a peace with Chosroes I, king of Persia. Some negotiations with pope Vigilius (552), and a new mission into Persia (562), are the last events known of the career of Peter the Patrician. He died soon after his return from Persia, leaving one son, who succeeded him in his office of magister officiorum. According to Suidas, Peter composed two works, Historiae and De Statu Reipublicae. The Historiae began with Augustus, or rather with the second triumvirate, and continued to a period a little later than the time of Constaptine the Great. Considerable portions of it are preserved in the Excerpta de Legationibus, made by order of the emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The treatise De Statu Reipublicae is lost, although Mai thinks he recognises it in De Republica, from which he has deciphered and published long passages in his Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio. Authentic fragments from the treatise of Peter are found in the De Caeremoniis Aulae Byzantinae of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. Peter the Patrician has given a relation of his negotiations with Chosroes, which is quoted by Menander. All the remains of this historian are given in the Bonn edition of the Excerpta de Legationibus. See Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, 6:135; 7:538; 8:33; Reiske, Praefatio, c. 2, to the De Caeremoniis of Constantine Porphyrogenitus; Niebuhr, De Historicis quorum Reliquiae hoc Volumine continentur, in the Excerpta de Legat. ed. of Bonn; Mai, De Fragmentis Politicis Petri Magistri, in the Script. Veterum Nova Collec. 2:571 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 3:226; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:182.

## Peter The Patrician (2)[[@Headword:Peter The Patrician (2)]]

             was a Greek saint who lived early in the 9th century. He had fought in the battle (A.D. 811) against the Bulgarians in which the emperor Nicephorus I was defeated and slain. A life of Peter, taken from the Meencea of the Greeks, is given in the original Greek, with a Latin version, and a  Commentariolus Prcevius by Joannes Pinius, in the Acta Sanctorum (July), 1:289, 290.

## Peter The Patrician (3)[[@Headword:Peter The Patrician (3)]]

             a Greek, different from the foregoing, and belonging to a somewhat later period. He presented to the emperor Leo VI Sapiens, who began to reign A.D. 886, a copy of Theodoret's Curatio Graecarum Adfectionum, to which he prefixed an Epigramma, which is printed at length by Lambecius ill his Commentarius de Biblioth. Caesaraea.

## Peter The Sicilian[[@Headword:Peter The Sicilian]]

             an Italian prelate, was born in Sicily near the beginning of the 9th century. In order to escape the persecution of the Saracens, who ruled in Sicily, he went to Byzantium in 830, and there spent a large part of his life. He gained the friendship of the emperor Basil, and the princes Constantine and Leo, his sons, who provided him with ecclesiastical benefices. He was sent by the emperor to Tabrica, in the district or on the frontier of Melitene, near the Euphrates, to negotiate an exchange of Christian prisoners, apparently with the chiefs of the Paulicians, a purpose which, after a  residence of nine months, he effected. We have of his works, Petri Siculi, humillimi Argirorum Episcopi, Funebris Oratio in B. Athanasium, Methones Episcopum.

It is given in the Latin version of the Jesuit Franciscus Blanditius, in the Acta Sanctorum of the Bollandists (January), 2:1125, etc.: — Petri Siculi Historia de vana et stolida Manichaeorum Haeresi tanquam Archiepiscopo Bulgarorum nuncupata. This account of the Paulicians was translated into Latin, and published by Matthaeus Raderus (Ingoldstadt, 1604, 4to), and has been reprinted in various editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum.

There was another bishop of Argos of the name of Peter, author of Eulogium Cosniae et Damiana SS. Anargyrorum in Asia s. Oratio in sanctos et gloriosos Anargyros et Thaumaturgos Cosnum et Damianum, which has never been printed. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. 3:222; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 40:183.

## Peter The Singer (Pierre le Chanteur)[[@Headword:Peter The Singer (Pierre le Chanteur)]]

             a French theologian, was born in Beauvoisis near the beginning of the 12th century. The place of his birth is strongly controverted, and certain authors assert that he was born in Paris or Rheims. It is probable that, educated by the care of Henry of France, brother of the king Louis le Jeune, and bishop of Beauvais in 1149, he followed him to Rheims when he was raised to that seat in 1162. Peter went afterwards to Paris, where he taught theology, and became grand chorister of the cathedral, a dignity which gained him the surname under which he was known (1184). Elected in 1191 bishop of Tournay, he saw his election broken for want of form, and was in 1196 called to the episcopal seat of Paris, but without being more fortunate this time. He was supplanted by Eudes de Sully. The pope charged him to preach the crusade in France; but Peter, weakened by disease, confided this care to Foulques, cure of Neuilly-sur-Marne, his disciple, and died in the garb of a monk at Longpont, September 22, 1197, when he had just been elected dean of Rheims. Of his numerous writings a single one has been published under the title of Verbum abbreviatum, because it commences with these words (Mons, 1639, 4to). See Hist. Litt. 15:283-303; Muldrac, Hist. de l'Abb. de Longpont; Dupin, Auteurs Eccles. du Treizieme Siecle. — Hoefer, Nouv, Biog. Genesis 40:192.

## Peter The Stammerer[[@Headword:Peter The Stammerer]]

             SEE PETER MONGUS.

## Peter The Venerable[[@Headword:Peter The Venerable]]

             also called Mauritius, a mediaeval character of note, was born in 1092 or 1094. He was educated at the Cistercian abbey at Soucilanges, and soon after the completion of his theological training was made prior of the convent at Vezelay, then at Domeine, and in 1122 abbot of Clugny. Petrus Venerabilis was more or less mixed with all the important ecclesiastical transactions of the 12th century. He took in the schism of 1130 the side of pope Innocent XI; and especially played a great part in the discussions between Bernard of Clairvaux and Abelard. His works, written with more ease than talent, have not yet been published in a collected form. He died, at Christmas, in 1157 (see Bibl. Patr. Despont, volume 22). His publications are, Sermones (in Martene et Durand, Thesaur. November 5, 1419): — Nucleus de sacrificio missae (Hittorpius, 1091): — Libri ii adversus nefariam sectam Saracenorum (in Martene et Durand, Collectio, 9:1120). His life was written by the monk Rudolph, his disciple: Vita Petri Venerabilis, abbatis Cluniacensis (ibid. 6:1187). See Hook, Eccles. Biog. 8:59; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. volume 27; Wilkins, Peter der Ehrwurdige (Leipsic, 1857). (J.H.W.)

## Peter, First Epistle Of[[@Headword:Peter, First Epistle Of]]

             the first of the seven Catholic Epistles of the N.T. In the following account of both epistles of Peter we pass over many particulars which will be found discussed elsewhere. SEE PETER

I. Genuineness and Canonicity. — This epistle found an early place in the canon by universal consent, ranking among the ὁμολογούμενα, or those generally received. The other epistle, by calling itself δευτέρα, refers to it as an earlier document (2Pe 3:1). Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Philippians, often uses it, quoting many clauses, and some whole verses, as  1Pe 1:13; 1Pe 1:21, in 1 Peter 2; 1Pe 3:9, in 1 Peter 5; 1Pe 2:11, in 1Pe 4:7, in chapter 6; and 1Pe 2:21-24, in chapter 8, etc. It is to be observed, however, that in no case does this father refer to Peter by name, but he simply cites the places as from some document of acknowledged authority; so that Eusebius notes it as characteristic of his epistle that Polycarp used those citations from the First Epistle of Peter as μαρτυρίαι (Hist. Ecc 4:14). The same lhistorian relates of Papias that in his Λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις he in a similar way used μαρτυρίαι from this epistle (Hist. Eccles. 3:39). Irenoeus quotes it expressly and by name, with the common formula, "Et Petrus ait" (Haeres. 4:9, 2), citing 1Pe 1:8; using the same quotation similarly introduced in ibid. 1Pe 5:7; 1Pe 5:2; and again, " Et propter hoc Petrus ait," citing 1Pe 2:16; ibid. 1Pe 4:16, . . Other quotations, without mention of the apostle's name, may be found, ibid. 1Pe 3:16; 1Pe 3:9, and 1Pe 4:2, etc. Quotations abound in Clement of Alexandria, headed with ὁ Πέτρος λέγει, or φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος. These occur both in his Stromata and Pcedag., and need not be specified. Quotations are abundant also in Origen, certifying the authorship by the words παρὰ τῷ Πετρῶ; and, according to Eusebius, he calls this epistle μιαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμογουμένην (Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 6:25). The quotations in Origen's works need not be dwelt upon. In the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, A.D. 177, there is distinct use made of v. 60 Theophilus of Antioch, A.D. 181, quotes these terms of 1Pe 4:3 — ἀθεμίταις εἰδωλολατρείαις. Tertullian's testimony is quite as distinct. In the short tract Scorpiace this epistle is quoted nine times, the preface in one place being" Petrus quidem ad Ponticos" (Scorp. c. 12), quoting 1Pe 2:20. Eusebius himself says of it, Πέτρου . . . ἀυωμολόγηται (Hist. Ecclesiastes 3”25). It is also found in the Peshito, which admitted only three of the catholic epistles. See Mayerhoff, Einleitung in die Petrin. Schriften, page 139, etc.

In the canon published by Muratori this epistle is not found. In this fragment occurs the clause, "Apocalypses etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus." Wieseler, laying stress on etiam, would bring out this meaning- in addition to the epistles of Peter and John, we also receive their Revelations; or also of Peter we receive as much as of John, two epistles and an apocalypse. But the interpretation is not admissible. Rather with Bleek may the omission be ascribed to the fragmentary character of the document (Einleit. in das N.T. page 643; Hilgenfeld, Der Canon and die Kritik des N.T. [Halle, 1833], page 43). Other modes of reading and  explaining the obscure sentence have been proposed. Hug alters the punctuation, "Apocalypsis etiam Johannis. Et Petri tantum recipimus;" certainly the tantum gives some plausibility to the emendation. Believing that the barbarous Latin is but a version from the Greek, he thus restores the original, καὶ Πέτρου μόνον παραδεχόμεθα, and then asks μόνον to be changed into μονήν — an alteration which of course brings out the conclusion wanted (Einleit. § I). Guericke's effort is not more satisfactory. Thiersch, with more violence, changes tantum into unam epistolam, and quam quidem in the following clause into alteram quidem. This document, so imperfect in form and barbarous in style, is probably indeed a translation from the Greek, and it can have no authority against decided and general testimony (see the canon in Routh's Reliquiae Sacrat, 1:396, edited with notes from Freindaller's Commentatio [Lond. 1862]). Nor is it of any importance whether the words of Leontius imply that this epistle was repudiated by Theodore of Mopsuestia, and if the Paulicians rejected it, Petrus Siculus gives the true reason — they were "pessime adversus illun affecti" — personal prejudice being implied in their very name (Hist. Manich. page 17).

The internal evidence is equally complete. The author calls himself the apostle Peter (1Pe 1:1), and the whole character of the epistle shows that it proceeds from a writer who possessed great authority among those whom he addresses. The writer describes himself as "an elder," and "a witness of Christ's sufferings" (1Pe 5:1). The vehemence and energy of the style are altogether appropriate to the warmth and zeal of Peter's character, and every succeeding critic, who has entered into its spirit, has felt impressed with the truth of the observation of Erasmus, "that this epistle is full of apostolical dignity and authority, and worthy of the prince of the apostles."

In later times the genuineness of the epistle has been impugned, as by Cludius in his Uransichten des Christenthums, page 296 (Altona, 1808). He imagined the author to have been a Jewish Christian of Asia Minor, and his general objection was that the similarity in doctrine and style to Paul was too great to warrent the belief of independent authorship. His objections were exposed and answered by Augusti (in a program, Jena, 1808) and by Bertholdt (Eirdeit. volume 6, § 667). Eichhorn, however, took up the theory of Cludius so far as to maintain that as to material Peter is the author, but that Mark is the actual writer. De Wette also throws out similar objections, hinting that the author may have been a follower of Paul  who had been brought into close attendance upon Peter. The question has been thoroughly discussed by Hug, Ewald, Bertholdt, Weiss, and other critics. The most striking resemblances are perhaps 1Pe 1:3 with Eph 1:3; Eph 2:18 with Eph 6:5; Eph 3:1 with Eph 5:22 and Eph 5:5 with Eph 5:21; but allusions nearly as distinct are found to the other Pauline epistles (comp. especially 1Pe 2:13 with 1Ti 2:2-4; 1Pe 1:1 with Eph 1:4-7; Eph 1:14 with Rom 12:2; Rom 2:1 with Col 3:8 and Rom 12:1; Rom 2:6-10 with Rom 9:32; Rom 2:13 with Rom 13:1-4; Rom 2:16 with Gal 5:13; Gal 3:9 with Rom 12:17; Rom 4:9 with Php 2:14; Php 4:10 with Rom 12:6, etc.; Rom 5:1 with Rom 8:18; Rom 5:8 with 1Th 5:6; 1Th 5:14 with 1Co 16:20). While, however, there is a similarity between the thoughts and style of Peter and Paul, there is at the same time a marked individuality, and there are also many special characteristics in this first epistle.

First, as proof of its genuineness, there is a peculiar and natural similarity between this epistle and the speeches of Peter as given in the Acts of the Apostles. Not to mention similarity in mould of doctrine and array of facts, there is resemblance in style. Thus Act 5:30; Act 10:39, 1Pe 2:24, in the allusion to the crucifixion and the use of ξύλον, the tree or cross; Act 2:32; Act 3:15, 1Pe 5:1, in the peculiar use of μάρτυς; Act 3:18; Act 10:43, 1Pe 1:10, in the special connection of the old prophets with Christ and his work; Act 10:42, 1Pe 4:5, in the striking phrase "judge quick and dead;" Act 3:16, 1Pe 1:21, in the clauses ἡ πίστις ἡ δἰαὐτοῦ-τοὺς δἰ αὐτοῦ πιστούς; and in the mode of quotation (Act 4:2; 1Pe 2:7). Certain favorite terms occur also — ἀναστροφή, and ἀγαθοποιεῖν with its cognates and opposites. There are over fifty words peculiar to Peter in this brief document, nearly all of them compounds, as if in his profound anxiety to express his thoughts as he felt them, he had employed the first, and to him at the moment the fittest terms which occurred. He has such phrases as ἐλπὶς ζῶσα, 1Pe 1:3; συνείδησις θεοῦ, 1Pe 2:19; ὀσφύες διανοίας, 1:13; φίλημα ἀγάπης, 1Pe 5:14. The nouns δόξαι, 1Pe 1:11, and ἀρεταί, 1Pe 2:9, occur in the plural. He uses εἰς before a personal accusative no less than four times in the first chapter. The article is often separated from its noun, 3:2, 3, 19; 4:2, 5, 8. 12. Peter has also a greater proneness than Paul to repetition-to reproduce the same idea in somewhat similar terms — as if he had felt it needless to search for a mere change of  words when a similar thought was waiting for immediate utterance (comp. 1Pe 1:6-9 with 1Pe 4:12-13; 1Pe 2:12 with 1Pe 3:16; 1Pe 4:4; 1Pe 4:7 with 1Pe 5:8). There are also in the epistle distinct and original thoughts-special exhibitions of the great facts and truths of the Gospel which the apostle looked at from his own point of view, and applied as he deemed best to a practical purpose. Thus the visit of Christ "to the spirits in prison" (1Pe 3:19); the typical connection of the Deluge with baptism; the desire of the old prophets to study and know the times and the blessings of the Gospel — are not only Petrine in form, but are solitary statements in Scripture. Thus, too, the apostle brings out into peculiar relief regeneration by the "Word of God," the "royal priesthood" of believers, and the qualities of the future "inheritance," etc.

Again, in phrases and ideas which in the main are similar to those of Paul, there is in Peter usually some mark of difference. Where there might have been sameness, the result of imitation, there is only similarity, the token of original thought. For example, Paul says (Rom 6:10-11), ζῆν τῷ θεῷ; Peter says (1Pe 2:24), ζῆν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. The former writes (Rom 6:2), ἀποθνήσκειν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾷ; the latter (1Pe 2:24), ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀπογίνεσθαι. Besides, as Bruckner remarks, the representation in these last clauses is differentdeath to sin in the passage from Romans being the result of union with the sufferings and death of Christ, while in Peter it is the result of Christ's doing away sin (De Wette, Erkldarung, ed. Bruckner, page 9). So, too, the common contrast in Paul is σάρξ and πνεῦμα, but in Peter πνεῦμα and ψυχή ;ἐκλογή) is connected in Paul with χάρις, or it stands absolutely; but in Peter it is joined to πρόγνωσις; government is with the first τοῦ θεοῦ διαταγή (Rom 13:2); but with the second it is ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις (1Pe 2:13); the expression with the one is καινὸς ἄνθρωπος (Eph 4:24); but with the other ὁ κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος (1Pe 3:4): what is called ἀφορμή in Gal 5:13 is named ἐπικάλυμμα in 1Pe 2:16, etc. Now, not to insist longer on this similarity with variance, it may be remarked that for many of the terms employed by them, both apostles had a common source in the Septuagint. The words found there and already hallowed by religious use were free to both of them, and their acquaintance with the Sept. must have tended to produce some resemblance in their own style. Among such terms are ἀγνωσία, ἀσωτία, εὔσπλαγχνος, καταλαλία, ὑπερέχειν, φρουρεῖν, χορηγεῖν (comp. Mayerhoff, Histor.-Krit. Einleitung in d. Petrin. Schriften, page 107 sq.).  That two apostles, in teaching the same system of divine truth, should agree in many of their representations. and even in their words, is not to be wondered at, since the terminology must soon have acquired a definite form, and certain expressions must have become current through constant usage. But in cases where such similarity between Peter and Paul occurs, there is ever a difference of view or of connection; and though both may refer to ideas so common as are named by ὑπακοή, δόξα or κληρονομία, there is always something to show Peter's independent use of the terms. One with his "beloved brother Paul" in the general view of the truth, he has something peculiar to himself in the introduction and illustration of it. The Petrine type is as distinct as the Pauline — it bears its own unmistakable style and character. The Galilean fisherman has an individuality quite as recognizable as the pupil of Gamaliel.

Once more, to show how baseless is the objection drawn from Peter's supposed dependence on Paul, it may be added that similarity in some cases may be traced between Peter and John. In many respects Paul and John are utterly unlike, yet Peter occasionally resembles both. though it is not surmised that he was an imitator of the beloved disciple. Such accidental resemblance to two styles of thought so unlike in themselves is surely proof of his independence of both, for he stands midway; as it were, between the objectivity of Paul and the subjectivity of John; inclining sometimes to the one side and sometimes to the other, and occasionally combining both peculiarities of thought. Thus one may compare 1Pe 1:22 with 1Jn 3:3 in the use of ἁγνίζω; 1Pe 1:23 with 1Jn 3:9 in the similar use of σπορᾶς and σπέρμα, denoting the vital germ out of which regeneration springs; 1Pe 5:2 with Joh 10:16 in the use of ποιμήν; 1Pe 3:18 and 1Jn 3:7 in the application of the epithet δίκαιος to Christ; 1Pe 3:18, Joh 1:29, in calling him ἀμνός. Such similarities only prove independent authorship. In the resemblances to James, which are sometimes adduced, the chief similarity consists in the use of Old-Test. quotations. Thus compare 1Pe 1:6-7 with Jam 1:2-3; Jam 1:24 with Jam 1:10; Jam 2:1 with Jam 1:21; Jam 2:5 with Jam 4:6; Jam 4:10; Jam 4:8 with Jam 5:20 and Jam 5:5 with Jam 4:6. What, then, do these more frequent resemblances to Paul, and the fewer to John and James, prove? Not, with De Wette, the dependence of Peter on Paul; nor, with Weiss, the dependence of Paul on Peter (Der Petrin. Lehrbegriff page 374); but that Peter, in teaching similar truths, occasionally employs similar terms; while the surrounding illustration is so  various and significant that such similarity can be called neither tame reiteration nor unconscious reminiscence. With much that is common in creed, there is more that is distinctive in utterance, originating in difference of spiritual temperament, or moulded by the adaptation of truth to the inner or outer condition of the churches for whom this epistle was designed.

On the other hand, the harmony of such teaching with that of Paul is sufficiently obvious. Peter, indeed, dwells more frequently than Paul upon the future manifestation of Christ, upon which he bases nearly all his exhortations to patience, self-control, and the discharge of all Christian duties. Yet there is not a shadow of opposition here; the topic is not neglected by Paul, nor does Peter omit the Pauline argument from Christ's sufferings; still what the Germans call the eschatological element predominates over all others. The apostle's mind is full of one thought, the realization of Messianic hopes. While Paul dwells with most earnestness upon justification by our Lord's death and merits, and concentrates his energies upon the Christian's present struggles, Peter fixes his eye constantly upon the future coming of Christ, the fulfilment of prophecy, the manifestation of the promised kingdom. In this he is the true representative of Israel, moved by those feelings which were best calculated to enable him to do his work as the apostle of the circumcision. Of the three Christian graces, hope is his special theme. He dwells much on good works, but not so much because he sees in them necessary results of faith, or the complement of faith, or outward manifestations of the spirit of love, aspects most prominent in Paul, James, and John, as because he holds them to be tests of the soundness and stability of a faith which rests on the fact of the resurrection, and is directed to the future in the developed form of hope.

But while Peter thus shows himself a genuine Israelite, his teaching, like that of Paul, is directly opposed to Judaizing tendencies. He belongs to the school, or, to speak more correctly, is the leader of the school, which at once vindicates the unity of the Law and the Gospel, and puts the superiority of the latter on its true basis, that of spiritual development. All his practical injunctions are drawn from Christian, not Jewish principles, from the precepts, example, life, death, resurrection, and fiuture coming of Christ. The apostle of the circumcision says not a word in this epistle of the perpetual obligation, the dignity, or even the bearings of the Mosaic law. He is full of the Old Testament; his style and thoughts are charged with its imagery, but he contemplates and applies its teaching in the light of the  Gospel; he regards the privileges and glory of the ancient people of God entirely in their spiritual development in the Church of Christ. Only one who had been brought up as a Jew could have had his spirit so impregnated with these thoughts; only one who had been thoroughly emancipated by the Spirit of Christ could have risen so completely above the prejudices of his age and country.

This is a point of great importance, showing how utterly opposed the teaching of the original apostles, whom Peter certainly represents, was to that Judaistic narrowness which speculative rationalism has imputed to all the early followers of Christ, with the exception of Paul. There are in fact more traces of what are called Judaizing views, more of sympathy with national hopes, not to say prejudices, in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, than in this work. In this we see the Jew who has been born again, and exclianged what Peter himself calls the unbearable yoke of the law for the liberty which is in Christ. At the same time it must be admitted that our apostle is far from tracing his principles to their origin, and from drawing out their consequences with the vigor, spiritual discernment, internal sequence of reasoning, and systematic completeness which are characteristic of Paul. A few great facts, broad solid principles on which faith and hope may rest securely, with a spirit; of patience, confidence, and love, suffice for his unspeculative mind. To him objective truth was the main thing; subjective struggles between the intellect and spiritual consciousness, such as we find in Paul, and the intuitions of a spirit absorbed in contemplation like that of John, though not by any means alien to Peter, were in him wholly subordinated to the practical tendencies of a simple and energetic character. It has been observed with truth that both in tone and in form the teaching of Peter bears a peculiarly strong resemblance to that of our Lord, in discourses bearing directly upon practical duties. The great value of the epistle to believers consists in this resemblance; they feel themselves in the hands of a safe guide, of one who will help them to trace the hand of their Master in both dispensations, and to confirm and expand their faith.

But apart from the style and language of the epistle, objections have been brought against it by Schwegler, who alleges the want of special occasion for writing it, and the consequent generality of the contents (Das Nach- apostol. Zeitalt. 2:7). The reply is that the epistle bears upon its front such a purpose as well suits the vocation of an apostle. Nor is there in it, as we have seen, that want of individuality which Schwegler next alleges. It bears upon it the stamp of its author's fervent spirit; nor does its use of Old-Test.  imagery and allusions belie his functions as the apostle of the circumcision (Wiesinger, Einl. page 21). If there be the want of close connection of thought, as Schwegler also asserts, is not this want of logical sequence and symmetry quite in keeping with the antecedents of him who had been trained in no school of human learning? Nor is it any real difficulty to say that Peter in the East could not have become acquainted with the later epistles of Paul. For in various ways Peter might have known Paul's epistles; and granting that there is a resemblance to some of the earlier of them, there is little or none to the latest of them. Schwegler holds that the epistle alludes to the persecution under Nero, during which Peter suffered, and that therefore his writing it at Babylon is inconsistent with his martyrdom at the same period at Rome. The objection, however, takes for granted what is denied. It is a sufficient reply to say that the persecution referred to was not, or may not have been, the Neronian persecution, and that the apostle was not put to death at the supposed period of Nero's reign. There is not in the epistle any direct allusion to actual persecution; the ἀπολογία (3:15) is not a formal answer to a public accusation, for it is to be given to every one asking it (Huther, Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch fiber den 1. Brief des Petrus, Einleit. page 27). The epistle in all its leading features is in unison with what it professes to be an earnest and practical letter from one whose heart was set on the well-being of the churches, one who may have read many of Paul's letters and thanked God for them, and who, in addressing the churches himself, clothes his thoughts in language the readiest and most natural to him, without any timid selection or refusal of words and phrases which others may have used before him.

II. Place and Time. — The place is indicated in 1Pe 5:13, in the clause ἀζεπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή. Babylon is named as the place where the apostle was when he wrote the epistle, as he sends this salutation from it, on the part of a woman, as Mayerhoff, Neander, Alford, and others suppose; or on the part of a Church, as is the opinion of the majority. It is remarkable, however, that from early times Babylon has here been taken to signify Rome. This opinion is ascribed by Eusebius on report to Papias and Clement of Alexandria (Hist. Ecc 2:15). Jerome and (Ecumenius also held it. In later times it has been espoused by Grotius, Cave, Lardner, Hengstenberg,Windischmann,Wiesinger, Baur, Thiersch, Schott (Der 1. Brief Pet. erklart, page 346, Erlangen, 1861), and Hofmann (Schriftb. 1:201). But why discover a mystical sense in a name set down as  the place of writing an epistle? There is no more reason for doing this than for assigning a like significance to the geographical names in 1:1. How could his readers discover the Church at Rome to be meant by ἡ συνεκλεκτή in Babylon? And if Babylon do signify a hostile spiritual power, as in the Apocalypse (Rev 18:21), then it is strange that Catholic critics as a body should adopt such a meaning here, and admit by implication the ascription of this character to their spiritual metropolis. Dr. Brown, of Edinburgh, puts a somewhat parallel case — "Our own city is sometimes called Athens from its situation, and from its being a seat of learning; but it would not do to argue that a letter came from Edinburgh because it is dated from Athens" (Expository Discourses on 1st Peter, 1:548).

Some, again, think that Babylon may mean a place of that name in Egypt. Of this opinion are Le Clerc, Mill, Pearson, Pott, Burton, Greswell, and Hug. Strabo (Geog. 17:1, 30) calls it not a town, but a strong fortress built by refugees from Babylon, and a garrison for one of the three legions guarding Egypt. The opinion that this small encampment is the Babylon of our epistle has certainly little plausibility. It is equally strange to suppose it to be Ctesiphon or Seleucis; and stranger still to imagine that Babylon represents Jerusalem, as is maintained by Cappellus, Spanheim, Hardouin, and Semler. The natural interpretation is to take Babylon as the name of the well-known city. We have indeed no record of any missionary journey of Peter into Chaldaea, for but little of Peter's later life is given us in the New Test. But we know that many Jews inhabited Babylon — ( οὐ γὰρ ὀλίγοι μυριάδες, according to Josephus — and was not such a spot, to a great extent a Jewish colony or settlement, likely to attract the apostle of the circumcision? Lardner's principal argument, that the terms of the injunction to loyal obedience (2:13, 14) imply that Peter was within the bounds of the Roman empire, proves nothing; for as Davidson remarks — "The phrase 'the king,' in a letter written by a person in one country to a person in another, may mean the king either of the person writing, or of him to whom the letter is written." Granting that the Parthian empire had its own government, he is writing to persons in other provinces under Roman jurisdiction, and he enjoins them to obey the emperor as supreme, and the various governors sent by him for purposes of local administration. Moreover as has often been observed, the countries of the persons addressed in the epistle (1Pe 1:1) are enumerated in the order in which a person writing from Babylon would naturally arrange them, beginning with those lying nearest to him, and passing in circuit to those in  the west and the south, at the greatest distance from him. The natural meaning of the designation Babylon is held by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Lightfoot, Wieseler, Mayerhoff, Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, and perhaps the majority of modern critics.

But if Peter wrote from Babylon on the Euphrates, at what period was the epistle written? The epistle itself contains no materials for fixing a precise date. It does not by its allusions clearly point to the Neronian persecution; it rather speaks of evil and danger suffered now, but with more in prospect. Suffering was endured and was also impending, and yet those who lived a quiet and blameless life might escape it, though certainly trials for righteousness' sake are implied and virtually predicted. About the year 60 the dark elements of Nero's character began to develop themselves, and after this epoch the epistle was written. The churches addressed in it were mostly planted by Paul, and it is therefore thought by some that Paul must have been deceased ere Peter would find it his duty to address them. Paul was plt to death about A.D. 64; but such a date would be too late for our epistle, as time would not, on such a hypothesis, be left for the apostle's going to Rome, according to old tradition, and for his martyrdom in that city. It may be admitted that Peter would not have intruded into Paul's sphere had Paul been free to write to or labor in the provinces specified. Still it may be supposed that Paul may have withdrawn to some more distant field of labor, or may have been suffering imprisonment at Rome. Davidson places the date in 63; Alford between 63 and 67. If the Mark of 5:13 be he of whom Paul speaks as being with him in Rome (Col 4:10), then we know that he was purposing an immediate journey to Asia Minor; and we learn from 2Ti 4:11 that he had not returned when this last of Paul's epistles was written. It is surely not impossible for him to have gone in this interval to Peter at Babylon; and as he must have personally known the churches addressed by Peter, his salutation was naturally included by the apostle. Silvanus, by whom the epistle was sent-if the same with the Silvanus mentioned in the greetings 1Th 1:1; 2Th 1:1 seems to have left Paul before the epistles to Corinth were written. He may have in some way become connected with Peter, and, as the Silas of the Acts, he was acquainted with many of the churches to whom this epistle was sent. The terms "a faithful brother as I suppose" (the faithful brother as I reckon) do not imply any doubt of his character, but are only an additional recommendation to one whose  companionship with Paul must have been known in the provinces enumerated by Peter.

But Schwegler ascribes the epistle to a later periodto the age of Trajan; and of course denies its apostolic authorship (Nach-apostol. Zeitalter, 2:22). The argulments, however, for so late a date are very inconclusive. He first of all assumes that its language does not tally with the facts of the Neronian persecution, and that the tone is unimpassioned — that Christians were charged with definite crime under Nero — that his persecution did not extend beyond Rome — that it was tumultuary, and not, as this epistle supposes, conducted by regular processes, and that the general condition of believers in Asia Minor, as depicted in the epistle, suits the age of Trajan better than that of Nero. The reply is obvious — that the tranquillity of tone in this epistle would be remarkable under any persecution, for it is that of calm, heroic endurance, which trusts in an unseen arm, and has hopes undimmed by death; that the persecution of Christians simply for the name which they bore was not an irrational ferocity peculiar to Trajan's time; that in the provinces Christians were always exposed to popular fury and irregular magisterial condemnation; that there is no allusion to judicial trial in the epistle, for the word ἀπολογία does not imply it; and that the sufferings of Christians in Asia Minor as referred to or predicted do not agree with the recorded facts in Pliny's letter, for according to it they were by a formal investigation and sentence doomed to death (Huther, Einleit. page 28). The persecutions referred to in this epistle are rather such as Christians have always to encounter in heathen countries from an ignorant mob easily stirred to violence, and where the civil power, though inclined to toleration in theory, is yet swayed by strong prejudices, and prone, from position and policy, to favor and protect the dominant superstition.

Supposing this epistle to have been written at Babylon, it is a probable conjecture that Silvanus, by whom it was transmitted to those churches, had joined Petei after a tour of visitation, either in pursuance of instructions from Paul, then a prisoner at Rome, or in the capacity of a minister of high authority in the Church, and that his account of the condition of the Christians in those districts determined the apostle to write the epistle. From the absence of personal salutations, and other indications, it may perhaps be inferred that Peter had not hitherto visited the churches; but it is certain that he was thoroughly acquainted both with their external circumstances and spiritual state. It is clear that Silvanus is not regarded by Peter as one of his own coadjutors, but as one whose personal character he  had sufficient opportunity of appreciating (1Pe 5:12). Such a testimonial as the apostle gives to the soundness of his faith would of course have the greatest weight with the Asiatic Christians, to whom the epistle appears to have been specially, though not exclusively addressed. The assumption that Silvanus was employed in the composition of the epistle is not borne out by the expression "by Silvanus I have written unto you," such words, according to ancient usage, applying rather to the bearer than to the writer or.amanuensis. Still it is highly probable that Silvanus, considering his rank, character, and special connection with those churches, and with their great apostle and founder, would be consulted by Peter throughout, and that they would together read the epistles of Paul, especially those addressed to the churches in those districts: thus, partly with direct intention, partly it may be unconsciously, a Pauline coloring, amounting in passages to something like a studied imitation of Paul's representations of Christian truth, may have been introduced into the epistle. It has been observed above, SEE PETER that there is good reason to suppose that Peter was in the habit of employing an interpreter; nor is there anything inconsistent with his position or character in the supposition that Silvanus, perhaps also Mark, may have assisted him in giving expression to the thoughts suggested to him by the Holy Spirit. We have thus, at any rate, a not unsatisfactory solution of the difficulty arising from correspondences both of style and modes of thought in the writings of two apostles who differed so widely in gifts and acquirements.

III. Persons for whom the Epistle was intended. — It was addressed to the churches of Asia Minor, which had for the most part been founded by Paul and his companions. From some expressions in the epistle many have thought that it was meant for Jewish Christians. The words of the salutation are — ἑκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, etc. — "to the elect strangers of the dispersion," etc. Viewed by themselves the words seem to refer to Jews — διασπορά being often employed to designate Jews living out of Palestine. This opinion is held by many of the fathers, as Eusebius, Jerome, and Theophylact, and by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grotius, Bengel, Hug, and Pott. A modification of this extreme view is maintained by Gerhard. Wolf, Jachmann, and Weiss, viz. that Jewish converts were chiefly regarded in the mass of Gentile believers. The arguments of Weiss need not be repeated, and they are well met by Huther (Einleit. page 21). But there are many things in the epistle quite irreconcilable with the idea of its being meant either solely or principally  for Jewish believers. He tells his readers that "sufficient lies the past for them to have wrought out the will of time Gentiles — as indeed ye walked in lasciviousness, wine-bibbing, revellings, drinking-bouts, and forbidden idolatries" — sins all of them, and the last particularly, which specially characterized the heathen world. Similarly does he speak (1Pe 1:14) of "former lusts in your ignorance;" (1Pe 3:6), of Sarah, "whose daughters ye have become" — ἐγενήθητε — they being not so by birth or blood. In 1Pe 2:9-10, they are said to be "called out of darkness," to have been "in time past not a people, but now the people of God." The last words, referring originally to Israel, had already been applied by Paul to Gentile believers in Rom 9:25. The term διασπορά may be used in a spiritual sense, and such a use is war. ranted by other clauses of the epistle — 1Pe 1:17, " the time of your sojourning;" 1Pe 2:11, "strangers and pilgrims." Peter, whose prepossessions had been so Jewish, and whose soul moved so much in the sphere of Jewish ideas from his very function as the apostle of the circumcision, instinctively employs national terms in that new and enlarged spiritual meaning which, through their connection with Christianity, they had come to bear. Besides, the history of the origin of these churches in Asia Minor shows that they were composed to a large extent of Gentile believers. Many of them may have been proselytes, though, as Wieseler has shown, it is wrong in Michaelis, Credner, and Neudecker to apply to such exclusively the terms in the address of this epistle. Nor is it at all a likely thing that Peter should have selected one portion of these churches and written alone or mainly to them. The provinces (1Pe 1:1) included the churches in Galatia which are not named in Acts, as Ancyra and Pessinus, and the other communities in Iconium, Lystra, the Pisidian Antioch, Miletus, Colosse, Laodicea, Philadelphia, Thyatira, Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamus, Troas, etc. (Steiger, Einleit. sec. 6). That the persons addressed in the epistle were Gentiles is the view of Augustine, Luther, Wetstein, Steiger, Brickner, Mayerhoff,Wiesinger, Neander, Reuss, Schaff, and Huther. Reuss (page 133) takes πάροικοι and παρεπίδημοι as גוים, Israelites by faith, not by ceremonial observance. See also Weiss, Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff, page 28, n. 2.

IV. Design, Contents, and Characteristics. — The objects of the epistle, as deduced from its contents, coincide with the above assumptions. They were:

1. To comfort and strengthen the Christians in a season of severe trial.

2. To enforce the practical and spiritual duties involved in their calling.

3. To warn them against special temptations attached to their position.

4. To remove all doubt as to the soundness and completeness of the religious system which they had already received.

Such an attestation was especially needed by the Hebrew Christians, who were wont to appeal from Paul's authority to that of the elder apostles, and above all to that of Peter. The last, which is perhaps the very principal object, is kept in view throughout the epistle, and is distinctly stated (1Pe 5:12).

These objects may come out more clearly in a brief analysis. The epistle begins with salutations and a general description of Christians (1Pe 1:1-2), followed by a statement of their present privileges and future inheritance (1Pe 1:3-5); the bearings of that statement upon their conduct under persecution (1Pe 1:6-9); reference, according to the apostle's wont, to prophecies concerning both the sufferings of Christ and the salvation of his people (1Pe 1:10-12); and exhortations based upon those promises to earnestness, sobriety, hope, obedience, and holiness, as results of knowledge of redemption, of atonement by the blood of Jesus, and of the resurrection, and as proofs of spiritual regeneration by the Word of God. Peculiar stress is laid upon the cardinal graces of faith, hope, and brotherly love, each connected with and resting upon the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel (1Pe 1:13-25).

Abstinence from the spiritual sins most directly opposed to those graces is then enforced (1Pe 2:1); spiritual growth is represented as dependent upon the nourishment supplied by the same Word which was the instrument of regeneration (1Pe 2:2-3); and then, by a change of metaphor, Christians are represented as a spiritual house, collectively and individually as living stones, and royal priests, elect, and brought out of darkness into light (1Pe 2:4-10). This portion of the epistle is singularly rich in thought and expression, and bears the peculiar impress of the apostle's mind, in which Judaism is spiritualized, and finds its full development in Christ. From this condition of Christians, and more directly from the fact that they are thus separated from the world, pilgrims and sojourners, Peter deduces an entire system of practical and relative duties, self-control, care of reputation, especially for the sake of Gentiles; submission to all constituted authorities; obligations of slaves, urged with  remarkable earnestness, and founded upon the example of Christ and his atoning death (1Pe 2:11-25); and duties of wives and husbands (1Pe 3:1-7). Then generally all Christian graces are commended, those which pertain to Christian brotherhood, and those which are especially needed in times of persecution, gentleness, forbearance, and submission to injury (1Pe 3:8-17): all the precepts being based on imitation of Christ, with warnings from the history of the. deluge, and with special reference to the baptismal covenant. In the following chapter (1Pe 4:1-2) the analogy between the death of Christ and spiritual mortification, a topic much dwelt upon by Paul, is urged with special reference to the sins committed by Christians before conversion, and habitual to the Gentiles.

The doctrine of a future judgment is inculcated, both with reference to their heathen persecutors as a motive for endurance, mind to their own conduct as an incentive to sobriety, watchfulness, fervent charity, liberality in all external acts of kindness, and diligent discharge of all spiritual duties, with a view to the glory of God through Jesus Christ (1Pe 4:3-11). This epistle appears at the first draught to have terminated here with the doxology, but the thought of the fiery trial to which the Christians were exposed stirs the apostle's heart, and suggests additional exhortations. Christians are taught to rejoice in partaking of Christ's sufferings, being thereby assured of sharing his glory, which even in this life rests upon them, and is especially manifested in their innocence and endurance of persecution: judgment must come first to cleanse the house of God, then to reach the disobedient: suffering according to the will of God, they may commit their souls to him in welldoing as unto a faithful Creator. Faith and hope are equally conspicuous in these exhortations. The apostle then (1Pe 5:1-4) addresses the presbyters of the churches, warning them as one of their own body, as a witness (parve) of Christ's sufferings, and partaker of future glory, against negligence, covetousness, and love of power; the younger members he exhorts to submission and humility, and concludes this part with a warning against their spiritual enemy, and a solemn and most beautiful prayer to the God of all grace. Lastly, he mentions Silvanus with special commendation, and states very distinctly what we have seen reason to believe was a principal object of the epistle, viz. that the principles inculcated by their former teachers were sound, the true grace of God, to which they are exhorted to adhere.

A salutation from the Church in Babylon and from Mark, with a parting benediction, closes the epistle.  A few characteristic features may be more distinctly looked at. The churches addressed were in trialssuch trials as the spirit of that age must necessarily have brought upon them (1Pe 3:17; 1Pe 4:12-19). Those trials originated to some extent in their separation from the heathen amusements and dissoluteness in which they had mingled prior to their conversion (1Pe 4:4-5). They are exhorted to bear suffering patiently, and ever to remember the example, and endure in the spirit, of the Suffering One — the Righteous One who had suffered for them. While affliction would come upon them in the present time, they are ever encouraged to look Nith joyous anticipation to the future. Peter indeed might be called the apostle of hope. Doctrine and consolation alike assume this form. The "inheritance" is future, but its heirs are begotten to a "living hope" (1Pe 1:3-4). Their tried faith is found unto glory "at the appearance of Jesus Christ" (1Pe 1:7). The "end" of their faith is "salvation" (1Pe 1:9), and they are to "hope to the end for the grace to be brought at the revelation of Jesus Christ" (1Pe 1:13). Their ruling emotion is therefore "the hope that is in them" (1Pe 3:15); so much lying over in reserve for them in the future, their time here is only a "sojourning" (1Pe 1:17); they were merely "strangers and pilgrims" (1Pe 2:11); nay, "the end of all things is at hand" (1Pe 4:7). Suffering was now, but joy was to come when his "glory shall be revealed" (1Pe 5:1). In Christ's own experience as Prototype suffering led to glory (1Pe 1:11; 1Pe 4:13); the same connection the apostle applies to himself, and to faithful ministers (1Pe 5:1-4). There are also allusions to Christ's words, or, rather, reminiscences of them mingle with the apostle's thoughts. Comp. 1Pe 1:4 with Mat 25:34; Mat 1:8 with Joh 20:29; Joh 1:10 with Luk 10:24; Luk 1:13 with Luk 12:35; Luk 2:12 with Mat 5:16; Mat 3:13-15 with Mat 5:16; Mat 10:28; Mat 5:6 with Mat 3:12, etc.

There were apparently some tendencies in those churches that required reproof — some temptations against which they needed to be warned, as "former lusts," "fleshly lusts" (1Pe 1:14; 1Pe 1:11); dark and envious feelings (1Pe 2:1; 1Pe 3:8-9); love of adornment on the part of women (1Pe 3:3); and ambition and worldliness on the part of Christian teachers (1Pe 5:1-4). God's gracious and tender relationship to his people was a special feature of the old covenant, and Peter reproduces it under the new in its closer and more spiritual aspects (1Pe 2:9-10; 1Pe 4:17; 1Pe 5:2). The old economy is neither eulogized nor disparaged, and no  remark is made on its abolition, the reasons of it, or the good to the world springing out of it. The disturbing question of its relation to Gentile believers is not even glanced at. In the apostle's view it had passed away by its development into another and grander system, one with it in spirit, and at the same time the realization of its oracles and types. His mind is saturated with O.-T. imagery and allusions, but they are freely applied to the spiritual Israel, which, having always existed within the theocracy, had now burst the national barriers, and was to be found in all the believing communities, whatever their lineage or country. To him the Jewish economy was neither supplanted by a rival faith nor superseded by a sudden revolution; Israel had only put off its ceremonial, the badge of its immaturity and servitude, and now rejoiced in freedom and predicted blessing. What was said of the typical Israel may now be asserted with deeper truth of the spiritual Israel. But the change is neither argued from premises laid down nor vindicated against Jews or Judaizers, and the results of the new condition are not held up as matter of formal congratulation; they are only seized and put forward as recognized grounds of joy, patience, and hope. The Redeemer stood out to Jewish hope as the Messiah; so Peter rejoices in that appellation, calling him usually Jesus Christ, and often simply Christ (1Pe 1:11; 1Pe 2:21; 1Pe 3:16-18; 1Pe 4:1; 1Pe 4:13-14); and it is remarkable that in nearly all those places the simple name Christ is used in connection with his sufferings, to the idea of which the Jewish mind had been so hostile. The centre of the apostle's theology is the Redeemer, the medium of all spiritual blessing. The relation of his expiatory work to sinners is described by ὑπέρ (1Pe 2:12; 1Pe 3:18); or it is said he bore our sins — τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀνήνεγκεν; or died περὶ δ ῾μαρτιῶν. "The sprinkling of blood" and the "Lamb without spot" were the fulfilment of the old economy, and the grace and salvation now enjoyed were familiar to the prophets (1Pe 1:10). Christ who suffered is now in glory, and is still keeping and blessing his people.

In fine, the object, as told by the author (1Pe 5:12), is essentially twofold. "I have written briefly, exhorting" (παρακαλῶν); and the epistle is hortatory-not didactic or polemical; "and testifying (ἐπιμαρτυρῶν) that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand." The true grace of God — ἀληθὴς χάρις — could not be doctrine imparted through the apostle's personal teaching. Some of the fathers, indeed, affirm that Peter visited the provinces specified in this epistle. Origen gives it as a probable conjecture; and Eusebius says that the countries in which Peter preached the doctrine  of Christ appear from his own writings, and may be seen from this epistle. The assertion has thus no basis, save in the idea that Peter must have preached in the churches to which he sent an epistle. Jerome repeats the statement, and Epiphanius, as his wont is, intensifies it; but it has no foundation. Nay, the apostle, by a change of person, distinguishes himself from "them that have preached the Gospel unto you" (1Pe 1:12). So that the "true grace" in which those churches stood was the Gospel which they had heard from others, and especially from Paul, by whom so many of them had been founded. The epistle, then, becomes a voucher for the genuineness of the Gospel preached in Asia Minor by the apostle of the uncircumcision. Not that, as Schwegler supposes, it attempts to mediate between James and Paul; for it proclaims the same truths, touching the peculiar aspects common to the two, without any dilution of Paul's distinctive forms, or any modification of Peter's as given in his oral addresses — both being in inner harmony, and differing only in mode of presentation, caused by mental diversity, or suggested by the peculiar circumstances, tendencies, or dangers of the churches which were warned or addressed.

V. Style. — The epistle is characterized by its fervor. The soul of the writer stamped its image on his thoughts and words — ὁ πανταχοῦ θερμός is the eulogy of Chrysostom. The epistle bears his living impress in his profound emotions, earnest convictions, and zealous thoroughness. He was never languid or half-hearted in what he said or did, though the old impulsiveness is chastened; and the fire which often flashed up so suddenly is more equable and tranquil in its glow. He is vivid without vehemence, and hurries on without impetuosity or abruptness. The epistle is throughout hortative, doctrine and quotation being introduced as forming the basis or warrant, or as showing the necessity and value of practical counsel or warning. There is in it little that is local or temporary; it is suited to the Church of all lands and ages; for believers are always in the present time "strangers and sojourners," with their gaze fixed on the future, exposed to trial and borne through by hope. The apostle infuses himself into the epistle, portrays the emotions which swayed and cheered him, as he reveals his own experience, which had been shaped by his past and present fellowship with a suffering and glorified Lord. What he unfolds or describes never stands apart as a theme by itself to be wrought out and argued; nor is it lifted as if to a lofty eminence that it may be admired from afar; but all is kept within familiar grasp, and inwrought into the relations,  duties, and dangers of everyday Christian existence. The truths brought forward are treated not in themselves, but in their immediate bearing on duty, trial, and hope; are handled quite in the way which one would describe air and food in their essential connection with life.

The language, though not rugged, is not without embarrassment. Ideas are often linked together by a relative pronoun. There is no formal development of thought, though the order is lucid and logical. Some word employed in the previous sentence so dwells in the writer's mind that it suggests the sentiment of the following one. The logical formulas are wanting- ουν not preceding an inference, but introducing a practical imperative, and ὅτι and γάρ not rendering a reason, but prefacing a motive conveyed in some fact or quotation from Scripture. Thoughts are reintroduced, and in terms not dissimilar. What the apostle has to say, he must say in words that come the soonest to an unpracticed pen. In short, we may well suppose that he wrote under the pressure of the injunction long ago given to him — "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren;" and this divine mandate might be prefixed to the epistle as its motto.

V. Commentaries. — The following are special exegetical helps on both epistles: Didymus Alexandrinus, In Ep. Petri (in Bibl. Max Patr. 5; and Galland. Bibl. Patr. 6); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. 5); Luther, A uslegung (1st Ep., Vitemb. 1523, 4to — with 2d En. ibid. 1524. 4to and 8vo, and later; also in Lat. and Germ. eds. of his works; in English, Lond. 1581, 4to); Bibliander, Commentarii (Basil. 1536, 8vo); Laurence, Scholia (Amst. 1540; Genev. 1669, 4to); Foleng, Commentaria [includ. James and 1 John] (Lugd. 1555, 8vo); Weller, Enarratio (Leips. 1557, 8vo); Sehlecker, Commentaria (Jen. 1567, 8vo); Feuardent, Commentarius (Par. 1600, 8vo) Winckelmain, Commentarius (Giess. 1608, 8vo); Turnemann, Meditationes (Frankf. 1625, 4to); Ames, Explicatio (Amst. 1635, 1643, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1641, 8vo); Byfield, Sermons [on 1-3] (Lond. 1637, fol.); Gerhard, Commentarius (ed. fil. Jen. 1641, 4to, and later); Nisbet, Exposition (Edinb. 1658, 8vo); Goltz, Verklaringe (Amst. 1689, 1690, 1721, 2 vols. 4to); Antonio, Verklaringe (Amst. 1693-7, 2 volumes, 4to; also in Germ., Brem. 1700, fol.); Anon, Untersuchung (Amsterd. 1702, 8vo); Lange, Exegesis (Halle, 1712, 4to, and later); Streso, Meditationes (Amst. 1717, 4to); Boyson, Erklar. (Halle, 1775, 8vo); Schirmer, Erklar. (Bresl. and Leips. 1778, 4to); Semler, Paraphrasis [includ. Jude] (Hal. 1783-4, 2 volumes, 8vo); Baumgirtel, Anmerk. (Leips. 1788, 8vo); Morus,  Praelectiones [includ. James], ed. Douat (Leips. 1794, 8vo); Hottinger, Commentaria [includ. 1 Pet.] (Leips. 1815, 8vo); Eisenschmid, Erldut. (Ronneb. 1824, 8vo); Mayerhoff, Einleitung (Hamb. 1835, 8vo); Windischmann (Rom. Cath.), Vindiciae (Ratisb. 1836, 8vo); Schlichthorst, Entwickelung (Stuttg. 1836 sq., 2 parts, 8vo); Demarest, Exposition (N.Y. 1851-65, 2 volumes, 8vo); Wiesinger, Erkldr. [includ. Jude] (Konigsb. 1856-62, 2 volumes, 8vo); Besser, Ausleg. (2d ed. Halle, 1857, 12mo); Schott, Erklar. [includ. Jude] (Erlang. 1861-3, 2 volumes, 8vo); Lillie, Lectures (Lond. and New York, 1869, 8vo). There are also articles on the authorship of the two epistles by Ranch, in Winer's Krif. Journ. 1828, page 385 sq.; by Seyler, in the Theol. Stud. u. Krif. 1832, page 44 sq.; by Bleek, ibid. 1836, page 1021 sq.; by J.Q.,in Kitto's Journ. of Sac. Lit., January and July 1861; by Baur, in the Theol. Jahrb. 1856, page 193 sq.; by Weiss, ibid. 1865, page 619; and 1865, page 255. SEE EPISTLE

The following are on the first epistle exclusively. Hessels, Commentarius (Lovan. 1568, 8vo); Schotan, Commentarius (Franek. 1644, 4to); Rogers, Exposition: (Lond. 1650. fol.); Leighton, Commentary (Lond. 1693, 2 vols. 8vo, and later); Van Alphen, Terklar. (Utr. 1734, 4to); Klemm, Anacrisis (Tub. 1748, 4to); Walther, Erklar. (Hanov. 1750, 4to); Moldenhauer, Erklar. Hamb. n. d. 8vo); Hensler, Commentar (Sulzb. 1813, 8vo); Steiger, Ausleg. (Berlin, 1832, 8vo; in English, Edinb. 1836, 2 volumes, 8vo); Lecoultre, Prem. Ep. de P. (Genev. 1839, 8vo); Brown, Discourses (2d ed. Edinb. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo, ibid. 1866, 3 volumes, 8vo, N.Y. 1850, 8vo); Kohlbrugge, Predigten [on chapter 2 and 3] (Leips. 1850, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1854, 8vo). SEE COMMENTARY.

## Peter, Mauritius[[@Headword:Peter, Mauritius]]

             SEE PETER THE VENERABLE.

## Peter, Second Epistle Of[[@Headword:Peter, Second Epistle Of]]

             follows immediately the other, but it presents questions of far greater difficulty than the former. SEE ANTILEGOMENA.

I. Canonical Authority. — The genuineness of this second epistle has long been disputed, though its author calls himself "Simon Peter," δοῦλος καὶ ἀπόστολος, "a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ."

1. History of Opinion. — It is hard to say whether the alleged quotations from it by the fathers are really quotations, or are only, on the one hand, allusions to the O.T., or, on the other, the employment of such phrases as had grown into familiar Christian commonplaces. Thus Clement of Rome, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (chapter 7), says of Noah, ἐκήρυξε  μετάνοιαν, and of those who obeyed him, ἐσώθησαν, language not unlike 2Pe 2:5; but the words can scarcely be called a quotation. The allusion in the same epistle to Lot (chapter 11) is of a similar nature, and cannot warrant the allegation of any proof from it. A third instance is usually taken from chapter 23, in which Clement says, "Miserable are the double-minded," a seeming reminiscence of Jam 1:5; but he adds, "We are grown old, and none of those things have happened to us" (γεγηράκαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμῖν τούτων συμβεβηκεν), as if in alluision to 2Pe 3:4. The appeal to Hermas is as doubtful; in lib. 1, Vis. 3:7, the words reliquerunt viam veram have a slight resemblance to 2Pe 2:15; in another place (2Pe 1:4) the clause qui effugistis sceculum hoc is not a citation of ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κοσμοῦ, 2Pe 2:20. Justin Martyr says, "A day with the Lord is as a thousand years" (Dialog. cumn Tryph. cap. 81; Opera, 2:278, ed. Otto, Jene, 1843), but the clause may as well be taken from Psa 90:4 as from 2Pe 3:8. Similar statements occur twice in Irenaeus, and have probably a similar origin, as citations from the O.T. The epistle is not quoted by Tertullian, the Alexandrian Clement, nor Cyprian, who speaks only of one epistle. A passage in Hippolytus (De Antichristo, 2), in asserting of the prophets that they did not speak "by their own power" (ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως), but uttered things which God had revealed, appears to be a paraphrase of 2Pe 1:21.

Another statement made by Theophilus (Ad Autolycum, lib. 2, page 87), in which he describes the prophets as πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου, is not unlike 2Pe 1:20, ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι. Theophilus again describes the word shining as a lamp in a house — φαίνων éσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰκήματι; but the figure is different from that in 2Pe 1:19, ὡς λύχνῳ φαίνοντι ἐν αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ — "as a light shining in a dark place." Clement of Alexandria commented, we are told by Eusebius and Cassiodorus, on all the canonical Scriptures, Eusebius specifying among them "Jude and the other Catholic epistles" — καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς (Hist. Eccles. 6:14). But a second statement of Cassiodorus mentions expressly the first epistle of Peter, as if the second had been excluded, and adds, "1 and 2 John and James," thereby also excluding Jude, which Eusebius, however, had distinctly named (De Institut. cap. 8). The testimony of Origen is no less liable to doubt, for it seems to vary. In the translation of Rufinnus, who certainly was not a literal versionist, we find the epistle at least three times referred to, one of them being the assertion, " Petrus enim duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis" (Hom. 4, on Joshua). In Hom. 4 on  Leviticus, 2Pe 1:4 is quoted, and in Hom. xiii on Numbers, 2Pe 2:16 is quoted. Somewhat in opposition to this, Origen, in his extant works in Greek, speaks of the first epistle as ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπ.; nay, as quoted by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 6:25), he adds that "Peter left one acknowledged epistle," adding ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ. This is not a formal denial of its genuineness, but is tantamount to it. Nor can the words of Firmilian be trusted in their Latin version. Yet in his letter to Cyprian he seems to allude to 2 Peter, and the warnings in it against heretics (Cypriani Opera, page 126, ed. Paris, 1836). In a Latin translation of a commentary of Didymus on the epistle it is called falsata, non in canone. Now falsare, according to Du Fresne in his Glossar. med. et infim. Latinitat., does not mean to interpolate, but to pronounce spurious. Eusebius has placed this epistle among the ἀντιλεγόμενα (Hist. Eccles. 3:25), and more fully he declares, "That called his second epistle we have been told has not been received, οὐκ ἐνδιάθετον; but yet appearing to many to be useful it has been diligently studied with the other Scriptures." Jerome says explicitly, "Scripsit duas epistolas . . . quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur;" adding as the reason, "propter styli cum priore dissonantiam," and ascribing this difference to a change of amanuensis, diversis interpretibus (De Script. Eccles. cap. 1, epist. 120, ad Hedib. cap. 11).

Methodius of Tyre makes two distinct allusions to a peculiar portion of the epistle (2Pe 3:6-7; 2Pe 3:12-13), the conflagration and purification of the world (Epiphan. Haeres. 64:31, tom. 1, pars post. page 298, ed. Oehler, 1860). Westcott (On the Canon, page 57) points out a reference in the martyrdom of Ignatius, in which (cap. ii) the father is compared to "a divine lamp illuminating the hearts of the faithful by his exposition of the Holy Scriptures" (2Pe 1:19). The epistle is not found in the Peshito, though the Philoxenian versioa has it, and Ephrem Syrus accepted it. The canon of Muratori has it not, and Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it. But it was received by Athanasius, Philastrius, Cyril, Rufinus, and Augustine. Gregory of Nazianzum, in his Carmen 33, refers to the seven catholic epistles. It was adopted by the Council of Laodicea, 367, and by the Council of Carthage, 397. From that period till the Reformation it was acknowledged by the Church. Not to refer to other quotations often given, it may suffice to say that, though the epistle was doubted, it usually had a place in the canon; that the objections against it were not historical, but critical in nature. and had their origin apparently among the Alexandrian scholars; and that in one case at least, that of Cosmas Indicopleustes, doctrinal prepossessions led to its rejection,  Gregory, at the end of the 6th century, seems to allude to others whose hostility to it had a similar origin, adding, "Si ejusdem epistolse verba pensare voluissent, longe aliter sentire potuerant." (See Olshausen, Opuscula, where the citations are given at length.) The old doubts about the epistle were revived at the time of the Reformation, and not a few modern critics question or deny its genuineness. In earlier times strong disbelief was expressed by Calvin, Erasmus, Grotius, and Salmasius. Scaliger, Semler, Credner, De Wette, Neander, and Mayerhoff deny its Petrine origin. Pott, Windischmann, Dalll, Qaussen, and Bonnet, on the other hand, make light of many objections to it. But the proofs adduced on its behalf by Dietlein (Die 2. Ep. Petri, 1851) are many of them unsatisfactory, the result of a dextrous and unscrupulous ingenuity on behalf of a foregone conclusion. Yet amid early doubts and modern objections we are inclined to accept this epistle, and to agree with the verdict of the early churches, which were not without the means of ample investigation, and to whom satisfactory credentials must have been presented.

The objections, as Jerome remarks, were based on difference of style, and we admit that there is ground for suspicion on the point. Still no doubter or impugner who placed the epistle among the ἀντιλεγόμενα gives any historical ground for his hostility. No one of old is ever brought forward as having denied it in his own name, or in the name of any early Church, to be Peter's. If the apostolic fathers do not quote it, it can only be inferred either that it was not in universal circulation, or that they had no occasion to make any use of it. We observe that it was not likely to be quoted frequently; it was addressed to a portion of the Church not at that time much in intercourse with the rest of Christendom: the documents of the primitive Church are far too scanty to give weight to the argument (generally a questionable one) from omission. Their silence would not warrant the assertion that the epistle was not in the canon during their period, and for half a century afterwards. The earliest impugners never speak of it as a book recently admitted into the canon, or admitted on insufficient evidence or authority. One objection of this nature would have been palpable and decisive. The silence of the fathers is accounted for more easily than its admission into the canon after the question as to its genuineness had been raised. It is not conceivable that it should have been received without positive attestation from the churches to which it was first addressed. We know that the autographs of apostolic writings were  preserved with care. It may be added that there appears to be no probable motive for a forgery. Neither personal ambition nor ecclesiastical pretensions are in any way forwarded by the epistle. There is nothing in it that an apostle might not have written, nothing that comes into direct conflict with Peter's modes of thought, either as recorded in the Acts or as found in the first epistle. No little circumstantial evidence can be adduced in its favor, and its early appearance in the callon is an element of proof which can it easily be turned aside.

The doubts as to its genuineness appear to have originated with the critics of Alexandria, where, nevertheless, the epistle itself was formally recognised at a very early period. Those doubts, however, were not quite so strong as they are now generally represented. The three greatest names of that school may be quoted on either side. On the one hand there were evidently external credentials, without which it could never have obtained circulation; on the other, strong subjective impressions, to which these critics attached scarcely less weight than some modern inquirers. They rested entirely, so far as can be ascertained, on the difference of style. The opinions of modern commentators may be summed up under three heads. Many, as we have seen, reject the epistle altogether as spurious, supposing it to have been directed against forms of Gnosticism prevalent in the early part of the 2d century. A few consider that the first and last chapters were written by Peter or under his dictation, but that the second chapter was interpolated. So far, however, is either of these views from representing the general results of the latest investigations, that a majority of names, including nearly all the writers of Germany opposed to Rationalism, who in point of learning and ability are at least upon a par with their opponents, may be quoted in support of the genuineness and authenticity of this epistle. The statement that all critics of eminence and impartiality concur in rejecting it is simply untrue, unless it be admitted that a belief in the reality of objective revelation is incompatible with critical impartiality, that belief being the only common point between the numerous defenders of the canonicity of this document. If it were a question now to be decided for the first time upon the external or internal evidences still accessible, it may be admitted that it would be far more difficult to maintain this than any other document in the New Testament; but the judgment of the early Church is not to be reversed without far stronger arguments than have been adduced, more especially as the epistle is entirely free from objections which might be brought, with more show of reason, against others now all but  universally received: it inculcates no new doctrine, bears on no controversies of post-apostolical origin, supports no hierarchical innovations, but is simple, earnest. devout, and eminently practical, full of the characteristic graces of the apostle, who, as we believe, bequeathed this last proof of faith and hope to the Church. Olshausen's deliberate conclusion is —

"1. That our epistle, as far as we can ascertain from history, was used by the Church, and was generally read, along with the other catholic epistles;

2. There were those who denied that Peter was the author of this epistle, but they were influenced particularly by critical and, perhaps, by doctrinal reasons;

3. That there were historical considerations which led them to assail our epistle is not probable; certainly it cannot be demonstrated. History, then, avails scarcely anything in overthrowing the authority of our epistle" (Integr. and Authent. of Second Epistle of Peter, transl. in Amer. Bibl. Repos. July 1836, pages 123-131).

2. Internal Evidence. — There are points of similarity in style between it and the first epistle. The salutation in both epistles is the same, and there are peculiar words common to both, though found also in other parts of the N.T. Both epistles refer to ancient prophecy (1Pe 1:16; 2Pe 1:20-21); both use ἀρετή as applicable to God (1Pe 2:9; 2Pe 1:3), and both have ἀπόθεσις (1Pe 3:21; 2Pe 1:14), which occurs nowhere else in the N.T.; ἀναστροφή is a favorite term (1Pe 1:15; 1Pe 1:17-18; 1Pe 2:12; 1Pe 3:1-2; 1Pe 3:16; 2Pe 2:7-18; 2Pe 3:11); the verb ἐποπτεύειν in 1Pe 2:12; 1Pe 3:20, corresponds to the noun ἐπόπτης (2Pe 1:16) ; the peculiar collocation ἄσπιλος καὶ ἄμωμος (1Pe 1:19) has an echo of itself (2Pe 2:13; 2Pe 3:14); πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας (1Pe 4:1) is not unlike ἀκαταπαύστους ἁμαρτίας, etc. (2Pe 2:14). We have also, as in the first epistle, the intervention of several words between the article and its substantive (2Pe 1:4; 2Pe 2:7; 2Pe 3:2). The frequent use of ἐν in a qualifying clause is common to both epis. ties (2Pe 1:4; 2Pe 2:3; 2Pe 3:10). The recurrence of similar terms marks the second epistle, but it is not without all parallel in the first. Thus 2Pe 1:3-4, δεδωρημένης, δεδώρηται; 2Pe 2:7-8, δίκαιος, three times; 2Pe 2:12, φθοράν ἐν τῇ φθορᾶ'/  καταφθαρήσονται. So, too, in 1Pe 3:1-2, ἀναστροφῆς, ἀναστροφή; and 2Pe 2:17, τιμήσατε, τιμᾶτε, etc. Then too, as in the first epistle, there are resemblances to the speeches of Peter as given in the Acts. Comp. ἡμέρα κυρίου (2Pe 3:10) with Act 2:20 — the phrase occurring elsewhere only in 1Th 5:24; λαχοῦσιν (2Pe 1:1) with ἔλαχε (Act 1:17); εὐσεβείαν (2Pe 1:6) with Act 3:12; and εὐσεβεῖς (2:9) with Act 10:2-7 : κολαζομένους (ib.) with Act 4:21 -an account which Peter probably furnished. We have likewise an apparent characteristic in the double genitives (2Pe 3:2; Act 5:32).

It is also to be borne in mind that the epistle asserts itself to have been written by the apostle Peter, and distinctly identifies its writer with the author of the first epistle — "This epistle now, a second, I write unto you, in both which I stir up" — averring also to some extent identity of purpose. It is not anonymous, like the epistle to the Hebrews, but definitely claims as its author Peter the apostle. Nay, the writer affirms that he was an eye- witness of the transfiguration, and heard "the voice from the excellent glory." He uses, moreover, two terms in speaking of that event which belong to the account of it in the Gospels; comp. 2Pe 1:13, σκηνώματι, with his own words σκηνὰς τρεῖς; also in 15, ἔξοδον, in reference to his own death-the same word being employed to denote Christ's death, τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, this being the theme of conversation on the part of Moses and Elias (Luk 9:31). Ullmann supposes the reference in the words δίκαιον δὲ ἡγοῦμαι διεγειρειν (1:13) to be to Mark's Gospel said to have been composed on Peter's authority; but the allusion seems to be to the paragraph immediately under his hand.

It would have been a profane and daring imposture for any one to personate an apostle, and deliver to the churches a letter in his name, with so marked a reference to one of the most memorable circumstances and glories in the apostle's life. A forgery so glaring could make no pretence to inspiration to be a product of the Spirit of Truth. The inspiration of the epistle is thus bound up with the question of its authorship, so that if it is not the work of Peter it must be rejected altogether from the canon. The opinion of critics of what is called the liberal school, including all shades from Liucke to Baur, has been decidedly unfavorable, and that opinion has been — adopted by some able writers in England. There are, however, very strong reasons why this verdict should be reconsidered. No one ground on which it rests is unassailable. The rejection of this book affects the authority of  the whole canon, which, in the opinion of one of the keenest and least scrupulous critics (Reuss) of modern Germany, is free from any other error. It is not a question as to the possible authorship of a work like that of the Hebrews, which does not bear the writer's name. The Church, which for more than fourteen centuries has received it, has either been imposed upon by what must in that case be regarded as a satanic device, or derived from it spiritual instruction of the highest importance. If received, it bears attestation to some of the most important facts in our Lord's history, casts light upon the feelings of the apostolic body in relation to the elder Church and to each other, and, while it confirms many doctrines generally inculcated, is the chief, if not the only, voucher for eschatological views touching the destruction of the framework of creation, which from an early period have been prevalent in the Church.

3. Objections. — There are serious difficulties, however, in the way of its reception; and these are usually said to be difference of style, difference of doctrine, and the marked correspondence of portions of the epistle with that of Jude. Yet Gaussen makes the astounding statement — "The two epistles when carefully compared reveal more points of agreement than difference," but he has not taken the trouble of noting them (On the Canon, page 359). The employment of ὡς is different in the second epistle from the first. There, though it occurs otherwise, it is generally employed in comparisons, and its frequency makes it a characteristic of the style; but it occurs much more rarely in the second epistle, and usually, though not always, with a different meaning and purpose. The use of ἀλλά after a negative clause and introducing a positive one is common in the first epistle, and but rare in the second. There are many ἃπαξ λεγόμενα in the second epistle. The first and second epistles differ also in the use of Χριστός. In the first epistle X. stands in the majority of instances without the article and by itself, either simply I. X. or X. I.; but in the second epistle it has usually some predicate attached to it (2Pe 1:1-2; 2Pe 1:8; 2Pe 2:14-16). The name θεός occurs nearly forty times in the first epistle, but only seven times in the second. Again, κύριος is applied to Christ only once in the first epistle (1Pe 1:3), but in the second epistle it is a common adjunct to other names of the Savior. In the first epistle it means the Father in all cases but one (1Pe 2:3), but in the second epistle it denotes the Son, in harmony with Peter's own declaration (Act 2:36; Act 10:36). The epithet σωτήρ, so often applied to Christ in the second epistle, is not found in the first. The second coming of our Lord is also expressed differently in  the two epistles. ἀποκάλυψις, or its verb, being used in the first epistle (1Pe 1:5; 1Pe 1:7; 1Pe 1:13; 1Pe 4:13; 1Pe 5:1); or it is called τὸ τέλος πάντων (1Pe 5:7); or χρόνοι ἔσχατοι (1Pe 1:20).

But in the second epistle it is called ἡμέρα κρίσεως (2Pe 2:9), παρουσία (2Pe 3:4), ἡμέρα κυρίου (2Pe 3:10), ἡμέρα θεοῦ (2Pe 3:12). These are certainly marked diversities, and it is difficult to offer a satisfactory explanation of them. It may, however, be replied that with the sacred writers the divine names are not used, as with us, without any prominent or distinctive application. In the first epistle the Redeemer's names are his common ones, the familiar ones in the mouths of all believers — for the writer brings into prominence the oneness of believers with him in suffering and glory; with him still as Jesus wearing his human name and his human nature with all its sympathies; or as the Christ who, as the Father's servant, obeyed, suffered, and was crowned, the Spirit that anointed him still being "the unction from the Holy One" to all his people. In the second epistle the writer has in view persons who are heretics, rebellious, dissolute, false teachers; and in warning them his mind naturally looks to the authority and lordship of the Savior, which it was so awful to contemn and so vain to oppose. If the last day be set in different colors in the two epistles, the difference may be accounted for on the same principle: for to those suffering under trial it shines afar as the hope that sustains them, but to those who are perverse it presents itself as the time of reckoning which should alarm them into believing submission.

The aspects under which the Gospel is represented in this second epistle differ from those in the first. The writer lays stress on ἐπίγνωσις, or γνῶσις (2Pe 1:2-3; 2Pe 1:5; 2Pe 1:8; 2Pe 2:20; 2Pe 2:11; 2Pe 3:18). In this epistle the Gospel is generally Χριστοῦ δύναμις καὶ παρουσία (2Pe 1:16), ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης (2Pe 2:21), ἁγία ἐντολή, etc.; whereas the first epistle throws into prominence ἐλπίς, σωτηρία, ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος I. X., χάρις (2Pe 1:10) ἀλήθεια (2 Peter 1:22), λόγος (2Pe 2:8), πιστις, etc. The reason may be ventured that the persons addressed in the second epistle were in danger of being tempted into error; and that a definite and progressive knowledge of Christianity was the safeguard against those loose speculations which were floating around them. On this account, too, we have admonition suggested and pointed by their perilous circumstances, "to make their calling and election sure" (2Pe 1:10; 2Pe 3:14); nay, the purpose of the epistle seems to be given in 2Pe 3:17 : "Ye therefore, beloved, knowing beforehand, take heed lest, being led  away with the error of the lawless, ye fall away from your own steadfastness; but grow in grace, and in the knowledge of oul Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The ἐπίγνωσις is the grand theme of counsel and the real prophylactic presented, for it embodies itself in that δικαιοσύνη on the possession of which so much depends, as is seen in the allusions to Noah and Lot, and to the want of which are traced in contrast the judgment of the flood and the fate of Sodom, the selfish character of Balaam, and the dark and deceitful ways and works of the false teachers.

There is also a characteristic difference in the mode of quotation from the O.T. Quotations are abundant in the first epistle, either formally introduced by διότι γέγραπται (1Pe 1:16), or by διότι περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ (1Pe 1:6), or are woven into the discourse without any prefatory statement, as if writer and readers were equally familiar with them (1Pe 1:24; 1Pe 2:3-5; 1Pe 2:7; 1Pe 2:9-10; 1Pe 2:22; 1Pe 2:24-25; 1Pe 3:9-11; 1Pe 3:15). But in the second epistle quotations are unfrequent, though we have Psa 90:4 in 1Pe 3:8, and Isa 65:17 in 1Pe 3:13. Of a different kind are the allusions to Noah and the flood, to Lot and Sodom, and to Balaam. But we may still explain that the modes of handling and applying the O.T. may differ according to the purpose which any writer has in view. In a longer and fuller epistle there may be quotations at length, but in a shorter one only apposite allusions to facts and incidents. The objection would have been stronger if in an epistle ascribing itself to Peter there had been no use made of the O.T. at all; but a third of this epistle consists of references to the O.T. or to warnings drawn from it.

The peculiar similarity of a large portion of this epistle to that of Jude has often been commented on. The second chapter and a portion of the third are so like Jude that the resemblance cannot be accidental, for it is found in words as well as in thoughts. It has been conjectured by some that both borrowed from a common source. Bishop Sherlock supposed that this source was some ancient Hebrew author who had portrayed the false teachers, Jude having used the epistle of Peter as well as this old authority (Use and Intent of Prophecy, Dissert. 1:200, Lond. 1725). Herder and Hasse, holding this theory, conjecture the document common to both writers to be the Zendavesta. This opinion has no foundation, and relieves us of no difficulty. Others imagine that Jude followed Peter, and several reasons have been alleged in favor of this opinion by Mill, Michaelis, Storr, Dahl, Wordsworth, Thiersch, Hleydenreich, Hengstenberg, and Gaussen. Their general argument is that Peter predicts what Jude describes as  actually existing (Jud 1:18), and that Jude refers to prophecies which are found only in Peter. But it is really doubtful if both epistles refer to the same class of errorists. Those described by Peter are rather speculators, though their immoral practices are also noted, while those branded by Jude are specially marked as libertines and sensualists, whose life has perverted and undermined their creed. Others again hold that Peter took from Jude; such is the view of Hug, Eichhorn, Credner, Neander, Mayerhoff, De Wette, Guericke, and Bleek. One argument of no small force is that the style of Jude is the simpler and briefer, and Peter's the more ornate and amplified; that Jude's is more pointed and Peter's more indefinite; and that some allusions in Peter are so vague that they can be understood only by a comparison with Jude (comp. 2Pe 2:4 with Jud 1:6; 2Pe 2:11 with Jud 1:9). Thus Peter says, generally, "Angels bring not railing accusations;"

Jude gives the special instance, Michael and Satan. Peter speaks of the "angels that sinned;" Jude says more precisely, they "kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation." Olshausen and Augusti in part think that the similarity may be accounted for by a previous correspondence between the writers; that Jude may have described to Peter the character and practices of the false teachers, and that Peter, relying on the truthfulness of the statement, made his own use of it without hesitation when he had occasion to refer to the same or a similar class of pernicious subverters of truth and purity. This hypothesis is scarcely probable, and it is more likely that Peter had read the epistle of Jude, and reproduced in his own epistle and in his own way its distinctive clauses, which must have deeply impressed him, but with such differences at the same time as show that he was no mere copyist. Is it unworthy of an apostle to use another writing divinely authorized, and can Peter's appropriation of so much of Jude's language be stigmatized, as by Reuss, as "a palpable plagiarism?" Thus Jude uses the phrase “clouds without water," but Peter "wells without water," this figure being more suited to his immediate purpose. The σπιλάδες of Jud 1:12 was from reminiscence of sound before Peter's mind, but it is changed of purpose into σπῖλοι; and Jude's phrase ἐν ταῖς αγάπαις ὑμῶν becomes in the same connection in Peter ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν. 2Pe 2:17 shows a like similarity and difference compared with Jud 1:13. The claim of originality thus lies on the side of Jude, while original thinking characterizes Peter's use of Jude's terser and minuter diction. There is no ground for Bertholdt's suggestion to reject the second chapter as spurious; or for Ullmann's, to refer both second and third chapters to a post-apostolic period; or for Lange to brand as spurious  the whole of the second chapter with the last two verses of the first chapter, and the first ten verses of the third-that is, from the first τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες to the other; or for Bunsen to receive only the first twelve verses and the concluding doxology (Bertholdt, Einleit. in d. N.T. volume 6; Ullmann, Der zweite Brief Petri; Lange, Apostol. Zeitalter, 1:152; and in Herzog's Eincyklop. s.v.; Bunsen, Ignatius von Antiochien. page 175).

Other more specific objections against the epistle may be briefly alluded to. According to Mayerhoff (Einleit. page 187), the writer in 2Pe 3:2 separates himself from the apostles; Bleek (Einleit. page 576) and others supposing that he intended to characterize himself as an apostle, and having before him the somewhat parallel expression of Jude, he so far altered it, but in the alteration has failed to give lucid utterance to his purpose. The phrase, with the double genitive καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου, naturally means, "and the commandment of the Lord given by your apostles." The pronoun ὑμῶν is the best-sustained reading, and the English version does violence to the position of the words. As Olshausen and Windischmann have shown, the use of ὑμῶν does not exclude Peter, even though it be rendered "the commandments of your apostles of the Lord Jesus." In fact, it neither denies nor affirms his apostleship; though if ἡμῶν had been employed, and the phrase rendered "our apostles," the conclusion against its genuineness would certainly have some weight. But this objection that the writer excludes himself from the apostles neutralizes another, to wit, that the writer betrays too great anxiety to show himself as the apostle Peter. He could not certainly do both in the same document without stultifying himself. Does not the apostle Paul when it serves his object use pointedly the first person singular, refer to himself, and assert his apostolic office as Peter does in 2Pe 1:12-15? The use of the name Συμεών;Λ in 2Pe 1:1 can neither tell for the genuineness, as Dietlein supposes, nor against it, as Mayerhoff argues. The reference in 2Pe 3:1 to a former epistle is not for the purpose of identifying himself with the author of that epistle, but naturally comes in as a proof of his anxiety for his readers that they should bear in memory the lessons already imparted to them.

It is said that the first epistle was addressed to a particular circle of churches (1Pe 1:1), while the second was to Christians in general (2Pe 1:1), yet it assumed (2Pe 3:1) that the readers were in both cases the same, the confusion being increased by the fact that in  chapter 2Pe 1:16 the writer speaks as if he had been their personal instructor, whereas in 2Pe 3:15 he treats them as the disciples of Paul. But we may well suppose that the first epistle, directed to a large enough circle at first, must soon have taken its place as a general epistle. The inspired penmen knew well that, though there was a paiticular occasion for their writing and special counsels to be given, yet their teachings were to be for the guidance of the whole Church. Hence we sometimes find them directing that their letters should be read beyond the first community to which they came (Col 4:16; 1Th 5:27). Peter miight therefore properly write a second time to Christians without express limitation of country, and still regard his readers as those whom he had admonished before. It is not necessary to suppose that by his expression in 2Pe 1:16 he means personal instruction: the reference was to what he had said in his former letter. We must consider too the circumstances under which he wrote at all. There was a spurious kind of wisdom corrupting the Church (Col 2:8; Col 2:16-23). Jewish traditions had their influence; and sensual indulgence was sure to follow. Paul, who had carefully watched the churches he had planted, had been long a prisoner, and was thus withdrawn from active superintendence of them. Very fitting therefore it was that Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, should write as he did at first, to confirm the doctrine learned of Paul, and to inculcate the holy principles and unblemished conduct which could alone fortify believers against impending persecution. Yet he anticipates in the first letter a further declension, and a greater necessity for faithful resistance of error (1Pe 4:1-4). Now we know that the evil did increase; and Paul in the pastoral epistles speaks of serious depravation of doctrine, and more open lawlessness of conduct (1Ti 1:19-20; 1Ti 4:1; 2Ti 2:17-18; 2Ti 3:1-7). The second epistle of Peter was called for, then, to check the progress of false teaching and of unbecoming conduct: it takes up the matter at a point historically later than the first; but it handles the same topics, and so is a proper supplement to it. Thus, as Schott says (page 162), "That which presented itself in the first epistle we see also in the second; the same uncertainty respecting the gospel-standing of Gentile Christians, and the gospel-teaching of Paul (2Pe 1:1; 2Pe 1:10; 2Pe 1:12; 2Pe 3:2; 2Pe 3:15, etc.); the same questionings about the revelation of Christ, the resurrection of the body, and the final judgment (2Pe 1:4, etc., 11, 12, etc., 16, etc.; 2Pe 2:9; 2Pe 3:2; 2Pe 3:8, etc., 10, etc., 18); the same tendency to relax in the work of Christian sanctification (2Pe 1:5-12, etc.; 2Pe 3:11, etc., 14, 17)." Other noteworthy traces he believes he  can detect of a relationship between the two. Some of these are a debased state of religious knowledge grounded on Jewish writings alien from the true teaching of Scripture, and an affected spirituality which fostered sensual indulgence. Evidence that such evils existed at the time of writing may be found more clearly in the second, more faintly, but yet noticeably, in the first epistle.

Three arguments have been adduced to prove that the epistle must belong to post-apostolic times.

(1.) It is alleged that the doubts about Christ's second coming, referred to in 2Pe 3:3-4, could not have arisen in apostolic times, when the belief in it was so firm and glowing; and a period of some length must have elapsed ere it could be said that the "fathers had fallen asleep." But the scoffers referred to were probably Gnostics who never believed that event, or at all events spiritualized the truth of it away; and after one generation had passed they might use the language imputed to them; or "the fathers" may, denote the Jewish patriarchs, since whose decease uniformity had characterized all the processes and laws of nature. The Gnostic spiritualism which treated the resurrection as past early troubled the Church, and its disciples might cast ridicule on the faith and hopes of others in the challenge which Peter quotes.

(2.) It is said that the allusion to Paul's epistles indicates a late date, as it supposes them to be collected in part at least, and calls them by the sacred name of ypacoal (2Pe 3:15-16). But surely it may be granted that towards the close of Peter's life several epistles of Paul may have been brought together and placed in point of authority on the same level as the O.T.; and that other documents also — τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς — already occupied a similar place. Whatever exegesis be adopted, this is the general result. The writings of Paul, so well known to the readers of this epistle, are mentioned not as a completed whole; the phrase ἐν πάσαις, etc., is not to be taken absolutely, but relatively, as if denoting "in all his epistles which he writes." The "things" referred to as discussed in these epistles (περὶ τούτων) are not their general contents, but the coming of our Lord and the end of the world, and in these discussions "are some things hard to be understood." The allusion certainly presupposes a late age, and the writer, as he informs us, was very near his death. The date of Peter's death is not precisely known, and the common traditions concerning it may therefore be modified. As Alford says, a later date than the usual one may  be assigned to it. 3. Again, it is held, as by Neander, that the epithet "holy mount," as applied to the hill of transfiguration, indicates a late period, for Zion only was so designated; and Mayerhoff affirms that the epithet suits Mount Zion alone. But the scene on which the glory of Jesus had been so displayed might many years afterwards be well called "holy" by one who was an eyewitness, when he referred to it as a proof and symbol of "the power and coming of the Lord Jesus."

Still, while a partial reply may be given to objections based on difference of style and of doctrinal representation, it must in honesty be added that these differences are not all of them wholly accounted for. The style and matter, as a whole, are so unlike the first epistle, that one has considerable difficulty in ascribing both epistles to the same author. While there is similarity in some words or phrases, the spirit, tone, and manner of the whole epistle are widely diverse. Minute criticism may discover ἃπαξ λεγόμενα, and arrange them in proof parallel to similar usage in the first epistle; but such minutiae do not hide the general dissimilitude. It may be argued, and the argument is not without weight, that a forger would have imitated the salient peculiarities of the first epistle. No one of ordinary critical discernment would have failed to attempt the reproduction of its characteristic features of style and thought. But the absence of such studied likeness is surely in favor of the genuineness. It may be added also that, as there are in the first epistle statements so peculiar to it as to be found nowhere else, the same specialty in what seems to be undesigned coincidence marks the second epistle in the declarations of its third chapter. It would have been difficult in the second century to impose on the churches a second epistle forged in Peter's name, and so unlike in many points to his first. A direct imitation of his style might have deceived some of the churches by its obvious features of similitude, but the case is widely different when a writing so obviously unlike the first epistle won its way into circulation unchallenged in its origin and history, and was not doubted save at length by scholars and mainly on critical grounds. Why did not Origen and others tell us of the time of its first appearance, and how and by whom it was placed in the canon? Possibly on such points they were ignorant, or at least they knew nothing that warranted suspicion. Still the difference of manner between the two epistles remains, and perhaps one might account for it, as Jerome has hinted and Calvin has supposed, by the supposition that Peter dictated the epistle in Aramaic, and that the amanuensis was left to express the thoughts in his own forms and phrases.  Difference of condition and purpose may account for difference of topic, and the change of style may be ascribed to the Greek copyist and translator. If, moreover, we admit that some time intervened between the composition of the two works; that in writing the first the apostle was aided by Silvanus, and in the second by another, perhaps Mark; that the circumstances of the churches addressed by him were considerably changed, and that the second was written in greater haste, not to speak of a possible decay of faculties, the differences may be regarded as insufficient to justify more than hesitation in admitting its genuineness. The authenticity of the epistle has been maintained more or less decidedly by Michaelis, Nitzsche, Flatt, Augusti, Storr, Dahl, Hug, Heydenreich, Lardner, Windischmann, Guericke, Thiersch, Stier, Dietlein, Hofmann, Luthardt, Bruckner, and Olshausen. Feilmoser and Davidson incline to the same side. These are great names; yet, though we agree with their opinion, we cannot venture to say, with Bonnet, that "of all the books of the N.T. which have been controverted at certain times, there is not one whose authenticity is so certain as that of the second epistle of Peter" (Nouv. Test., Introd., 2:701, Geneve, 1852).

II. Time, Place, Design, and Persons addressed. — When and where the epistle was written cannot be definitely known. The place was Rome in all probability; for Peter, after coming to Rome, did not, so far as we know, leave that city till his death. His death is usually placed in 64, but it may have been later, and this epistle was written just before it. Mayerhoff ascribes it to a Jewish Christian of Alexandria about the middle of the second century. Huther places it in the last quarter of the first century or the beginning of the second.

The persons for whom the epistle is intended are "those who have obtained like precious faith with us;" and 2Pe 3:1 identifies them with those addressed in the first epistle. It is objected that this epistle asserts that Peter had taught them in person — such not being the case with those addressed in the first epistle. But the phrase adduced — ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν (2Pe 1:16), "we made known unto you" — seems to refer not to oral discourse, but to various portions of the first epistle in which the coming and glory of Christ are dwelt on. The object of the epistle is to warn against "false teachers," “bringing in damnable heresies," "denying the Lord that bought them," holding a peculiar daemonology — covetous, sensual, and imperious apostates, the victims and propagators of Antinomian delusion. Probably they taught some early form of Gnostic error, which,  denying the Lord's humanity and atoning death, ridiculed his second advent in man's nature, set aside the authority of law, and by this effrontery justified itself in licentious impurity. The false teachers were like the "false prophets," perhaps claiming divine basis for their teachings, and therefore the more able to shake the faith of others, and seduce them into perilous apostasy. Thus, in brief, as the writer himself describes it (2Pe 3:17), his object is, first, warning, or to caution his readers against seduction: "Beware lest ye also, being led away with the error of the wicked, fall from your own steadfastness'" προγιγνώσκοντες — "as ye know those things beforehand," that is, from his descriptive accounts; and, secondly, counsel, or to urge on them, — as the best of all antidotes to apostasy, to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." For this χάρις and γνῶσις would fortify them and make them invincible against those assaults which so often succeeded with the unwary who fell in their heedlessness, the graceless who trusted in their own strength, and the ignorant or half-informed, so liable from their partial knowledge to be imposed upon by any system that dealt in novel speculations, professed to unfold mysteries, or give license and warrant for lawless practices. The supposition of Grotius, that it was written in the reign of Trajan against the Carpocratians, and by Simeon, bishop of Jerusalem, is without any probability, as Bertholdt has more than sufficiently shown. The arguments of Schwegler for its place as Rome, its date the end of the second century, and its purpose as an effort to conciliate Petrine and Pauline theological differences, are answered conclusively by Huther.

III. The contents of the epistle seem quite in accordance with its asserted origin. The customary opening salutation is followed by an enumeration of Christian blessings and exhortation to Christian duties, with special reference to the maintenance of the truth which had already been communicated to the Church (2Pe 1:1-13). Referring then to his approaching death, the apostle assigns as grounds of assurance for believers his own personal testimony as an eye-witness of the transfiguration, and the sure word of prophecy, that is the testimony of the Holy Ghost (14-21). The danger of being misled by false prophets is dwelt upon with great earnestness throughout the second chapter; their covetousness and gross sensuality, combined with pretences to spiritualism, in short all the permanent and fundamental characteristics of Antinomianism, are described; while the overthrow of all opponents of Christian truth is predicted (2Pe 2:1-22) in connection with  prophecies touching the second advent of Christ, the destruction of the world by fire, and the promise of new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. After an exhortation to attend to Paul's teaching, in accordance with the less explicit admonition in the previous epistle, and an emphatic warning, the epistle closes with the customary ascription of glory to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

IV. Commentaries. — Exegetical helps on the whole of this epistle exclusively are the following: Simson, Commentary (Lond. 1632, 4to); Adams, Commentary (ibid. 1633, fol.); Smith, Commentaries (ibid. 1690, 4to); Deurhof, Erklaringe (Amst. 1713, 4to); Nitzsche, Vindicatio (Lips. 1785, 8vo); Flatt, Defensio (Tub. 1806, 8vo); Dahl, De αὐθεντίᾷ, etc. [includ. Jude] (Rost. 1807, 4to); Richter, De Origine, etc. [includ. Jude] (Vit. 1810, 8vo); Ullmann, Auslegung (Lips. 1322, 8vo); Olshausen, De Integ. et Authent. etc. (Regiom. 1822-3, 4to; in English in the Bibl. Repos. July and October 1863); Picot, Recherches, etc. (Genev. 1829, 8vo); Moutier, Authentie, etc. [includ. Jude] (Strasb. 1829, 8vo); Delille, Authentie, etc. (ibid. 1835, 8vo); Magnus, id. (ibid. 1835, 8vo); Heydenreich, Aechtheit, etc. (Herb. 1837, 8vo); Audemars, Lamentations 2 d Ep. de P. (Genev. 1838, 8vo); Daumas, Introduction critique (Strasb. 1845. 8vo); Brown, Discourses [on chapter 2 (Edinb. 1856, 8vo); Smith, Lectures (Lond. 1878, 8vo). SEE PETER, FIRST EPISTLE OF

.

## Peter-Low, Christian[[@Headword:Peter-Low, Christian]]

             a convert from Judaism, flourished in the first half of the 18th century for several years as professor of Oriental languages at the University of Upsala. He wrote, in the Swedish language, Speculum religionis Judaicae, which, in fifty-eight chapters, treats of the Jewish festivals, rites, circumcision, dogmas, resurrection, etc. — Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:80; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 4:966; Niedersachsische Nachrichten (Hamburg, 1731), page 666 sq.; and Leipziger Gelehrte Zeitung (Leips. 1731), page 884, where a full index to all the chapters is given. (B.P.)

## Peter-pence[[@Headword:Peter-pence]]

             is the annual tribute of one penny from every Roman Catholic family, paid at Rome at a festival of the apostle Peter. It is offered to the Roman pontiff in reverence of the memory of St. Peter, of whom that bishop is believed to be the successor. From an early period the Roman see had been richly endowed; and although its first endowments were chiefly local, yet as early as the days of Gregory the Great large estates were held by the Roman bishops in Campania, in Calabria, and even in the island of Sicily. The first idea, however, of an annual tribute appears to have come from England, and is by some ascribed to Ina (A.D. 721), king of the West Saxons, who went as a pilgrim to Rome, and there founded a hospice for AngloSaxon pilgrims, to be maintained by an annual contribution from England; by others, to Offa and Ethelwulf, at least in the sense of their having extended it to the whole of the Saxon territory. But this seems very uncertain; and although the usage was certainly long anterior to the Norman conquest, Dr. Lingard is disposed not to place it earlier than the time of Alfred. The tribute consisted in the payment of a silver penny by every family possessing land or cattle of the yearly value of thirty pence, and was collected in the five weeks between St. Peter's and St. Paul's Day and August 1. In the time of king John, the total annual payment was £199 8s., contributed by the several dioceses in proportion, an account of which will be found in Lingard's History of England, 2:330. The tax called Romescot, with some variation, continued to be paid till the reign of Henry VIII, when it was abolished. Pope Gregory VII sought to establish the Peter-pence for France: and other partial or transient tributes are recorded from Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Poland. This tribute, however, is quite different from the payments made annually to Rome by the kingdoms which were held to be feudatory to the Roman see — as Naples, Aragon, England  under the reign of John, and several other kingdoms, at least for a time." — Chambers. The pope having suffered a considerable diminution of his own revenue since the revolution of 1848, an effort has been made in several parts of Europe to revive this practice. In some countries it has been very successfully carried out, and the proceeds have been among the chief of the resources of Pius IX, as he has steadfastly refused to accept any support from the new kingdom of Italy, since his temporalities were merged in it. See Thompson, Papal Power (N.Y. 1877,1 2mo); Riddle, lrist. of the Papacy; Hefele, Conciliengesch. volume 5; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy in the 16th and 17th Centuries, 1:21, 37, 230; Inett, Ch. Hist. of England (see Index).

## Peterffi, Charley[[@Headword:Peterffi, Charley]]

             a Hungarian Jesuit, was born towards the close of the 17th century. He was descended from a noble family. Admitted among the Jesuits in 1715, he taught belles-lettres at Tyrnau and philosophy at Vienna. He died August 10, 1746. He made himself known by a valuable collection, Sacra concilia in regno Hungariae celebrata, ab a. 1016 usque ad a. 1715 (Vienna, 1742, fol.), in which a good method and the variety of research are to be admired. See Feller, Dict. Hist. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:691.

## Petermann, Julius Heinrich, D.D[[@Headword:Petermann, Julius Heinrich, D.D]]

             a famous German Orientalist, was born at Glanchau, August 12, 1801. In 1837 he was professor of Oriental literature at, Berlin, from 1852 to 1855 he travelled through Asia Minor and Persia, in 1867 and 1868 through Palestine and Syria. He died in June, 1876. Besides his contributions to different periodicals and cyclopaedias, he published, Grammatica Lingua Ameniacae (Berlin, 1837): — De Ostikasnis, Arabicis, Arsneniae Gubernatoribus (1840): — Beitrage zu eiser Geschichte der neuesten Reformen des Osmanischen Reichs (1842): — Pauli Epistola ad Philemonesm. etc. (1844): Porta Linrsarum Orientalium (1864-72, 5 volumes): — Reise in den Orient (2d ed. Leipsic, 1865, 2 volumes): — Liber Magnus Vulgo Liber Adamsi Appellatus (1867): — Pentateuchus Samaritanus (Berlin, 1872 sq., 3 volumes). (B.P.).

## Peters (St.) Day[[@Headword:Peters (St.) Day]]

             (June 29) is a festival observed in the Roman Catholic Church. Its origin has been traced back to the 3d century. In 348 Prudentius mentions that the pope celebrated the Holy Communion in both St. Peter's and St. Paul's churches at Rome on this festival, which in the 6th century was observed at Constantinople, and was kept, until the Reformation, associated with the name of St. Paul, whose conversion was not generally commemorated on Jan. 25 until the 12th century. Cathedra Sancti Petri is a commemoration virtually of SS. Peter and Paul, but its title is the Chair of St. Peter, wherein he first sat at Rome, January 18. On February 22 his chair at Antioch is commemorated.

## Peters, Absalom, D.D[[@Headword:Peters, Absalom, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Wentworth, N.H., September 19, 1793, and was educated at Dartmouth College, class of 1816, and for the ministry at Princetoll Seminary, class of 1819. He was the son of general Absalom Peters, a descendant of William, of Boston, brother of the noted Hugh Peters. In 1819 he was made a missionary in Northern New York, but in the following year became pastor of the First Church, Bennington, Vermont, where he remained until December 14, 1825. After this he was successively secretary of the Home Missionary Society until 1837, and editor of the Home Missionary and Pastor's Journal; and in 1838 began to edit the American Biblical Repository. He was professor of pastoral theology and homiletics in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, from 1842 to 1844, and pastor of the First Church, Williamstown, Mass., from 1844 to 1857. Here he originated and edited the American Eclectic  and the American Journal of Education, which was afterwards merged in that of Dr. Henry Barnard. When past seventy he published a volume of poems. He died at New York May 18, 1869. During his long life he was never ill. He is the author of A Plea for Voluntary Societies: — Sprinkling the Only Mode of Baptism, etc.: — Sermon against Horse-racing (1822): — Sacred Miusic (1823): — Colleges, Religious Institutions (1851).

## Peters, Charles[[@Headword:Peters, Charles]]

             a learned English divine, was born in Cornwall near the close of the 17th century, and was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. On entering into orders he obtained the living of Boconoc. In 1727 he was made rector of St. Mabyn, Cornwall, where he died, at a very advanced age, in 1777. In his dissertation on the book of Job he displayed a deep knowledge of Hebrew, and great power of argument against Warburton. The work, which is valuable, is entitled A critical Dissertation on the Book of Job, wherein the A ccount given of that Book by the Author of the Divine Legation of Moses demonstrated [Warburton] is particularly considered, the Antiquity of the Book vindicated, the great Text (19:25) explained, and a future State shown to have been the popular Belief of the ancient Jews (2d ed. corrected, Lond. 1757, 8vo): — An Appendix to the critical Dissertation on the Book of Job, giving a further Account of the Book of Ecclesiastes; to which is added a Reply to some Notes of the late D-n of B-, in his new Edition of the Divine Legation, volume 2, part 2, by the Author of the Critical Dissertation (Lond. 1760). There are also extant Sermons, published from his MSS. by his nephew, Jon. Peters, M.A., vicar of St. Clement's, near Truro, Cornwall (Lond. 1776, 8vo). (J.H.W.)

## Peters, Hugh[[@Headword:Peters, Hugh]]

             an English divine, who came to this country in the colonial days, and is noted both as a preacher and politician, was born at Fowey, Cornwall, England, in 1599. He was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he graduated in 1622; then entered the ministry, and preached successfully at St. Sepulchre's, London, until he was silenced for nonconformity, and imprisoned. As soon as liberated he went to Rotterdam, and became pastor of the Independent Church in that place. In 1635 he resigned and sailed for New England, where he arrived October 6, and was installed December 21, 1636, pastor of the First Church, Salem, as successor to Roger Williams, whose doctrines he disclaimed and whose adherents he excommunicated.  He was also active in civil and mercantile affairs, suggesting coasting and foreign voyages, and the plan of the fisheries. In March 1638, he was appointed by the General Court to assist in collecting and revising the colonial laws, and having been chosen to "represent the sense of the colony upon the laws of excise and trade," he sailed for England August 3, 1641. He became in 1643 a preacher in the Parliamentary army, in which capacity he was present at the siege of Lynn and the capture of Bridgewater. For his services he was largely rewarded, and in 1653 was one of the committee of legal reform appointed by Parliament. In 1658 he was chaplain to the garrison at Dunkirk. After the Restoration Peters, being suspected of some complicity with the death of the king, was committed to the Tower, and indicted for high-treason October 13, 1660. He was:convicted and executed October 16, 1660. During his imprisonment he wrote several letters of advice to his daughter, subsequently (1717) published under the title of A dying Father's last Legacy to an only Child. His private character has been the subject of much discussion both in England and America. He as charged by his enemies with gross immorality, and the most bitter epithets were appliedtto him by bishops Burnet. Kennet, and others; but oflate years he has been estimated more favorably. He published also God's Doings and Man's Duty, opened in a Sermon preached before the House of Commons, the Lord Mayor, and the Assembly of Divines (1646): — Peters's last Report of the English Wars, occasioned by the Importunity of a Friend pressing an Answer to some Queries (1646): — A Word for the Army and Two Words for the Kingdom, to Clear the One and Cure the Other, forced in much Plainness and Brevity from their faithful Servant, Hugh Peters (1647): — A Good Work for a Good Magistrate, or a Short Cut to a Great Quiet (1651): — Some Notes of a Sermon preached on the 14th of October, 1660, in the Prison of Newgate, after his Condemnation (1660). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1:70; Drake, Dict. of Amer. Biogr. s.v.

## Peters, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Peters, Richard, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman of colonial days, was born at Liverpool, England, where he was educated as a clergyman of the Church of England, and came to Philadelphia in 1735. His services were soon engaged at Christ's Church, for which he was licensed by the bishop of London. — He shortly resigned, and then held an important Church agency, and also became secretary to a succession of governors. In May 1749, he became a member of the provincial council, butin 1762 he resigned all civil offices  and was made one of the ministers of the United Church; was afterwards chosen their rector, and in 1764 went to England to receive his license in due form. On his return he resumed his duties. He resigned in 1775, and died July 10, 1776. He published a Sermon on Education (1751). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:88; Dorr, Hist. of the Christ. Church, volume 1.

## Peters, Samuel Andrew, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Peters, Samuel Andrew, D.D., LL.D]]

             an eccentric Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Hebron, Conn., November 20, 1735, and passed A.B. in Yale, 1757, when he went to England for ordination. He returned in 1759, and in 1762 took charge of the Church at Hebron, where he continued for many years. During the Revolution, being a Tory, he retired first to Boston, and soon sailed to England, as his imprudence and loyalty to the English cause made him very obnoxious. Of course his royal master rewarded his fidelity by a pension and a grant of confiscated lands. In 1781 he published a general history of Connecticut, which has been called "the most unscrupulous and malicious of lying narratives." Its narrations are independent of time, place, and probability. In 1794 he was chosen bishop of Vermont, but he was never consecrated. After being struck off the pension roll by William Pitt, he returned home in 1805, and spent his years in useless petitions to Congress for lands granted to Jonathan Carver, the Indian traveller. In 1817 he journeyed westward, and in 1818 returned to New York, where he lived in obscurity and poverty until his death, April 19, 1826. He is the "Parson Peter" of Trumbull's M'Fingal. Peters published, A General History of Connecticut, by a Gentleman of the Province (Lond. 1781): — A Letter on the Possibility of Eternal Punishments, etc. (ibid. 1785): — and The History of Rev. Hugh Peters, etc. (ibid. 1807). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:191.

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

             an English clergyman, who flourished in the latter part of the 18th century, distinguished himself especially as a painter. He was a man of wit, and possessed a lively imagination and great conversational powers, which made him a favorite. Having a passion for painting, he practiced it first as an amusement, and, by associating much with the eminent artists of the time, he greatly improved his manner, and produced many beautiful works which were greatly admired. He painted for the Shakespeare Gallery scenes  from that author's dramatic works; also several pictures for Macklin's Gallery, as the Resurrection of a Pious Family; the Guardian Angels and the Spirit of a Child; the Cherubs, etc., all of which were very popular. He executed many fancy subjects from his own imagination, which are pleasingly sentimental. He was much patronized by the nobility, and he sometimes painted subjects not strictly in accordance with just notions of propriety. His pictures are well composed, and his coloring rich and harmonious, with an admirable impasto, in which he imitated Reynolds. Many of his works were engraved by Bartolozzi, Thew, Simon, Smith, Marcuard, and others. He is generally called the Reverend W. Peters. The duke of Rutland was his chief patron, and presented him with a valuable living. The bishop of Lincoln gave him a prebendal stall in his cathedral. He died in 1814.

## Petersen, August[[@Headword:Petersen, August]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, who died at Gotha, November 1, 1875, doctor of theology and general, superintendent, is the author of, Die Idee der christlichen Kirche (Leipsic, 1839-46, 3 volumes); Schleiermacher als Reformator den deutschen Bildung (Gotha, 1869): —  Die protestantische Lechfreihent und ihre Grenzen (Frankfort, 1865). (B.P.).

## Petersen, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Petersen, Johann Wilhelm]]

             a German writer noted for his theological studies, and his heresies in certain branches of Christian doctrine, was born July 1, 1649, at Osnabrick, was educated at Lubeck in the preparatory branches, and studied theology at the universities of Giessen, Rostock, Leipsic, Wittenberg, and Jena. He then lectured for a while at Giessen, preached at Lubeck, and finally accepted a professorship at the university in Rostock. He had written a poem satirizing the Jesuits; they in turn had made it so uncomfortable for him at Lubeck that he went to Rostock, but also here, and at Hanover later, they followed him with their opposition and invectives, and in 1678 he gladly accepted the superintendency of the churches at Eutin. In 1688 he became superintendent at Lineburg, but did not remain long, as differences sprang up between him and the pastors. In 1692 he was deposed, on the ground that he espoused chiliastic ideas. He now purchased a farm near Zerbst, and died in retirement, January 31, 1727. His last years were spent in the advocacy of chiliasticopietistic opinions, and he wrote much for that purpose. A list of all his writings is given in his autobiography (1717). This book is valuable, as it indicates the sources whence the pietism of Spener and Francke drew its strength. We must not be understood, however, to say that Spener's pietism depended on Petersen, but simply that Petersen and Spener had much in common, and that the former, by his influence and acceptance of pietistic views, strengthened Spener's hands. Petersen seems to have misapprehended Spener, and to have gone farther than he.

Thus, for example, Petersen. misunderstanding Spener's doctrine concerning "better times to come",  SEE ESCHATOLOGY; SEE SPENER, and the realization of God's kingdom on earth, announced the speedy approach of the millennial reign, and, for the sake of accommodation, even adopted the final restoration theories of Origen (q.v.), with which he became acquainted, as he tells us, in the writings of the English fanatic Jane Leade (q.v.). His wife adopted these views also, and became a propagator of this heresy and the notion of a universal apocatastasis. But the doctrine, though it pleased many by limiting the eternity of punishment, and some who had almost strayed from the Church beyond hope of regaining their former hold on Christ and his Church, yet met with almost universal rejection, because it obliged its advocates to embrace a physical process of redemption, or at least one which was not brought about by the Word of Christ. A train of thought Which was the germ of the Terministic controversy of 1698-1710 might well lead farther. It had been usual so to identify the day of grace with the duration of earthly life as to allow no hope beyond it, and also to regard the term of grace as unexpired while life lasted. Though the original foundation of this opinion was a serious view of the importance of earthly life, it was yet capable of being made the basis of that levity which would delay repentance till the approach of death. To put a stop to this notion, Bose, with whom Rechenberg (q.v.) agreed, upheld the tenet that there is, even in this life, a peremptory termination of grace. This cannot depend upon so external a matter as time, but upon the inward maturity of the decision for or against Christ. Grace is taken from those who have repeatedly refused it, and the justification formerly pronounced is withdrawn. See, however, the art. GRACE SEE GRACE .

To Petersen's adoption of a millennium and a universal restoration, he added, thirdly, faith in the continuation of supernatural inspiration. He was led to this step by a Miss Rosamunda Juliana Von Arnburg, who professed, after her seventh year, to see miraculous visions, especially during prayer, and to experience extraordinary divine revelations. Petersen was acquainted with her after 1691. He boasts that his house had been blessed by her presence as the house of Obed-Edom. He then busied himself with the matter, and composed a work in favor of the lady, in which he sought to establish the divine character of her revelations against all doubt. Besides, Petersen and his wife also claimed to be themselves favored with such illuminations and revelations, and they not unfrequently entertained their superstitious age with extraordinary experiences of a disorganized and infatuated brain. But notwithstanding all his peculiar views, and his too ready credulity, Petersen must be pronounced a noble and pious man. He wrote many hymns, some  of which are preserved in German collections to this day. Dippel (q.v.) and Edelmann joined Petersen, though they differed from him much on doctrinal points. See Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent. 1:159 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2:370; Dorner, Hist. of Protestant Theology, 2:154; Lebensbeschreibung (1719). (J.H.W.)

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

             an English divine, was installed prebendary of the Church at Exeter, August 16, 1619; elected canon residentiary, June 2, 1621; and advanced to the deanery, July 18, 1629. He died December 6, 1661, aged seventy- four years. Dr. Peterson was a man of exemplary life, faithful in preaching the gospel, and charitable to the poor.

## Peterzano (or Preterazzano), Simone[[@Headword:Peterzano (or Preterazzano), Simone]]

             an Italian painter, was, according to Lomazzo, a pupil of Titian, and flourished at Milan in 1591, where he executed some works for the churches, both in oil and fresco. Lanzi says: “On his Pieta in S. Fidela he inscribed himself ‘litiani Discipulus;' and his close imitation seems to confirm the truth. He produced several works in fresco, particularly several histories of St. Paul in S. Barnaba. He there seems to have aimed at uniting the expression, the foreshortening, and the perspective of the Milanese to the rich coloring of Venetian artists, noble works if they were thoroughly correct, and if the author had been as excellent in fresco as in oil painting." There is a fine picture by this master of the Assumption of the Virgin in the Chiesa di Brera.

## Peth-tel[[@Headword:Peth-tel]]

             (Heb. Pethuel', פְּתוּאֵל, stamp or engraving of God; but according to others, i.q. מַתוּאֵל, Methuel', i.e., folk of God; Sept. Βαθουήλ), the father of the prophet Joel (Joe 1:1). B.C. ante 800.

## Pethach Debaray[[@Headword:Pethach Debaray]]

             (פֶּתִח דְּבָרִי) is the title of an excellent Hebrew grammar written in rabbinic char-, acters by an anonymous Spanish author, the first edition of which appeared at Naples in 1492, and not, as is generally believed, at Pesaro in 1507. Another edition, with additions, appeared at Constantinople in 1515, and the same, with corrections by Elias Levita (q.v.), at Venice in 1545. Of the first edition of this valuable grammar only two copies, one at the Vatican Library, and one at Parma, are extant. The Pethach Debaray has been edited with Ibn-Ezra's Moynaim (Venice, 1546), and together with Haja ben-Sherira's work on dreams, חלומות פתרון(Constantinople, 1515, and often); and, lastly, with Moses Kimchi's (q.v.) grammatical work, The Journey on the Paths of Knowledge, מהל ִשבילי הדעת. See De Rossi, Dizionario storico degli autori Ebrei, page 262 (Germ. transl. by Hamburger); Wolf. Bibl. Hebr. 2:1412 sq.: Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch, page 8, No. 75 sq. (Berlin, 1859). (B.P.)

## Pethahiah[[@Headword:Pethahiah]]

             (Heb. Pethachyah', פַּתִחיָה, freed of Jehovah; Sept. , Φεθεϊvα, Ezr 10:23; Φεσσίας, Neh 9:5; Φαθαϊvα, 11:24; Φεθείας, 1Ch 24:16). The name of three men.

1. The head of the nineteenth course in David's division of the priests (1Ch 24:16). B.C. cir. 1020.

2. A Levite, who put away an idolatrous wife at the injunction of Ezra (Ezr 10:23), and joined in the hymn of praise and the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 9:5). B.C. cir. 458.

3. A Hebrew, son of Meshezabeel, of the tribe of Judah, who acted as counsellor of Artaxerxes in matters concerning the Jews (Neh 11:24). B.C. cir. 446.

## Pethor[[@Headword:Pethor]]

             (Heb. Pethor', פַּתוֹר, opened; Sept. (Φαθουρά ; but in Deu 23:6 Sept. omits), the name of a place in Mesopotamia, on the Euphrates, the native country of Balaam, to which Balak sent for him to come and curse Israel (Num 22:5; Deu 23:5). It is supposed to have been near Tiphsah, on the Euphrates, but this is altogether uncertain. SEE BALAAM. The name occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.).

## Petillianists[[@Headword:Petillianists]]

             those who adhered to the party of Petillian, the Donatist bishop of Carthage, in his controversy with St. Augustine.

## Petit, Samuel[[@Headword:Petit, Samuel]]

             a celebrated French scholar, was born at Nismes in 1594. He studied at Geneva with such success that at the age of seventeen he was admitted to the sacred ministry. Soon after he was raised to the professorship of theology, and of Greek and Hebrew, in that city. He died in 1645. He was  a man of vast and profound erudition. He published Varies lectiones in S. Scripturam (in the Critici Sao volume 8). His other works are, Miscellaneorum libri 9: — Eclogae Chronologicae: — Diatribe de Jure, Principunm Edictis, etc.: — Diatribe de Dissidiorum Causis, Effectis et Remediis.

## Petit-Didier, Matthew[[@Headword:Petit-Didier, Matthew]]

             a learned French prelate of note, was born in Lorraine in 1659. He very early in life entered the Order of the Benedictines, and later became abbot of Senones, and finally bishop of Macra (in partibus infidelium). He died in 1728. He is the author of several valuable works, among them, Traite theologique sur l'autorite et 'infallibilite des Papes (Avign. 1726, sm. 8vo). This work, asserting the infallibility of the pope, has been attacked by various writers, Romanist as well as Protestant; especially by Lenfant at the end of his Hist. of the Council of Constance. He also published several critical, historical, and chronological dissertations on the Scriptures (1689- 1728). His brother, Jean Joseph, who was a Jesuit, flourished from 1664 to 1756. See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Petit-Pied, Nicolas (1)[[@Headword:Petit-Pied, Nicolas (1)]]

             a French canonist, was born in Paris December 24, 1627. He was made doctor of the Sorbonne in 1658, and counsellor-clerk in the Chatelet in 1662. He was provided shortly after with the curacy of Saint-Martial in Paris, united later to that of Saint-Pierre-des-Arcis, and finally became under-chorister and canon of the metropolitan church. In 1678, having  wished, as dean of the counsellors, to preside in the Chatelet in the absence of the lieutenants, he found a violent opposition among the lay-counsellors, who pretended that the clergy had not the right to preside and to decaniser. Upon the complaint of Petit-Pied, March 17, 1682, the authorities interposed a decree which gained for him the cause. The researches which he was obliged to make for the pursuit of this affair furnished him the occasion for composing an excellent Trait' du droit et des prerogatives des ecclesiastiques dans l'administration de la justice seculiere (Paris, 1705, 4to). See Journ. des Savans, 1705; Moreri. Dict. Hist.; Descript. Hist. de l'Eglise de Paris. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:719.

## Petit-Pied, Nicolas (2)[[@Headword:Petit-Pied, Nicolas (2)]]

             a French theologian, nephew of the preceding, was born in Paris August 4, 1665. After having finished with distinction his ecclesiastical studies, he was received doctor of the Sorbonne in 1692, and his reputation caused him to be chosen in 1701 to teach the Holy Scriptures in that celebrated school. Having signed, July 20, 1702, with thirty-nine other doctors, the famous Cas de conscience, which was condemned at Rome February 15, 1703, he would not retract, and was therefore exiled to Beaune and deprived of his pulpit. He hastened to join in Holland his friend Quesnel, and remained in that country until 1718, producing each year, for the support of Jansenism, new articles upon the formulary, upon respectful silence, and upon other analogous matters now forgotten. The bull Unigenitus found in him a formidable adversary: he fought it in pamphlets, in memoirs, and in more extended works. On his return to France, Petit- Pied passed some time at Troyes, and afterwards went to Paris, where, June 1 and 6, 1719, the faculty of theology and the Sorbonne established him again in his rights as doctor. On the 15th of the same month he was again exiled, and on the 21st a lettre de cachet ordered the cancelling of the conclusion of the faculty in his favor. Petit-Pied had established his home and a new kind of Protestant Church in the village of Asnibres, near Paris. There he made a trial of the regulations and all the liturgy practiced by the Jansenists in Holland. Renown published astonishing things of him; people hastened there in crowds from the capital, and Asnibres soon became another Charenton. Petit-Pied showed himself from that time a more obstinate appellant. M. de Lorraine, bishop of Bayeux, selected him shortly after for his theologian, but on the death of that prelate, June 9, 1728, he retired again to Holland, whence he returned only in 1734. His  zeal for Jansenism and the fertility of his pen were not inconsistent in this new exile; but from his return to Paris he led a more tranquil life, and contented himself with composing several works to defend the missal given to his diocese by Bossuet, bishop of Troyes. Petit-Pied died in Paris January 7, 1747. The list of all his works would be too long; Moreri mentions eighty-one. We quote of his works, Examen theologique de l'instruction pastorale approuvee dans l'assemblee di clerge . . . pour l'acceptation de la bulle (Paris, 1713, 3 volumes, 12mo): — Examen des faussetes sur le culte Chinois avancees par le P. Jouvency (ibid. 1714, 12mo): — and Lettres touchant la matiere de l'usure, par rapport aux contrats des rentes rachetables des deux cotes (Lille, 1731, 4to). He also labored upon the work of Legros, Dogma Ecclesiae circa usuram expositum et vindicatum (Utrecht, 1731, 4to). Sarcastic in his works, Petit- Pied was of a mild, sociable character. See Dict. Hist. des Auteurs Eccles. volume 3; Journal de Dorsanne, Calendrier ecclesiastique (ibid. 1757, 12mo); Nouv. eccles. passim; Moreri, Dict. Hist. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:719.

## Petition[[@Headword:Petition]]

             according to Dr. Watts, is the fourth part of prayer, and includes a desire of deliverance from evil, and a request of good things to be bestowed. On both these accounts petitions are to be offered up to God, not only for ourselves, but for our fellow-creatures also. This part of prayer is frequently called intercession. SEE PRAYER.

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

             an eminent French painter in enamel, is noted especially as a Huguenot who spurned all efforts for his conversion, and, notwithstanding the personal intercession for his recall to Romanism on the part of king Louis XIV, died as he lived, a pious Protestant. Petitot was the son of a sculptor and architect, and was born at Geneva in 1607. Being designed for the trade of a jeweller, he was placed under the direction of Bordier, and in this occupation was engaged in the preparation of enamels for the jewelry business. He was so successful in the production of colors that he was advised by Bordier to attempt portraits. They conjointly made several trials, and though they still wanted many colors which they knew not how  to prepare for the fire, their attempts had great success. After some time they went to Italy, where they consulted the most eminent chemists. and made considerable progress in their art, but it was in England, whither they removed after a few years, that they perfected it. In London they became acquainted with Sir Theodore Mayern, first physician to Charles I, and an intelligent chemist, who had by his experiments discovered the principal colors proper to be used in enamel, and the means of vitrifying them, so that they surpassed the boasted enamelling of Venice and Limoges. Petitot was introduced by Mayern to the king, who retained him in his service and gave him apartments in Whitehall. He painted the portraits of Charles and the royal family several times, and copied many pictures, after Vandyck, which are considered his finest works. That painter greatly assisted him by his advice, and the king frequently went to see him paint. On the death of Charles, Petitot retired to France with the exiled family. He was greatly noticed by Charles II, who introduced him to Louis XIV. Louis appointed him his painter in enamel, and granted him a pension and apartments in the Louvre. He painted the French king many times, and, among a vast number of portraits, those of the queens Anne of Austria and Maria Theresa. He also occupied himself in making copies from the most celebrated pictures of Mignard and Lebrun. Petitot, dreading the effects of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, solicited leave, but for a long time in vain, to return to Geneva. Finally the king, determined to save his painter, employed Bossuet to endeavor to convert him to Romanism; in this effort, however, that eloquent prelate was wholly unsuccessful. At length Louis permitted him to depart, and, leaving his wife and children in Paris, Petitot proceeded to his native place, where he was soon after joined by his family. Arrived now at eighty years of age, he was sought by such numbers of friends and admirers that he was forced to remove from Geneva, and retire to Vevay, a small town in the canton of Vaud, where he continued to labor till 1691, in which year, while painting a portrait of his wife, he was suddenly attacked by apoplexy, of which he died. For his works of art, see Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Petosiris[[@Headword:Petosiris]]

             (Πετόσιρις), an Egyptian priest and astrologer, who is generally named along with Nechepsos, an Egyptian king. The two are said to be the founders of astrology, and of the art of casting nativities. Suidas states that Petosiris wrote on the right mode of worshipping the gods, astrological maxims, ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων (which are often referred to in connection with astrology), and a work on the Egyptian mysteries. But we may infer from a statement made by Vetius Valens, of which the substance is given by Marsham (Canon Chronicus [ed. Lips. 1676], page 479), that Suidas assigns to Petosiris what others attributed partly to him and partly to Nechepsos. For his ῎Οργανον Α᾿στρονομικόν, or ψῆφος σεληνισκή, containing astrological principles for predicting the event of diseases, and for his other writings, Fabricius (Bibl. Graec. 4:160) may be consulted. To the list given by him may be added a translation into Latin by Bede of the astrological letter of Petosiris to Nechepsos, entitled De Divinatione Mortis et Vitce (Bed. Opera [ed. Col. Agripp. 1612], 2:233, 234). His name, as connected with astrology, was in high repute early in Greece, and in Rome in her degenerate days. This we learn from the praises bestowed on him by Manetho (5:10), who, indeed, in the prologue to the first and fifth books of his Apotelesmatica, professes only to expand in Greek the prose rules of Petosiris and Nechepsos ("divini illi viri atque omni  admiratione digni"), and from the references of Pliny (Hist. Nat. 1:23; 7:49). But the best proof is the fact that, like our own Lilly, Petosiris became the common name for an astrologer, as we find in Aristophanes, quoted by Athenaeus (3:114, c) in the fortysixth epigram of Lucilius (Jacobs, Anthol. Graec. 3:38), whence we learn the quantity, and in Juvenal (6:580). Marsham has a full dissertation on Nechepsos and Petosiris in the work above quoted (pages 474-481).

## Petra[[@Headword:Petra]]

             (in the earlier Greek writers Πέτρα or ἡ Πέτρα, but in the later αί Πέτραι) was the capital of the Nabathaean Arabs in the land of Edom, and seems to have given name to the kingdom and region of Arabia Petrcea. As there is mention in the Old Testament of a stronghold which successively belonged to the Amorites (Jdg 1:36), the Edomites (2Ki 14:7), and the Moabites (Isa 16:1; comp. in Hebrews chapter 42: 11), and bore in Hebrew the name of סֵלִע, Sela, which has the same meaning as Petra in Greek, viz. "a rock," that circumstance has led to the conjecture that the Petra of the Nabathaeans had been the Sela of Edom. SEE SELAH. This latter name seems, however, to have passed away with the Hebrew rule over Edom, for no further trace of it is to be found; although it is still called Sela by Isaiah (16:1). These are all the certain notices of the place in Scripture. Arce is said by Josephus to have been a name of Petra (Ant. 4:4, 7); but probably we should read Α᾿ρκήμ for Α᾿ρκή (yet see Amer. Bib. Rep. for 1833, page 536, note). SEE ARKITE.

1. History. — The earliest notice of this place under the name Petra by the Greek writers is connected with the fact that Antigonus, one of Alexander's successors, sent two expeditions against the Nabathaeans in Petra (Diod. Sic. 19:94-98). The first of these, commanded by Athenaeus, and the second by Demetrius, changed the habits of the Nabathaeans, who had hitherto been essentially nomadic, and led them to engage in commerce. In this way, during the following centuries, they grew up into the kingdom of Arabia Petraea, occupying very nearly the same territory which was comprised within the limits of ancient Edom. In the first expedition, Athenseus took the city by surprise while the men were absent at a neighboring mart or fair, and carried off a large booty of silver and merchandise. But the Nabatheeans quickly pursued him to the number of 8000 men, and, falling upon his camp by night, destroyed the greater part of his army. Of the second expedition, under the comr mand of Demetrius,  the Nabathaeans had previous intelligence; and prepared themselves for an attack by driving their flocks into the deserts, and placing their wealth under the protection of a strong garrison in Petra; to which, according to Diodorus, there was but a single approach, and that made by hand. In this way they succeeded in baffling the whole design of Demetrius. For points of history not immediately connected with the city, SEE EDOMITES; SEE NABATHAEANS.

Strabo, writing of the Nabathaeans in the time of Augustus, thus describes their capital: "The metropolis of the Nabathaeans is Petra, so called; for it lies in a place in other respects plain and level, but shut in by rocks round about, yet within having copious fountains for the supply of water and the irrigation of gardens. Beyond the enclosure the region is mostly a desert, especially towards Judaea" (Geog. 16, page 906). At this time the town had become a place of transit for the productions of the East, and was much resorted to by foreigners (Diod. Sic. 19:95; Strabo, 1.c.). Pliny more definitely describes Petra as situated in a valley less than two miles (Roman) in amplitude, surrounded by inaccessible mountains, with a stream flowing through it (Hist. Nat. 6:28). About the same period it is often named by Josephus as the capital of Arabia Petrsea (War, 1:6, 2; 13, 8; etc.). Petra was situated in the eastern part of Arabia Petraea, in the district called under the Christian emperors of Rome Palsestina Tertia (Vet. Rom. Itin. page 74, ed. Wessel; Malala, Chronogr. 16:400, ed. Bonn). According to the division of the ancient geographers, it lay in the northern district, Gebalene; while the modern ones place it in the southern portion, Esh-Sherah, the Mount Seir of the Bible. Petra was subdued by A. Cornelius Palma, a lieutenant of Trajan (Dion Cass. 58:14). Hadrian seems to have bestowed on it some advantage, which led the inhabitants to give his name to the city upon coins; several of these are still extant (Mionnet, Med. Antiques, 5:587; Eckhel, Doctr. Num. 2:503). It remained under the Roman dominion a considerable period, as we hear of the province of Arabia being enlarged by Septimius Severus, A.D. 195 (ibid. 75:1, 2; Eutrop. 8:18). It must have been during this period that those temples and mausoleums were made, the remains of which still arrest the attention of the traveller; for, though the predominant style of architecture is Egyptian, it is mixed with florid and overloaded Roman- Greek specimens, which are but slightly modified by the native artists. In the 4th century Petra is several times mentioned by Eusebins and Jerome; and in the Greek ecclesiastical Notitiae bf the 5th and 6th centuries it appears as the metropolitan see of the third Palestine (Reland, Palaest. pages 215, 217); the last named of the bishops is Theodorus, who was  present at the Council of Jerusalem in A.D. 536 (Oriens Christ. 3:725). From that time not the slightest notice of Petra is to be found in any quarter; and as no trace of it as an inhabited site is to be met with in the Arabian writers, the probability seems to be that it was destroyed in some unrecorded incursion of the desert hordes, and was afterwards left unpeopled. It is true that Petra occurs in the writers of the sera of the Crusades; but they applied this name to Kerak, and thus introduced a confusion as to the true Petra which is not even now entirely removed. It was not until the reports concerning the wonderful remains in Wady Musa had been verified by Burckhardt that the latter traveller first ventured to assume the identity of the site with that of the ancient capital of Arabia Petraea. He expresses this opinion in a letter dated at Cairo, Sept. 12, 1812, published in 1819, in the preface to his Travels in Nubia; but before its appearance the eminent geographer Carl Ritter had suggested the same conclusion on the strength of Seetzen's intimations (Erdkunde, 2:217). Burckhardt's view was more amply developed in his Travels in Syria, page 431, published in 1822, and received the high sanction of his editor, Col. Leake, who produces in support of it all the arguments which have since been relied upon, namely, the agreement of the ancient descriptions with this site, and their inapplicability to Kerak; the coincidence of the ancient specifications of the distances of Petra from the Elanitic gulf and from the Dead Sea, which all point to Wady Musa, and not to Kerak; that Josephus, Eusebius, and Jerome testify that the Mount Hor where Aaron died was in the vicinity of Petra; and that to this day the mountain which tradition and circumstances point out as the same still rears its lonely head above the vale of Wady Musa, while in all the district of Kerak there is not a single mountain which could in itself be regarded as Mount Hor; and even if there were, its position would be incompatible with the recorded journeyings of the Israelites (Leake's Preface to Burckhardt's Travels in Syria, pages 7-9; Robinson's Palestine, 2:576-579, 653-659).

2. Description of the present Site. — The ruined city lies in a narrow valley, surrounded by lofty and, for the most part, perfectly precipitous mountains. Those which form its southern limit are not so steep as to be impassable; and it is over these, or rather through them, along an abrupt and difficult ravine, that travellers from Sinai or Egypt usually wind their laborious way into the scene of magnificent desolation. The ancient and more interesting entrance is on the eastern side, through the deep narrow  gorge called the Sik. It is not easy to determine the precise limits of the ancient city, though the precipitous mountains by which the site is encompassed mark with perfect distinctness the boundaries beyond which it never could have extended. These natural barriers seem to have constituted the real limits of the city; and they give an extent of more than a mile in length, nearly from north to south, by a variable breadth of about half a mile. Several spurs from the surrounding mountains encroach upon this area; but, with inconsiderable exceptions, the whole is fit for building on. The sides of the valley are walled up by perpendicular rocks from four hundred to six or seven hundred feet high. The northern and southern barriers are neither so lofty nor so steep, and they both admit of the passage of camels. A great many small recesses or side valleys open into the principal one, thus enlarging as well as varying almost infinitely the outline. With only one or two exceptions, however, they have no outlet, but come to a speedy and abrupt termination among the overhanging cliffs, as precipitous as the natural bulwark that bounds the principal valley. Including these irregularities, the whole circumference of Petra may be four miles or more. The length of this irregular outline, though it gives no idea of the extent of the area within its embrace, is perhaps the best measure of the extent of the excavations.

The valley of Wady Musa, which leads to the ruins, in a general westerly direction, is about one hundred and fifty feet broad at its entrance, and is shut in by cliffs of red sandstone, which gradually increase from a height of forty or fifty feet to two hundred or two hundred and ntty feet. The valley gradually contracts till at one spot it becomes only twelve feet broad, and is so overlapped by the perpendicular cliffs that the light of day is almost excluded. This is the ravine or Sik of Wady uIsa, which extends, with many windings, for a good English mile. This valley contains a wonderful necropolis hewn in the rocky walls. The tombs, which adjoin or surmount one another, exhibit now a front with six Ionic columns, now with four slender pyramids, and by their mixture of Greek. Roman, and Oriental architecture remind the spectator of the remains found in the valley of Jehoshaphat near Jerusalem. The entrance of the ravine is spanned by a bold arch, perhaps a triumphal one, with finely sculptured niches evidently intended for statues. This, like the other remains of this extraordinary spot, is ascribed by the natives either to the Pharaohs or to the Jins, i.e., evil genii. Along the bottom Of the valley, in which it almost vanishes, winds the stream. In ancient times its bed seems to have been paved; and it  appears to have been, in many places at least, covered in, so that the street passed above it. In other wider portions of the ravine, especially where it opens out into the city, it was spanned by frequent bridges, its sides strengthened with stone walls or quays, and numerous small canals derived from it supplied the inhabitants with water. But now its banks are overspread with hyacinths, oleanders, and other shrubs, and the upper portions of it are overshadowed by lofty trees.

Opposite the termination of the Sik, or narrow part of the ravine, just where it turns at its junction with a second ravine-like but broader valley, stands the chief attraction of the whole place, the finest monument in fact in all Syria. This is the Khuzneh — well preserved, considering its age and site, and still exhibiting its delicate chiselled work, and all the freshness and beauty of its coloring. Like all the other wonders of the place, it is carved out of the face of the perpendicular cliff, which here rises about 150 feet high. It has two rows of six columns over one another (one of the lower ones has fallen), with statues between, surmounted by capitals and a sculptured pediment, the latter divided by a little round temple crowned with an urn. The Arabs imagine that this urn contained treasure (khuzneh, hence the name of the entire structure), which they ascribe to Pharaoh. The interior does not correspond with the magnificence of the fa9ade, being a plain, lofty hall, with a chamber adjoining each of its three sides. It was either a mausoleum or, more probably, a temple.

From this spot the cliffs on both sides of the valley are pierced with numerous excavations, the chambers of which are usually small, though the fronts are occasionally of some size and magnificence; scarcely two, however, are exactly alike. After a gentle curve the valley expands still more, and here on its left side lies the theatre, entirely hewn out of the rock. Its diameter at the bottom is one hundred and twenty feet, and it has thirty-three rows of seats, capable of accommodating three thousand spectators. Strangely enough, it is entirely surrounded by tombs. One of the more northerly of these is inscribed with the name of Q. Praefectus Florentinus, probably the governor of Arabia Petraea under Hadrian or Antoninus Pius. Another has a Greek inscription not yet deciphered. Travellers are agreed that these excavations, some of the most striking of which are in time cliff directly opposite the theater, were mostly tombs, though some think they may originally have served as dwellings. Indeed  several of them have loculi sunk in the floor as if for burialplaces. A few were doubtless temples for the worship of Baal, but subsequently converted into Christian churches. They extend all along the eastern cliffs.

Proceeding still down the stream, at about one hundred and fifty paces from the theatre the cliffs expand rapidly, and soon recede so far as to give place to a plain about a mile square, surrounded by gentle eminences. The brook, which now turns again to the west, traverses the middle of this plain till it reaches a ledge of sandstone cliffs, through which it pierces, and is lost in the sands of the Arabah. This little plain was the site of the city of Petra, and it is still covered with heaps of hewn stones, traces of paved streets, and foundations of houses.

The chief public buildings occupied the banks of the river and the high ground, especially on the south, as their ruins sufficiently show. One sumptuous edifice remains standing, though in an imperfect and dilapidated state. It is on the south side of the river, near the western side of the valley, and seems to have beena palace rather than a temple. It is called Kasr Faruin, or Pharaoh's palace, and is thirty-four paces square. The walls are nearly entire, and on the eastern side they are still surmounted by a handsome cornice. The front, which looks towards the north, was ornamented with a row of columns, four of which are standing. An open piazza behind the colonnade extended the whole length of the building. In the rear of this piazza are three apartments, the principal of which is entered under a noble arch, apparently thirty-five or forty feet high. It is an imposing ruin, though not of the purest style of architecture, and is the more striking as being the only proper edifice now standing in Petra.

A little east of this, and in a range with some of the most beautiful excavations in the mountain on the east side of the valley, are the remains of what appears to have been another triumphal arch. Under it were three passages, and a number of pedestals of columns, as well as other fragments, would lead to the belief that a magnificent colonnade was connected with it. In the same vicinity are the abutments of a massive bridge.

On an eminence south of this is a single column (obscenely called Zab Farun, i.e., hasta virilis Pharaonis) connected with the foundation walls of a temple, whose pillars lie scattered around in broken fragments, some of  them five feet in diameter. Twelve of these, whose pedestals still remain in their places, adorned either side of this stately edifice. There were also four columns in front and six in the rear of the temple. They are prostrate on the ground, and Dr. Olin counted thirty-seven massive frusta of which one of them was composed.

Still farther south are other piles of ruins — columns and hewn stones — parts, no doubt, of important public buildings. The same traveller counted not less than fourteen similar heaps of ruins, having columns and fragments of columns intermingled with blocks of stone, in this part of the site of ancient Petra. They indicate the great wealth and magnificence of this ancient capital, as well as its unparalleled calamities. These sumptuous edifices occupied what may be called the central parts of Petra. A large surface on the north side of the river is covered with substructions which probably belonged to private habitations. An extensive region still farther north retains no vestiges of the buildings which once covered it. Public wealth was lavished on palaces and temples, while the houses of the common people were slightly and meanly built, of such materials as a few years, or at most a few centuries, were sufficient to dissolve.

The acropolis is thought to have occupied an isolated hill on the west. The whole ascent of the hills on the south, up which the toilsome passage-way out of this museum of wonders winds, is elaborately pierced with tombs, temples, or dwellings. At the north-west extremity of the cliff surrounding the plain is the Deir or cloister, the second most remarkable sculpture of the entire place, hewn likewise out of the face of the rock. A ravine somewhat like the Sik, with many windings, leads to the base, and the approach up to it is in places by a path five or six feet broad, cut with immense labor in the precipitous rock. Its facade is larger than that of the Khuzneh; but, as in that building (if such we may call it), the interior does not correspond, being merely a large square chamber, with a recess resembling the niche for the altar in Greek ecclesiastical architecture, and bearing evident signs of having been converted from a heathen into a Christian temple. The cliffs on the north-east side of the basin, which here extends up a considerable valley, are in like manner cut into temples, tombs, or other architectural forms of great variety.

Laborde and Linant also thought that they traced the outline of a naumachia or theater for sea-fights, which would be flooded from cisterns in which the water of the torrents in the wet season had been reserved — a  remarkable proof, if the hypothesis be correct, of the copiousness of the water-supply, if properly husbanded, and a confirmation of what we are told of the exuberant fertility of the region, and its contrast to the barren Arabah on its immediate west (Robinson, 2:169). Stanley (Syr. and Pal. Page 95) leaves little doubt that Petra was the seat of a primeval sanctuary, which he fixes at the spot now called the "Deir" or "Convent," and with which fact the choice of the site of Aaron's tomb may, he thinks, have been connected (page 96). As regards the question of its identity with Kadesh, SEE KADESH; and, for the general subject, see Ritter, 14:69, 997 sq.

The mountain torrents which at times sweep over the lower parts of the ancient site have undermined many foundations, and carried away many a chiselled stone, and worn many a finished specimen of sculpture into unshapely masses. The soft texture of the rock seconds the destructive agencies of the elements.

Even the accumulations of rubbish which mark the site of all other decayed cities have mostly disappeared; and the extent which was covered with human habitations can only be determined by the broken pottery scattered over the surface or mingled with the sand — the universal, and, it would seem, an imperishable memorial of populous cities that exist no longer. These vestiges, the extent of which Dr. Olin took great pains to trace, cover an area one third as large as that of Cairo, excluding its large gardens from the estimate, and very sufficient, he thinks, to contain the whole population of Athens in its prosperous days.

The attention of travellers has, however, been chiefly engaged by the above-noted excavations, which, having more successfully resisted the ravages of time, constitute at present the great and peculiar attraction of the place. These excavations, whether formed for temples, tombs, or the dwellings of living men, surprise the visitor by their incredible number and extent. They not only occupy the front of the entire mountain by which the valley is encompassed, but of the numerous ravines and recesses which radiate on all sides from this enclosed area. They exist, too, in great numbers in the precipitous rocks which shoot out from the principal mountains into the southern, and still more into the northern part of the site, and they are seen along all the approaches to the place, which, in the days of its prosperity, were perhaps the suburbs of the overpeopled valley. Some of the most peculiar are found in the valley above the entrance of the  Sik. Were these excavations, instead of following all the sinuosities of the mountain and its nurerous gorges, ranged in regular order, they probably would form a street not less than five or six miles in length. They are often seen rising one above another in the face of the cliff, and convenient steps, now much worn, cut in the rock, lead in all directions through the fissures and along the sides of the mountains, to the various tombs that occupy these lofty positions. Some of them are apparently not less than from two hundred to three or four hundred feet above the level of the valley. Conspicuous situations, visible from below, were generally chosen; but sometimes the opposite taste prevailed, and the most secluded cliffs, fronting towards some dark ravine, and quite hidden from the gaze of the multitude, were preferred. The flights of steps, all cut in the solid rock, are almost innumerable, and they ascend to great heights, as well as in all directions. Sometimes the connection with the city is interrupted, and one sees in a gorge, or upon the face of a cliff, fifty or a hundred feet above him, a long series of steps rising from the edge of an inaccessible precipice. The action of winter torrents and other agencies have worn the easy ascent into a channel for the waters, and thus interrupted the communication.

The situations of these excavations are not more various than their forms and dimensions. Mere niches are sometimes cut in the face of the rock, of little depth and of various sizes and forms, of which it is difficult to conjecture the object, unless they had some connection with votive offerings and religious rites. Bv far the largest number of excavations were manifestly designed as places for the interment of the dead; and thus exhibit a variety in form and size, of interior arrangement and external decorations, adapted to the different fortunes of their occupants, and conformable to the prevailing tastes of the times in which thev were made. There are many tombs consisting of a single chamber, ten, fifteen, or twenty feet square by ten or twelve in height, containing a recess in the wall large enough to receive one or a few deposits; sometimes on a level with the floor, at others one or two feet above it, and not unfrequently near the ceiling, at the height of eight or ten feet. Occasionally, as above mentioned, oblong pits or graves are sunk in the recesses, or in the floor of the principal apartment.

Some of these are of considerable depth, but they are mostly choked with stones and rubbish, so that it is impossible to ascertain it. In these plebeian  tombs there is commonly a door of small dimensions, and an absence of all architectural decorations; in some of larger dimensions there are several recesses occupying two or three sides of the apartment. These seem to have been formed for family tombs. Besides these unadorned habitations of the humble dead, there is a vast number of excavations enriched with various architectural ornaments. To these unique and sumptuous monuments of the taste of one of the most ancient races of men with whom history has made us acquainted, Petra is indebted for its great and peculiar attractions. This ornamental architecture is wholly confined to the front, while the interior is quite plain and destitute of all decoration. Pass the threshold, and nothing is seen but perpendicular walls, bearing the marks of the chisel, without mouldings, columns, or any species of ornament. But the exteriors of these primitive and even rude apartments exhibit some of the most beautiful and imposing results of ancient taste and skill which have remained to our times. The front of the mountain is wrought into favades of splendid temples, rivalling in their aspect and symmetry the most celebrated monuments of Grecian art. Columns .of various orders, graceful pediments, broad, rich entablatures, and sometimes statuary, all hewn out of the solid rock, and still forming part of the native mass, transform the base of the mountain into a vast splendid pile of architecture, while the overhanging cliffs, towering above in shapes as rugged and wild as any on which the eye ever rested, form the most striking and curious of contrasts. In most instances it is impossible to assign these beautiful fagades to any particular style of architecture. Many of the columns resemble those of the Corinthian order; but they deviate so far, both in their forms and ornaments, from this elegant model, that it would be impossible to rank them in the class. A few are Doric, which are precisely those that have suffered most from the ravages of time, and are probably very ancient.

But nothing contributes so much to the almost magical effect of some of these monuments as the rich and various colors of the rock out of which, or more properly in which, they are formed. The mountains that encompass the vale of Petra are of sandstone, of which red is the predominant hue. Their surface is a good deal burned and faded by the elements, and is of a dull brick color, and most of the sandstone formations in this vicinity, as well as a number of the excavations of Petra, exhibit nothing remarkable in their coloring which does not belong to the same species of rock throughout a considerable region of Arabia Petraea. Many of them, however, are adorned with such a profusion of the most lovely and brilliant  colors as it is scarcely possible to describe. Red, purple, yellow, azure or sky-blue, black and white, are seen in the same mass distinctly in successive layers, or blended so as to form every shade and huc of which they are capable — as brilliant and as soft as they ever appear in flowers, or in the plumage of birds, or in the sky when illuminated by the most glorious sunset. The red perpetually shades into pale, or deep rose or flesh color, and again approaches the hue of the lilac or violet. The white, which is often as pure as snow, is occasionally just dashed with blue or red. The blue is usually the pale azure of the clear sky or of the ocean, but sometimes has the deep and peculiar shade of the clouds in summer when agitated by a tempest. Yellow is an epithet often applied to sand and sandstone. The yellow of the rocks of Petra is as bright as that of saffron. It is more easy to imagine than to describe the effect of tall, graceful columns exhibiting these exquisite colors in their succession of regular horizontal strata. They are displayed to still greater advantage in the walls and ceilings of some of the excavations where there is a slight dip in the strata.

See Irby and Mangles, Travels, chapter 8; Robinson, Bibl. Research. 2:512 sq.; Laborde, Voyage (Par. 1830-33), page 55 sq. (this work is chiefly valued for its engravings); Bartlett, Forty Days in the Desert, page 126 sq.; Roberts, Sketches (Lond. 1842-48), volume 3; Olin, Travels, 2:1 sq.; Palmer, Desert of the Exodus, page 366 sq.; Ridgaway, The Lord's Land, page 139 sq.; Porter, in Murray's Handbook for Sinai and Pal. page 81 sq.; Badecker, Palastina und Syrien, page 304 sq. SEE IDUMEA.

## Petra, Vicenzo[[@Headword:Petra, Vicenzo]]

             an Italian cardinal, was born at Naples November 13, 1662. He occupied at the court of Rome several considerable positions, and was created cardinal in 1724, then bishop of Praeneste. He enjoyed great influence with popes Innocent XII and Benedict XIII, who often consulted him upon grave affairs. He died at Rome March 24, 1747. He published De sacra Poenitentiara Apostolica (Rome, 1712, 4to), and Commentaria ad Constitutiones Apostolicas (Ven. 1729, 4 volumes, fol.). See Nomini illustri del Regno di Napoli. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:730.

## Petrarch (Ital. Petrarca), Francesco[[@Headword:Petrarch (Ital. Petrarca), Francesco]]

             one of the most celebrated of Italian writers of prose and poetry, deserves a place here because he was for many years a devout and consistent ecclesiastic, and exerted a farreaching ilfluence on the classical culture of Italy in the later mediaeval period known as the Renaissance (q.v.). Petrarch was born at Arezzo, in Tuscany, July 20, 1304. His father, a Florentine notary, had been exiled two years before, in the same disturbance which drove out the poet Dante; and he soon left Italy for Avignon, where the papal court then resided. The son was educated in this French city washed by the Rhone, and at Montpellier, and then sent to study law at Bologna. Though Petrarch certainly loved the lEneid more than the Pandects, and copied ancient manuscripts more willingly than law papers, yet the subsequent course of his public life proves that he did not neglect professional pursuits, and that he prepared himself for being a useful man of business. Returning to, Avignon soon after he became of age, he found himself ia possession of a small inheritance, and indulged for some years in an aLternation of classical studies and political composition, with such gayety (sombre, perhaps, but not the more pure on that account) as the clerical court offered. In the year 1327 he conceived an attachment to an Avignonese lady, young but already married. Some slight obscurity still hangs over his relation to this lady, but it is almost certain that she was no less a paragon of virtue than of loveliness. He met her on April 6, 1327, in the church of St. Clara in Avignon, and at once and forever fell deeply in love with her. The lady was then nineteen, and had been married for two years to a gentleman of Avignon, named Hugues de Sade. For ten years Petrarch lived near her in the papal city, and frequently met her at church, in society, at festivities, etc. He sang her beauty and his love, under the name of his "Laura," in those sonnets whose mellifluous conceits ravished the ears of his contemporaries, and have not yet ceased to charm. The lady, whoever she was, knew how to keep Petrarch at a respectful distance, and for using the only opportunity he had of avowing his love in her presence she so severely reproved him that he never repeated the offence. About 1338 he retired for two or three years to dwell in the beautiful valley of Vaucluse, near Avignon. He himself said that his withdrawal to the retreat which he immortalized was caused by no reason more sentimental or poetic than his disgust with the licentiousness of the papal court, and the disappointment of the hopes of preferment which the pope had held out to  him. Long before this time Petrarch's talents and accomplishments had procured for him not only distinguished patronage, but frequent and active employment. A most brilliant honor awaited him at Rome in 1341, where, on Easter-day, he was crowned in the Capitol with the laurel-wreath of the poet. The ceremonies which marked this coronation were a grotesque medley of pagan and Christian repreo sentations. Petrarch was, however, as ardent a scholar as he was a poet; and throughout his whole life he was occupied in the collection of Latin MSS., even copying some with his own hand. To obtain these, he travelled frequently throughout France, Germany, Italy and Spain. In 1353 Petrarch returned to Italy, and soon became the trusted counsellor and diplomatic agent of several of his country's rulers. He was sent on missions at home and abroad. He finally settled at Milan, where he spent ten years, and lived for a season also at Parma, Mantua, Padua, Verona, Venice, and Rome. Though he had never entered holy orders, he was rewardqd for his faithful services to the state by ecclesiastic benefices in the north of Italy. He might have risen to positions of great influence and rich returns if he had chosen, but he preferred the quiet life of a recluse. In 1370 Petrarch removed to Arquh, a little village prettily situated among the Euganean hills, where he spent his closing years in hard scholarly work, much annoyed by visitors, troubled with, epileptic fits, not over rich, but serene in heart, and displaying in his life and correspondence a rational; and beautiful piety. He died July 18, 1374. Petrarch was not only far beyond his age in learningvbut had risen above many of its prejudices and superstitions. He despised astrology, and the childish medicine of his times; but, on the other hand, he had no liking for the conceited scepticism of the mediaeval savans; and in his De sui ipsius et multorum aliorum Ignorantia he sharply attacked the irreligious speculations of those who had acquired a shallow, free-thinking habit from the study of the Arabico-Aristotelian school of writers, such as Averroes. Petrarch's Latin works were the first in modern times in which the language was classically written. The principal are his Epistolae, consisting of letters to his numerous friends and acquaintances, and which rank as the best of his prose works: De Vitis Virorum Illustrium: — De Remedis utriusque Fortunae: — De Vita Solitaria: — Rerum Memorandarum libri 4: — De Contemptu Mundi, etc. Besides his prose epistles, he wrote numerous epistles in Latin verse, eclogues, and an epic poem called Africa, on the subject of the Second Punic War. It was this last production which obtained for him the laurel-wreath at Rome. Petrarch, whose life was thus active, is immortal in history by reason of more claims than one. He is  placed as one of the most celebrated of poets in right of his "Rime," that is, verses in the modern Italian tongue of which he was one of the earliest cultivators and refiners. Celebrating in these his visionary love, he modelled the Italian sonnet, and gave to it, and to other forms of lyrical poetry, not only an admirable polish of diction and melody,.but a delicacy of poetic feeling which has hardly ever been equalled, and a play of rich fancy which, if it often degenerates into false wit, is as often delightfully and purely beautiful. But though Petrarch's sonnets and canzoni and "triumphs" could all be forgotten, he would still be honored as one of the benefactors of European civilization. No oaie but Boccaccio shares with him the glory of having been the chief restorer of classical learning. His greatest merit lay in his having recalled attention to the higher and more correct classical authors; in his having been an enthusiastic and successful agent in reviving the study of the Greek tongue, and in his having been, in his travels and otherwise, an indefatigable collector and preserver of ancient manuscripts. To his care we owe copies of several classical works which, but for him, would, in all likelihood, have perished. Collective editions of his whole works have been repeatedly published (Basle, 1495, 1554, and 1581 sq.). His life has employed many writers, among whom may be mentioned Bellutello, Beccadelli, Tomasini, De la Bastie, De Sades, Tirabosehi, Baldelli, Ugo Foscolo, Campbell, and Geiger. In July 1874, a Petrarch festival' was held at Padua, and a statue of the great poet by Ceccon was erected. The eulogy on this occasion was pronounced by Alcardi, in the aula magna of the university. See, besides the complete biographies, Longfellow, Poets and Poetry of Europe; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Romnan Empire. chapter 70; Preseott, Miscellanies, page 616; For. Qu. Rev. July 1843; Contemp. Rev. July 1874; Revue des Deux Mondes, July 15, 1874; Ueberweg, Hist. of Phil. 2:7, 8, 462; Revue Chretienne, 1869, page 143.

## Petrazzi, Astolfo[[@Headword:Petrazzi, Astolfo]]

             a painter of Siena, was born about 1590. He studied successively under Francesco Vanni, the younger Salimbeni, and Pietro Somi. He acquired distinction, and executed many works for the churches and public edifices of his native city, as well as for the private collections. He also opened an academy there, which was much frequented by the artists of Siena, and honored by the attendance of Borgognone, who stopped some months with Petrazzi before he proceeded to Rome. Lanzi says that Petrazzi seemed to have adhered more to the manner of Vanni than any other master. He  frequently aims at pleasing, and not unfrequently chose his models from the schools of Upper Italy. His Marriage Feast at Cana brings Paul the Veronese strongly to our recollection. Petrazzi's Communion of St. Jerome, at the Agostiniani, is painted much after the manner of Caracci. Petrazzi excelled in painting children, and his pictures are generally adorned with choirs of angels. His cabinet pictures are ingeniously composed, and have a lively and pleasing effect. His pictures of the Four Seasons, at Volte. a seat of the noble family of Chigi, are admired for the playfulness and elegance of the groups of Cupids introduced. He died in 1663.

## Petreius (Lat. for Peeters), Theodorus[[@Headword:Petreius (Lat. for Peeters), Theodorus]]

             a learned Dutchman, was born April 17, 1567, at Kempen (OverIssel). After having been received as master of arts in Cologne, he entered the Carthusian convent of that city (1587), and was prior of Dulmen, in the bishopric of Mulnster; in this capacity he twice assisted at the general chapter of his order. His taste for study led him to employ the time left him from the duties of his profession in composing or translating different works for the defence of the Catholic faith. He died at Cologne April 20, 1640. We quote from him, Confessio Gregoriana (Cologne, 1596 or 1605, 12mo); in the same manner he made similar compilations for the collection of passages extracted from Tertullian and St. Cyprian (1603), from Leo the Great (1614), and from St. Bernard (1607): — Bibliotheca Cartusiana (ibid. 1609, 12mo); Moroti greatly profited from this in preparing his Theatrumn S. Cartusiensis ord. (ibid. 1680, fol.): — Chronologia, tam Romanorum pontificum quam imperatorum, historica (ibid. 1626, 4to): — Catalogus haereticorum (ibid. 1629, 4to); not very exact. He translated into Latin two theological works from fathers Coster and Jean David, and he edited the Opera omnia of St. Bruno (ibid. 1640, 3 volumes, fol.). See Niceron, Memoires, volume 40; Paquot, Memoires, volume 2. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:752.

## Petreolo, Andrea[[@Headword:Petreolo, Andrea]]

             a painter of Venzone, who, according to Renaldis, was employed in the cathedral of his native city about 1586, where he "decorated the panels of the organ with very beautiful histories of S. Geronimo and S. Eustachio, together with the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, surrounded with fine architecture."

## Petreus[[@Headword:Petreus]]

             a name common to several Swedish theologians, of whom we mention the following:

1. AESCHILIUS, who died at Abo in 1657, professor and doctor of theology, is the author of, Ensarrationes in Evangelia. Dominicalia et Festivalia: — De Veteris et Novi Testamenti Discriminae: — De Anti- Christo Iagno, besides a translation of the Bible into Finnish.

2. LAURENTIUS, who died January 7, 1655, is the author of Canticum Canticorusm Salomonis, Paraphrasi tum Ligata Hebraea et Danica, turn Prosa Latina Adornatum (Hafnite, 1640).

3. NICOLAS (1) was born at Husum, September 10, 1569. He studied at different universities, was in 1600 doctor of theology, and died at Ratzeburg, January 7, 1641, a superintendent.

4. NICOLAS (2) was born at Zealand in 1601. He studied at different universities, was professor of Oriental languages at Copenhagen, and died October 4, 1634. He is the author of, Nomenclator Hebraeus (Hafnum, 1629): — Lexicon Hebraicum cum Grammatica Hebraica (1627, 1633): — Musae Hebaea seu Collgonia Hebraea (1628).

5. SEVERIUN, born in 1609, and died November 25, 1657, professor at Copenhagen, is the author of, Grammatica Hebraea (1642): — Fundamenta Linguae Sanctae (1647): Disquisitio de Fundamesto Philosophiae Moralis.

6. THEODOIRE, who died at Copenhagen in 1673, is the author of, Prophetia Joelis Ethiop., Interpret. Latina ad Verbum-Donata (Leyden, 1661): — Prophetia Jonae AEthiop. et ex AEthiop. in Lat. de Verbum  Verisa et Notis atque Adagiis Illustrata (1660): — Vaticinium Mmalahhisie Ethiop. Latino Idionate ad Verbuin Donatum (1661). See Jichuer, Allgemeines Geleherten-Lexikon, s.v.; Flirst, Bibl. Jud. 3:80; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:63, 64. (B.P.)

## Petri (Lat. for Peeters), Barthelemi[[@Headword:Petri (Lat. for Peeters), Barthelemi]]

             a Belgian theologian, was born about 1547 at Op-Linter, near Tirlemont. After having taught philosophy for ten years at Louvain, in order to escape the miseries of war he was obliged to retire to Douai (1580), where he was provided with a canonicate and a theological chair. A zealous Thomist, he bequeathed all his wealth to the Dominicans. He died at Douai February 26, 1630. 'His works are mostly scholastic, with some ecclesiastical history borrowed from Baronius; the most carefully written are a commentary upon the Acts of the Apostles (Douai, 1622, 4to), and some Praeceptiones logicae (ibid. 1625, 12tno). He prepared a good edition of the Summa of St. Thomas (ibid. 1614, fol.), and published the commentaries of Estius upon the epistles of St. Paul and St. John (ibid. 1614-1616, 2 volumes, fol.). See Foppeus, Bibl. Belgica; Paquot, Memoires, volume 8. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:757.

## Petri, Laurent[[@Headword:Petri, Laurent]]

             one of the three principal Swedish Reformers. a brother of the following, was born at OErebro in 1499. After having followed at Wittenberg the teaching of Luther and Melancthon, on his return to Sweden he spread the principles of Reform in that country. Appointed by Gustavus Vasa professor of theology in the University of Upsala, of which he became rector in 1527, he was elevated in 1531 to the archiepiscopal chair of that city. He then undertook, with the aid of his brother Olaus and of Laurent Andrea, a Swedish translation of the Bible, based principally upon Luther's version, which was printed in 1541: it is known under the name of Gustavus's Bible, and it has contributed greatly to the development of the Swedish language. Sent in 1534 as ambassador to the czar of Russia, he held, in the presence of that prince, a conference upot religion with the patriarch of the Russian Church; the discussion took place in Greek; but the interpreter em ployed by the czar to translate into Russian the word of the interlocutors often did not understand the abstract terms used by Petri, and then told what passed through his head, until one of the assistants, who understood Russian and Greek, disclosed the fraud by bursts of laughter. Petri, during the rest of his life, was occupied in consolidating Lutheranism in his own country, and in organizing the new Church, of which he was one of the principal founders. He was very beneficent. and distinguished himself advantageously over his brother by his conciliatory spirit, which did not  prevent him from addressing to Eric XIV, in 1567, a severe reprimand on the subject of the murder of the Sture.

Petri died in 1573. We have of his works. Verae ac justae rationes quare regnum Sueciae Christierno captivo, Daniae olim regi ac ejus heredibus nihil debeat (Stockholm, 1547, 4to): — Postille sur les Evangiles (ibid. 1555, 1641, 8vo): — Refutatio D. Beurei pertinens ad articulum de Cona Domini (Upsala, 1563): — Discipline de l'Eglise Suedoise (Stockholm, 1571, 4to); a work which, by a decision of the Diet of 1572, obtained the force of law: — Sermons sur la Passion (ibid. 1573, 8vo): — several other Sermons, and liturgic, polemical, and dogmatical works. See Schinmeier, Lebensbeschreibung der drei Schwedischen Reformatoren, Andrea, Olaus und Laurent Petri (Lubeck, 1783, 4to); Hallman, Lefvernes beskrifing ofver Olaus och Lars Petri; Biographisk-Lexikon; Alaux, La Suede sous Gustave Wasa (Paris, 1861).Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:755. Comp. Fisher, Hist. of the Ref. page 176 sq.; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 4:276.

## Petri, Olaus-Phase[[@Headword:Petri, Olaus-Phase]]

             a Swedish theologian, was born at OErebro, in 1497: the son of a blacksmith, he received his early education among the Carmelites of his native town, together with his brother Laurent, with whom he attended the University of Wittenberg, where they embraced the doctrines of Luther. On their return to Sweden, in 1519, they began, after having as by a miracle escaped from the executioners of Christian II, to propagate the ideas of the Reformer. Appointed in 1523 rector of the school of Strengnas, Olauis won to his opinions the archdeacon Laurent Andrea, and, through the mediation of the latter, Gustavus Vasa appointed Peter preacher at Stockholm. In his sermons and in divers conferences he attacked the old religion with an increasing ardor. The first among all Protestant ecclesiastics in Sweden, he was publicly married in 1525. After having assisted at the Diet of Vesteras in 1527, where he had a dispute upon religion with the professor of Upsala, Pierre Galle, whom Gmlstavus declared to have been conquered, he entered more and more into the favor of the king, who consulted him upon the most important affairs, and finally appointed him his chancellor. In 1539 Petri, tired of business, exchanged his duties for those of first pastor of the capital. The following year he was condemned to death for not having revealed, in 1536, the conspiracy formed against the life of the king by some citizens of the Han'seatic villages, one of whom had confessed to him. He purchased his pardon for a  large sum. Three years after the king reinstated him in his office of pastor, and he kept it until his death, which occurred at Stockholm in 1552. He joined to quite extensive and varied learning great activity and a captivating eloquence, but he never spared his adversary, and often degenerated into abuse of a bold and rash character. He may be called the Luther of Sweden, while his brother Laurent, milder and more moderate, was the Melancthon. We have of Petri's works, in Swedish, treatises on Marriage of Ecclesiastics (Stockholm, 1524, 1528, 4to): — the Difference between the Evangelical Faith and the Roman (ibid. 1527, 1605, 4to): — on the Duties of the Clergy and the Laity (ibid. 1528, 4to): — on the Inconveniences of the Monastic Life (ibid. 1528, 4to): — Postills on all the Evangelists (ibid. 1530): — Introduction to Sacred Scripture (ibid. 1538. 4to): — some Sermons, Odes that are still sung in Sweden, and several other theological writings. Petri has left in manuscript some Memoirs upon the history of his country, which remained unpublished because Gustavus found them written with too much independence; one copy of which, preserved in the Royal Library of Paris, has been analyzed by Keralio in the Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits, volume 1. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:754. See also the references under the preceding article.

## Petri, Pietro de[[@Headword:Petri, Pietro de]]

             an Italian painter, was born in Premia, a district of Novara, in 1671. He studied under Carlo Maratti at Rome, and painted some works for the ehurches in that metropolis. Lanzi says he formed a style of his own by engrafting on that of Maratti a portion of the manner of Cortona. He did not. however, obtain the reputation which his merits deserved, on account of his infirm health and extreme modesty. His best works are a picture of The Crucifixion, in the church of SS. Vincento c Anastasio, and some frescos in the tribune of S. Clemente. He was called at Rome de' Pietri. Orlandi calls him a Roman, others a Spaniard, but Latnzi says he was a native of Premia. He died at Rome in 1716, in the prime of life. There are a few etchings heretofore attributed to him, but Bartsch gives them to another artist of the same name.

## Petro-Johannites[[@Headword:Petro-Johannites]]

             a name given to the partisans of Peter John Olivi (A.D. 1279-1297), a monk of Bezibres, the founder of the Fraticelli schism among the Franciscaus, and a disciple of the abbot Joachim. He followed in the steps of his master, and wrote a commentary on the Revelation, containing interpretations of a similar character to the prophecies of Joachim. From his birthplace he is called Peter of Serignan, and from his monastery Petrus Biterrensis. When pope Nicholas III issued a new interpretation of the rule of St. Francis (A.D. 1279), with the view of suppressing the fanaticism which was rising among the "spirituals" of that order, a party was formed to resist it under the leadership of Olivi, and this party of Petro-Johannites, or strict Franciscans, became after his death the party out of which the Fraticelli took their rise. See Wadding, Annal. Min. Fratr.; Oudin, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticum, 3:584; Baluze, Miscellan. 1:213.

## Petrobrusians[[@Headword:Petrobrusians]]

             The sect of the Petrobrusians, or. as they are commonly but.less correctly called, Petrobussians, was the earliest of the anti-sacerdotal communities  which the profound discontent inspired by the tyranny of Rome called into existence at the beginning of the 12th century. They were the followers of the eloquent Peter of Bruys, who about the year 1100 began to declaim against the corruptions of the Church and the vices of the clergy. He continued the battle for twenty years most successfully, especially in Languedoc and Provence, and made many converts to his own opinions. What these really were it is difficult to state here, as there is no record among his friends. From Peter of Clugny, who replied to Peter of Bruys, we gather that his principal doctrines — which, with one exception (his repugnance to the cross), were more ably extended by his more powerful. successor, Henry the Deacon — were, though somewhat rationalistic, yet upon the whole rather evangelical. At first the preaching of Peter seems to have been confined to the inculcation of a system of general morality; but time and impunity so favored him that he attacked the seeds of dogmatic errors "per xx fere annos sata et aucta quinque praecipue et venenata virgulta." The capital charges upon which he is arraigned are:

(1) He rejected infant baptism, alleging that no miraculous gifts were possible in that ceremony, which he declared to be wholly void when performed on the person of an irresponsible infant.

(2) He denied that any special sanctity resided in consecrated buildings; forbidding the erection of churches, and directing that such churches as did exist should be pulled down.

(3) In particular he objected to the worship of the cross, alleging that the accursed tree should be held in horror by all Christians as the instrument of the torture and death of the Redeemer.

(4) He denied all sort of real presence in the Eucharist. Whether or not he retained the office of the communion as a memorial rite is not known.

(5) He was bitterly opposed to prayers, oblations, alms, and other good deeds done on behalf of the dead. To these five capital tenets, which form the subject of the Clugniac abbot's refutation, must be added a total prohibition of chanting and all use of sacred music. Puritanical as some of these tenets seem, Peter of Bruys was no lover of asceticism. He inculcated marriage, even of priests, as a high religious usage. The deleterious effects which the Romanists claim to have come from his teachings are thus summed up by Peter of Clugny: “The people are rebaptized, churches profaned, altars overturned, crosses are burned, meat eaten openly on the  day of the Lord's passion, priests scourged, monks cast into dungeons, and by terror or torture constrained to marry." His followers continued until the end of the 13th century. See Milman, AHistory of Latin Christianity, 5:412; Hardwick, Church Hist. of the M.A.; Baaur, Dogmengeschichte, volume 2; Piper, Monumental Theology, § 140; Jortin, Eccles. Rev. 3:323; Alzog, Kirchengeschichte, 2:72; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. (see Index). SEE PETER OF BRUYS

## Petrocorius, Paulinus[[@Headword:Petrocorius, Paulinus]]

             sometimes confounded with Paulinus of Nola (q.v.), was an Eastern ecclesiastic, and, according to his own reports, flourished in the Western empire in the 5th century. He was intimate with Perpetuus, who was bishop of Tours from A.D. 461 to 491, and whom he calls his patron. It was at the desire of Perpetuus that he put into verse the life of St. Martin of Tours; and in an epistle addressed to that prelate he humbly tells him, with an amusing reference to the history of Balaam, that, in giving him confidence to speak, he had repeated the miracle of opening the mouth of the ass. He afterwards supplied, at the desire of the bishop, some verses to be inscribed on the walls of the new church which Perpetuus finished about A.D. 473 (or, according to Oudin, A.D. 482), and to which the body of St. Martin was transferred. He sent with them some verses, De Visitatione Nepotuli sui, on occasion of the cure, supposed to be miraculous, which his grandson, and the young lady to whom he was married or betrothed, had experienced through the efficacy of a document, apparently the account of the miracles of St. Martin, written by the hand of the bishop. We gather that this poem was written when the author was old, from the circumstance of his having a grandson of marriageable age. Of the death of Paulinus we have no account. The works of Paulinus Petrocorius are, De Vita S. Martini, a poem in hexameter verse, divided into six books. It has not much poetical or other merit. The first three books are little else than a versified abridgment of the De Beati Martini Vita Liber of Sulpicius Severus; and the fourth and fifth comprehend the incidents mentioned in the Dialogi II et III de Virtutibus Beati Martini of the same author. The sixth book comprises a description of the miracles which had been wrought at the tomb of St. Martin under the eyes of Perpetuus, who had sent an account of them to Paulinus: — De Visitatione Nepotuli sui, a description of the miraculous cure of his grandson already mentioned, also written in hexameter verse: — De Orantibus (an inappropriate title, which should rather be Orantibus simply, or Ad Orantes), apparently a portion of the  hexameter verses designed to be inscribed on the walls of the new church built by Perpetuus: — Perpetuo Episcopo Epistola. This letter was sent to Perpetuus with the verses De Visitatione and De Orantibus. The works of Paulinus Petrocorius were first printed by Franciscus Juretus (Par. 1585). After the first publication of the works they were inserted in several collections of the Christian poets, and in some editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum, generally, however, under the name of Paulinus of Nola. In the Lyons edition of the Bibliotheca Patrum (1677, fol.), 6:297, etc., they are ascribed to their right author. They were again published by Christianus Daumius (Leips. 1686, 8vo), with ample notes of Juretus, Barthius, Gronovius, and Daumius. To the works of our Paulinus were subjoined in this edition the Eucharisticon of Paulinus the Penitent, or Paulinus of Pella, and the poem on Jonah and the Ninevites, ascribed to Tertullgan. See Hist. Litteraire de la France, 2:469, etc.; Cave, Hist. Litt. ad ann. 461 (Oxon. 17401743, fol.), 1:449; Fabricius, Biblioth. Med. et Inf. Latinitat. 5:206, ed. Mansi; Tillemont, Memoires, 16:404; Oudin, De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles. volume 1, col. 1288, 1289.

## Petronilla, St[[@Headword:Petronilla, St]]

             a Romish saint, is reputed to have been the daughter of the apostle Peter, and to have been at Rome with him. As the presence of the apostle himself at the Eternal City is still questioned, we need hardly discuss the presence of his daughter in that place. She is reputed to have become deprived of the  use of her limbs by sickness. One dav when some of his disciples sat at dinner with the apostle, they asked why it was that when he healed others his own child remained helpless. Peter replied that it was good for her to be ill, but, that his power might be shown, he commanded her to rise and serve them. This she did, and when the dinner was over lay down helpless as before. Years after, when she had become perfected by suffering, she was made well in answer to her earnest prayers. Now Petronilla was very beautiful, and a young noble, Valerius Flaccus, desired to marry her. She was afraid to refuse him, and promised that if he returned in three days he should then carry her home. She then earnestly prayed to be delivered from this marriage, and when the lover came with his friends to celebrate the marriage he found her dead. Flaccus lamented sorely. The attendant nobles bore her to her grave, in which they placed her crowned with roses She is commemorated in the Roman Church May 31.

## Petronius[[@Headword:Petronius]]

             the name of two Romans somewhat involved in Jewish history.

1. CAIUS PETRONIUS succeeded Aulius Gallus in the government of Egypt, and carried on a war in B.C. 22 against the Ethiopians, who had invaded Egypt under their queen Candace (q.v.). He was a friend of Herod, and sent corn to Judsea during a famine (Josephus, Ant. 15:9, 2).

2. PUBLIUS PETRONIIS was sent by Caligula to Syria as the successor of Vitellius (A.D. 40), in the capacity of governor, with orders to erect the emperor's statue in the Temple at Jerusalem; but at the intercession of the Jews he was prevailed upon to disobey the imperial command, and escaped punishment by the opportune death of the emperor (Josephus, Ant. 18:9, 2; War, 2:10).

## Petronius (St.) Of Bologna[[@Headword:Petronius (St.) Of Bologna]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate sainted for his piety, flourished in the first half of the 5th century. He was a Roman by birth, and descended of a noble family. He early entered the service of the Church, and soon rose to positions of influence and distinction. He finally became bishop of Bologna, and distinguished himself by banishing the Arians from that city. He died A.D. 430. In the paintings of the Romish saints he is represented in episcopal robes, with mitre and crosier. He has a thick black beard in an ancient representation, but generally is without it. His attribute is a model  of Bologna, which he holds in his hand. His pictures are confined to Bologna; and there is in that city a beautifll church dedicated to his memory.

## Petrus[[@Headword:Petrus]]

             SEE PETER.

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

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Orkney in 1270, and was one of the ambassadors sent by Eric, king of Norway, to negotiate a marriage between that monarch and Margaret, daughter to Alexander I, king of Scotland. He died in 1284. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 220.

## Petrus Hispanus[[@Headword:Petrus Hispanus]]

             SEE John 20.

## Pettengill, Erastus[[@Headword:Pettengill, Erastus]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newport, N.H., July 7, 1805; was converted in Orford in 1824, and was baptized by Reverend Nathan Howe and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. He received license to preach in 1835, and labored that year on the Bethlehem charge under the direction of the presiding elder. He joined the New Hampshire Conference in 1836, and was stationed at Bristol. His subsequent appointments were as follows: in 1837, Androscoggin Mission; 1838, Stratford; 1839, Bethlehem; 1840-41, Lunenburgh, Vermont; 184243, St. Johnsbury; 1844-45, Barton; 1846, Newbury; 1847-48, Londonderry; 1849-50, Hartland; 1851-52, East Barnard; 1853-54, Norwich and Hartford; 1855, UnionVillage; 1856, Bellows Falls; 1857-58, Hardwick; 1859-60, Irasburgh; 1861, Corinth; 1862-63, Williams, town 1864-66, Union Village; 1867-68, Barnard. While laboring faithfully and with great acceptance on this last appointment he was stricken with a fatal disease, and after weeks of suffering, borne with great patience and Christian fortitude, he died March 8, 1869, relying upon the divine promise and trusting solely to the merits of Christ. See Minutes of Am. Conf. 1870.

## Pettibone, Roswell[[@Headword:Pettibone, Roswell]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Orwell, Vermont, August 26, 1796. He had limited facilities for an early education, entered Middlebury College in 1817, graduated in 1820, taught in the academy there in 1821, studied divinity with Dr. Hopkins, and was licensed by the Addison County Association in 1822. He commenced preaching in Hopkinton, St. Lawrence County, N.Y., in 1823, and was ordained July 22, 1824; here he labored with great acceptability and success till poor health induced him to seek a milder climate, and in September 1830, he went West, and preached  at Ann Harbor, Mich., through the winter, and in the spring received a unanimous call to take charge of the Church, but ill-health prevented his doing so. During 1831 he was invited to the Church in Evans' Mills, Jefferson County, N.Y., which he served with great fidelity and success until, in November 1837, he was called to Canton, St. Lawrence County, N.Y., and installed February 14, 1838. Here he labored until April 1, 1854, when he became chaplain of Clinton State Prison, where he died, August 15, 1854. Mr. Pettibone was pre-eminent in every relation and in. the discharge of every duty; in spirit and conduct a progressive conservative, and strongly attached to the Calvinistic doctrines of grace; very active in organizing different benevolent societies and churches in his own and sister counties. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, page 310. (J.L.S.)

## Pettigrew, Charles[[@Headword:Pettigrew, Charles]]

             a prelate of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born about 1755, in Ireland, whence his father immigrated about 1770. The family was of Scottish origin, and possessed those marked characteristics of Scotch genius which have distinguished so many of the Presbyterian brethren who have come to this country from Scotland. In 1773 Pettigrew became a teacher at Edenton, but two years later he took holy orders, and was ordained pastor of the Protestant Episcopal Church at London. In May, 1794, at a convention held at Tarborough, he was elected bishop. He died at Bonaron, Lake Scuppernong, where he settled in 1774. Pettigrew took a leading part in founding tie University of North Carolina.

## Pettingell, John Hancock[[@Headword:Pettingell, John Hancock]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Manchester, Vermont, May 11, 1815; graduated from Yale College in 1837; was professor im the Deaf and Dumb Institute, New York, 1838-43; studied in Union Theological Seminary in 1841; was pastor, 1843-52; district secretary of the A.B.C.F.M., 1853-60; pastor, 1860-66; seamen's chaplain, in Antwerp, Belgium, 1866-72; and thereafter without a charge until his death, February 27, 1887. He was the author of Language: Its Nature and Functions (1876): — Homiletical Index (eod.): — The Theological  Trilemma (1878): — Platonism vs. Christianity (1881): — Bible Terminology (eod.): — Life Everlasting (1882): — The Unspeakable Gift (1884): — Views and Reviews (1887).

## Petto (or Pepto), Samuel[[@Headword:Petto (or Pepto), Samuel]]

             an English Nonconformist divine, the date of whose birth is not known, fiourished near the close of the 17th century. He was educated for the Church Establishment at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, and afterwards became rector of Sancroft, in Suffolk. When the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1662 he was ejected from his living as a Nonconformist. Afterwards he became pastor in a Dissenting Church at Sudbury, where he passed the remainder of his life. He died probably about 1708, at an advanced age. His work entitled The Revelation Unveiled (1693) dealt with Scripture prophecies. The plan of the work was to inquire:

1. When many Scripture prophecies had their accomplishment.

2. What are now in process of fulfilment.

3. What are still to be fulfilled. His other works were, The Difference between the Old and the New Covenant (the preface of this work was written by Dr. Owen): — The Voice of the Spirit: — Infant Baptism Appointed by Christ: — Scripture Catechism: — Narrative of the Wonderful and Extraordinary Fits of Thom. Ipatchel under the Influence of Witchcraft.

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

             an eminent minister of the Primitive Methodist Connection in England, was born in 1807, and died in 1868. His ability, piety, and devotedness won for him some of the most important and responsible positions in the connection. For seven years he was editor of the Primitive Methodist magazines, "and did good service in sustaining the efficiency and useful, ness of these periodicals throughout the connection." He was the author of several works having a large circulation, of which the most important was The History of the Primitive Methodist Connection, a work performed by request of the Conference, and with great thoroughness and ability. During the last three years of his life he was governor of Elmfield School, the principal educational establishment among the Primitive Methodists. In that position he was especially useful in moulding the character and promoting the scholarship of the students for the ministry. As a Christian, Mr. Petty aimed with strong faith and blessed success at eminent personal holiness. As a scholar, "his learning was varied, accurate, profound, sanctified." As a preacher, he evinced a deep insight into Christian life and experience, and his style combined elegant simplicity with intense earnestness. Among his last words were, "what boundless stores of fulness there are in Jesus." (G.C.J.)

## Petursson, Hallgrimur[[@Headword:Petursson, Hallgrimur]]

             a noted psalmist, was born in Iceland in 1614. While Hallgrimur was yet a boy, his father was appointed chorister at the cathedral in Hole (the old northern episcopal residence in Iceland), having been called thither by bishop Gudbrand Thorlaksson, who is known as the first translator of the Bible into Icelandic, and as the real founder of Protestantism in Iceland. Hallgrimur got his elementary education in the school at Hole; but for some unknown reason he was expelled from this school, whereupon he, aided by some of his friends, went abroad, first to Gluckstad, in Sleswick, and later to Copenhagen. In Copenhagen he worked for a blacksmith until  Brynjolf Sveinsson (afterwards bishop of Skalholt, in Iceland), about the year 1632, got him a place in the school of Our Virgin. Here Hallgrimur made rapid progress, and in 1636 we find him studying the so-called "master's lesson." In the year 1627 Iceland was visited by Mohammedan pirates from Algeria, in the northern part of Africa, who at that time extended their tyrannical rule of the sea from the shores of the Mediterranean to the most western and northern islands of the Atlantic. A number of Icelanders were slain by them, while others were carrie'd away as slaves. By the interference of the Danish kinig, Christian IV, some of the prisoners who had not already perished in the land of the barbarians were ransomed, and in 1636 thirty-eight Icelanders were broughit from Algeria to Copenhagen, where they had to remain a few months until merchant- ships in the spring of 1637 could take them back to Iceland. While prisoners in Algeria they had imbibed various Mohammedan ideas, and hence it was thought necessary during their stay in Copenhagen to instruct them in the principles of Christianity; but, not understanding Danish, an Icelandic teacher had to be found for them. Hallgrimur Petursson was selected. Among those set free was a woman by name Gudrid, who had formerly been the wife of an Icelander in the Westmann Isles. Hallgrimur fell in love with this woman so much that when the people were sent back to Iceland in the spring, he left the school and returned home with his beloved.

The ship which carried them landed at Keflavik, in the southern part of Iceland, and here Hallgrimur remained through the summer, doing the work of a common laborer for the Danes. Gudrid got a place to work on the farm Njardvik, not far from Keflavik, and here she gave birth to a son, whose father was Hallgrimur. Soon afterwards he married Gudrid, and lived for some time in the most abject poverty in a lonely cottage at Suderness, until the above-mentioned Brynjolf Sveinsson, who meanwhile had become bishop of Skalholt, persuaded him to enter the service of the Church, ordained him for the ministry, and gave him the poor parish of Hvalness, in Guldbringe Syssel. He entered the ministry in 1644, and remained in Hvalness until 1651, when he was removed to Saurbaer, in Borgarfjord. At Saurbaer he found some relief from his poverty until Aug. 15, 1662, when the parsonage and al its contents were consumed by fire. The people were all saved, however, excepting an old stranger, who had found his lodgings there for the night. Though Hallgrimur heretofore had suffered much abuse and ridicule, he now found that he also had some friends, who assisted him in rebuilding the parsonage and furnishing him with the necessaries of life. A few years later (1665) Hallgrimur first  noticed the symptoms of the disease (leprosy) which finally laid him on his death-bed. He performed his ministerial duties alone until 1667, when his illness made it. necessary to get an assistant. He was compelled to resign his position in 1669, moved to a neighboring farm, Kalastad, where he remained two years, and then moved to another farm close by, Ferstikla, where, amid constantly increasing sufferings, he at last found a welcome death, October 27, 1674, not having left his bed the last year of his life. He was buried near the entrance of the church at Saurbser. In 1821 a small monument was raised on the spot beneath which his bones rest. By his wife, who died in 1679, he had several children, but the most of them died very young.

We have given this detailed account of this man's life because of the prominent position he holds in the religious history of Iceland. He was an eloquent preacher, a thoroughly classical writer, and one of the most gifted psalmists that ever lived. His religious poems give evidence of a Christian courage that reminds one of the martyrs during the first century after Christ. Hallgrimur Petursson's works are the following: (a) in prose1. Diarium Christianum, consisting of religious meditations for every day in the week: — 2. A Christian's Soliloquy every Morning and Evening: — 3. A Collection of Prayers: — 4. Commentaries on some of the Songs in the Sagas, especially in Olaf Tryggveson's Saga. (b) In poetry — l. Psalterium Passionale, fifty psalms on the sufferings of Christ for singing at family devotions during lent, an unsurpassed masterpiece, whether we regard it from a poetical or Christian standpoint. This work has passed through twenty-seven large editions in Iceland, nnd is found in every Icelander's house. The funeral psalm found in this collection, and beginning "Allt einsog blomstrid eing," has found its way into many of the Continental languages, and the whole collection has twice been translated into Latin: — 2. A poetical treatment of the first and second books of Samuel, which he left unfinished, but which was completed by the ministers Sigurd Gislesson and Jon Eyulfsson: — 3. Some epicromantic poems (the so-called rimur), of which all ages of Icelandic literature have furnished a large number: — 4. Finally, we have from Hallgrimur Petursson a collection of all his psalms and poems that are not found in the above- named works, and of which the majority were not published until long after his death. This last collection is almost as great a favorite with the Icelandic people as the Psalterium Passionale. In it is found a cycle of Bible poems, morning and evening hymns, and other songs, but the best portion of it is a number of psalms, in which the poet has expressed his thoughts upon death and eternity. Some of them were composed on his death-bed. They bear  testimony to the fervent love of the Saviour wherein he lived and died. His beautiful funeral hymn, which he closes by greeting the angel of death welcome, cheerful in the consciousness that his Savior lives, has its heathen prototype in Ragnar Lodbrok's dying words: "The hours of life have glided by; I fall, but smiling shall I die." In Petursson's religious poetry the old heathen courage is regenerated into Christian life, and the pagan coldness has yielded to the genial warmth of a celestial faith. No man has exercised a greater influence upon the Christian character of the Icelandic people than Hallgrimur Petursson. — Jon Bjarnason, Husbibliothek, 2:98-103. (R.B.A.)

## Petzelians or Poeschelians[[@Headword:Petzelians or Poeschelians]]

             a modern sect of a politico-religious character, who derived their name from a priest of Brennan, called Petzel or Poeschel. They held the natural and legal equality of all human beings, and maintained that they had a continual and inalienable property in the earth and its natural productions. Their enemies charged them with offering human sacrifices, particularly on Good Friday. They appear to have adopted the political principles of the Spenceans, and probably their infidelity. Congregations belonging to this sect are said to have existed in Upper Austria, but by the interference of the public authorities they have been dispersed. A similar sect seems to have taken start and spread somewhat in Switzerland, who are charged with the like enormities.

## Peucer, Kaspar[[@Headword:Peucer, Kaspar]]

             a German theologian of the Reformation period, was born January 6, 1525, at Bautzen, and studied at the school in Goldberg and the University of Wittenberg, where he was the table and house companion of the Reformer Melancthon, who afterwards became his father-in-law. Well educated and remarkably talented, he became in 1545 a magister, in 1554 ordinary professor of mathematics, in 1560 professor of medicine. Some time after this he was introduced to the personal attention of the elector Augustus of Saxony;who was so pleased with Peucer that he put him in charge of the Saxon high school. Peucer, greatly interested in the theological controversies of his day, avowed Philippism (q.v.), and used his influence for its propagation in Saxony, and thus arrayed the strongly Lutheran elector against him. Peucer was imprisoned from 1575 until 1586. .e died September 25, 1602. He left a large number of medical, mathematical,  historical, theological, and philological writings. See Henke, Kaspar Peucer u. Nic. Krell (Barb. 1865); Calinich, Kampf u. Untergang des Melancithonismus in Kursachsen (Leips. 1866) ; also the art. SEE CRYPTO-CALVINISTIC CONTROVERSY.,

## Peulthai[[@Headword:Peulthai]]

             (Heb. Peullethay', פְּעֻלְּתִי, my wages; Sept. Φολλαθί), son of Obed- edom, the last named of eigh (1Ch 26:5); he belonged to the family of Asapl of the tribe of Levi, and was one of the porters of th tabernacle in the reign of David. B.C. cir. 1020.

## Peutinger, Konrad[[@Headword:Peutinger, Konrad]]

             a German writer noted for his lntiquarian labors, was born at Augsburg in 1465; studied in German and Italian universities, and was employed in his native city by the authorities of the place and by the emperor as counsellor. He was a manysidqd, educated man, and is celebrated not only as a writer, but also as a humanist, and was greatly interested in Luther when he first appeared against the Romanists. See Hagen, Deutschland's literarische Zustande im Zeitalter der Reformation, volume 1.

## Pevernage, Andre[[@Headword:Pevernage, Andre]]

             a Belgian writer, was born in 1541 at Courtray. At first music teacher in the collegiate church at Courtray, he abandoned this place to settle in Antwerp, where he passed the last ten or twelve years of his life in the capacity of simple musician of the cathedral. He established in his house weekly concerts, and there was heard the most beautiful music of the composers then in repute. He died at Antwerp July 30, 1589. We have of his works, Cantiones sacrce (Antwerp, 1574-1591, 5 parts, 4to); some masses, religious fragments, and a collection compiled from different authors under the title of Harmonie celeste (ibid. 1583, 1593, 4to). See Paquot, Memoires. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:776.

## Pew[[@Headword:Pew]]

             (anciently pue; Old Fr. puy; Dutch, puye; Lat. podium, "anything on which to lean;" s'appuyer), an enclosed seat in churches. The old French word puie meant a balcony, a gallery built on bulks or posts of timber; and it has been unnecessarily suggested that pew may only be a form of podium, a book-desk, or the crutch used by monks before sitting was permitted. In  the early days of the Anglo-Saxon and some of the Norman churches, a stone bench afforded the only sitting accommodation for members or visitors. In the year 1319 the people are spoken of as sitting on the ground or standing. At a later period the people introduced low, three-legged stools, and they were placed in no order in the church. Directly after the Norman conquest seats came in fashion. Church-seats were in use in England some time before the Reformation, as is proved by numerous examples still extant, the carving on some of which is as early as the Decorated Period, i.e., before A.D. 1400, and records as old as 1450 speak of such seats by the name of pues. They were originally plain fixed benches, all facing east, with partitions of wainscoting about three feet high.

After the Reformation seats were more appropriated, a crowbar guarded the entrance, bearing the initial of the owner. It was in 1508 that galleries were thought of. As early as 1614 pews were arranged to afford comfort by being baized or cushioned, while the sides around were so high as to hide the occupants; probably under the influence of the Puritans, who, objecting to some parts of the service which they were compelled to attend, sought means to conceal their nonconformity. An early specimen of a pew of this kind exists in Cuxton Church, Kent. Up to a period some time after the Reformation the naves of churches, which were occupied by the congregation, were usually fitted with fixed seats, as they had been from the 14th century downwards, at the least: these seats varied in height from about two feet and a half to three feet, and were partially enclosed at the ends next the passages, sometimes with what are called bench-ends: sometimes these rose considerably above the wainscoting, and were terminated with carved finials or poppies, but they are more frequently ranged with the rest of the work, and were often straight at the top and finished with the same capping-moulding: these end enclosures occupied about the width of the seat, and the remainder of the space was left entirely open. The partitions sometimes reached down to the floor, and sometimes only to a little below the seats' they were usually perfectly plain, but the wainscoting next the cross passages was generally ornamented with panellings, tracery, small buttresses, etc.: opposite to the seat at the back of each division or pew a board was frequently fixed, considerably narrower, intended to support the arms when kneeling. This mode of fitting the naves of churches was certainly very general, but it is difficult to ascertain when  it was first introduced, the great majority of specimens that exist being of the Perpendicular style. SEE STANDARD.

In England pews were assigned at first only to the patrons of churches. A canon made at Exeter, in 1287, rebukes quarrelling for a seat in church, and decrees that none shall claim a seat as his own except noblemen and the patrons. Gradually, however, the system of appropriation was extended to other inhabitants of the parish, to the injury of the poor, and the multiplication of disputes. The law of pews in England is briefly this: All church-seats are at the disposal of the bishop, and may be assigned by him either (1) directly by faculty to the holders of any property in the parish; or (2) through the churchwardens, whose duty it is, as officers under the bishop, to "seat the parishioners according to their degree." In the former case the right descends with the property, if the faculty can be shown, or immemorial occupation proved. In the latter, the right canl at any time be recalled, and lapses on the party ceasing to be a regular occupant of the seat. It appears that by common law every parishioner has a right to a seat in the church, and the churchwardens are bound to place each one as best they can. The practice of letting pews, except under the church-building acts, or special local acts of Parliament, and, much more, of selling them, has been declared illegal, except for the chapels of the Dissenters, who need the income of the pews for the payment of the pastor's salary. In Scotland pews in the parish churches are assigned by the heritors to the parishioners, who have accordingly the preferable claim on them; but when not so occupied they are legally open to all. As is well known, pews in dissenting churches are rented as a means of revenue to sustain general charges. In some parts of the United States pews in churches are a matter of annual competition, and bring large sums.

Latterly in England there has been some discussion as to the injuriously exclusive character of the "pew system," and a disposition has been manifested to abolish pews altogether, and substitute movable seats available by all indiscriminately. Several pamphlets have appeared on the subject. The Times remarks that in dealing with this subject the first question is not the letting of pews, but the appropriation of seats. In most country churches the seats are more or less appropriated, but the pews are seldom rented. When we consider the matter from this point of view, does it not seem reasonable, as a matter of mere order and decency, that those who regularly attend a church should have their appropriated places within it? If the churches are thrown  completely open, they are thrown open not only to the parish, but to the whole world. In one of the best known of the London churches the incumbent lately complained from the pulpit that his parishioners could not obtain seats in the church which had been expressly built for them, and he announced his intention of altering the system. Another church, in Wells Street, which was especially built for the accommodation of a poor district, and in which all the seats are free, is usurped every Sunday by an aesthetic congregation of welldressed people, who come to enjoy the excellent performance of the choir. Such a result would always take place where the preacher was popular or the service attractive. Again, the existing churches would not hold more than a certain number of persons, and they are filled as it is. If more were invited to come, it would be only driving out the rich to make way for the poor, and then we should want another national association for preaching the Gospel to the rich, or, rather, we should see the rich building proprietary chapels for themselves, in which the seats would be appropriated as before. But does any one suppose that the poor would thus force their way into the churches, and dispossess their present occupants? Whether the seats are free or not, the result would be much the same. When the question of the appropriation of seats is decided. that of pew rents is comparatively simple. If the rich are to have a certain number of seats appropriated to them, what can be more natural and convenient than that they should pay a certain sum in respect of them? In the Roman Catholic churches on the Continent pews are seldom to be seen.

The reading-pue, first mentioned in the rubric of 1662, was the reader's stall in the chancel. It had two desks-one on the west for the Holy Bible, and the other for the Prayer-book facing eastwards, as in Hooker's Church at Drayton Beauchamp. In 1571 Grindel called it "the pulpit, where prayers are said." Calamy applies the word to designate an open-air pulpit. George Herbert made his pulpit and reading pue of equal height, so as to be of equal honor and estimation, and agree like brethren. See Walcott, Sacred Archaeol. s.v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Parker, Glossary of Architecture, s.v.

## Peyrat, Napoleon[[@Headword:Peyrat, Napoleon]]

             a Protestant theologian and historian of France, was born at Bordes-sur- Arise, Aribge, January 20, 1809. In 1849 he was appointed pastor at St. Germain-en-Laye, and he died April 4, 1881. He is the author of Pasteurs du Desert (1842), a work which has been styled "un benedictin romantique." This work was followed by L'Histoire de Vigilance: — Les Reformateurs de la Fraunce et de l'Italie au Douzienne Siecle (Pierre de Brueys, Arrigo, Abelard, Arnaud de Brescia, St. Bernard, Berenger): — Le. Colloque de Poissy: — Le Siege du Mss d'Azil: — L'Histoire des Albigeois: — Beranger et Lamsennais, Correspondence et Souvenirs (Paris, 1861), this last a charming volume. See Mme. Napol. on Peyrat, Napolon Peysrst, Poite, Historien, Pasteur (Paris, 1881); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Peyrere, Isaac[[@Headword:Peyrere, Isaac]]

             a French Protestant writer, was born at Bordeaux in 1592. He fitted himself for military and diplomatic service, and at one time served the prince of Conde, whom he pleased by the singularity of his humor. PeyrBre finally turned pious. He was at the time a Protestant. He claimed that it had  been revealed to him by St. Paul that Adam was not the first man created, and he undertook to prove his theory by publishing in Holland, in 1655, a book entitled Prceadamitce, sive exercitatio super versibus 12, 13, 14, capitis xv Epistolae Pauli ad Romanos, which work was consigned to the flames, and he himself imprisoned at Brussels. Upon recantation and the interference of the prince of Condd he was released, and went to Rome in 1655, where he published the reasons for his recantation, and abjured Calvinism and Praeadamitism before pope Alexander VII. He was not believed sincere by the people, and doubtless public opinion was just. The pontiff endeavored to detain him at Rome, but he finally returned to Paris, and again entered the service of the prince of Condd, acting as his librarian. He was not thought to be attached to any particular Church, notwithstanding that he had joined the Romanists. He, however, submitted to receive the sacrament. Some time after his return to Paris he retired to the "Seminaire des Vertus," where he died in 1676. He wrote, besides the abovementioned articles, works upon Greenland and Iceland; also one upon the Restoration of the Jews, etc.

## Peyron, Amadeo[[@Headword:Peyron, Amadeo]]

             a famous Italian Orientalist and antiquarian, was born at Turin, October 2, 1785. In 1815 he succeeded his former teacher, the abbot Valperga di Caltlso, as professor of Oriental languages at Turin, and he died April 27, 1870. He is especially known by his Lexicon Linguac Copticce (Turin, 1835) and Grammatica Linguae Copticae (1841); besides, he wrote a number of essays, published in the Memorie of the Turin Academy of Sciences. (B.P.)

## Peyton, Yelverton T[[@Headword:Peyton, Yelverton T]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Stafford County, Virginia, 1797; was converted in 1815; entered the Baltimore Conference in 1818; and after filling some of the most important stations in the Conference, died in Baltimore January 15, 1831. He was a devoted pastor, a faithful minister, and a very useful preacher. See Minutes of Am. Conferences, 2:118.

## Pez, Bernard[[@Headword:Pez, Bernard]]

             a learned German Benedictine, was born in 1683 at Ips. He early entered the monastery of Molk. For several years he, with his brother Jerome, collected chronicles, charters, and other documents of the Middle Ages, in Austria, Bavaria, and other parts of Germany. After having spent some time in France, where he was associated with count Zinzendorf, he returned to his convent, whose library was confided to his care. He died March 27, 1735. We have of his works, Acta et vita Wilburgis virginis cum notis (Augsb. 1715, 4to): — Bibliotheca Benedictino-Mauriana, seu de vitis et scriptis Patrum e congregatione S. Mauri (ibid. 1716, 8vo): — Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus, seu Veterum monumentorum praecipue ecclesiasticorum collectio (17211723, 5 volumes, fol.): —  Bibliotheca ascetica antiquo-nova (Ratisb. 1723-1740, 12 volumes, 8vo): — Acta S. Truperti martyris (Vienna, 1731, 4to): — some Notes a l'Anonymus Mellicensis de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, published by Fabricius; several articles in different collections, etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon; Kropf, Biblioth. Mellicensis. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:789.

## Pez, Hieronymus[[@Headword:Pez, Hieronymus]]

             a learned German Benedictine, brother of the preceding, was born at Ips in 1685. After having taken the Benedictine habit in the monastery of Molk, he began, with his brother, the search for unpublished historical documents concealed in the archives and libraries of Austria and Bavaria. Placed later at the head of the library of his convent, he passed the last fifteen years of his life in the most profound retreat. He died October 14, 1762. We have of his works, Acta S. Colomani, Scotice regis (Krems, 1713, 4to): — Scriptores rerum Austriacarum veteres, cum notis et observationibus (Leips. 1720-1725, 2 volumes, fol.), followed by a third volume. published in 1745 at Ratisbon; a very precious collection: — Historia S. Leopoldi, Austriae marchionis, id nominis 4, ex diplomatibus adornata (Vienna, 1747, fol.). See Meusel, Lexikon; Schrockh, Leben v. Pez (in the Leipziger Gelehrte Zeitung for 1762, page 737). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:789.

## Pezel, Christoph[[@Headword:Pezel, Christoph]]

             a German theologian, was born March 5, 1539, at Plauen; studied at Wittenberg; was then three years cantor in his native place, and in 1567 became court-preacher and professor of theology at Wittenberg. An ardent advocate of Philippism (q.v.), he was deposed after the condemnation of Crypto-Calvinism in 1574; in 1576 was sent out of the country; in 1577 went to Siegen, where he taught for a while, and then became pastor at Herborn. In 1580 he was called to Bremen as pastor, and in 1584 was made professor of theology at the newly founded Gymnasium illustre. .In 1589 he again assumed the pastorate, and became also superintendent, and as such contributed to the strengthening and development of Lutheranism. He died February 25, 1604. Besides theological controversial writings, and the so-called Wittenberg Catechism entitled Catechesis continens explicationem decalogi, symboli, oratiolis dominicae, doctrinae de poenitentia et sacramentis (Wittenberg, 1571), he wrote also Mellificium  Historicum, a muchused handbook of history, and edited Melancthon's letters to Hardenberg. (J.H.W.)

## Pezron, Paul[[@Headword:Pezron, Paul]]

             a Roman Catholic monastic of much celebrity, was born at Heminebon, in Bretagne, in 1639. He embraced the monastic life in the Cistercian abbey de Prieres in 1661; was appointed master of the novices and sub-prior in 1672; sub-prior of the college of the Bernardins at Paris in 1677; vicar- general of his order in 1690, and obtained the abbey of Charmoye in 1697. He resigned it finally to give himself entirely to his studies, and became a doctor of the Sorbonne. He died in 1706. His most important publication is L'antiquite des temps retablie et defendue, contre les Juifs et les nouveaux chronologistes (Amst. 1687, 12mo). In this work the author maintains the authority of the Septuagint chronology against that of the Hebrew Bible. Pezron's book was extremely admired for the ingenuity and learning of it; yet created, as was natural, no small alarm among the religious. Martianay, a Benedictine, and Le Quien, a Dominican, wrote against this new system, and undertook the defence of the Hebrew text; Martianay with great zeal and heat, Le Quien with more judgment and knowledge. Pezron published Defense de l'antiquite des temps in 1691 (4to), which, like the work itself, abounded with curious and learned researches. Le Quien replied, but Martianay brought the affair into another court; and, in 1693, laid the books and principles of Pezron before M. de Harlai, archbishop of Paris. Harlai communicated the representation of this adversary to Pezron, who, finding no difficulty in supporting an opinion common to all the fathers before Jerome, rendered the accusation of no effect. Other works of his are, Essai d'un Commentaire Litteral et Historique sur les Prophetes (1693,12mo): — L'Histoire Evangelique Confirmee par la Judaique et la Romaine (1696, 2 volumes, 12mo): — Antiquite de la Nation et de la Langue des Celtes (1703, 12mo, etc.). See Niceron, Memoires, volume 1; Dict. Hist. des Auteurs Eccles. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Pfaff, Christoph Matthaus, D.D[[@Headword:Pfaff, Christoph Matthaus, D.D]]

             a German Protestant theologian, son of Johann Christoph Pfaff (q.v.), was born December 25, 1686, at Stuttgard. At the age of thirteen he was admitted to the university, and after having finished his theological studies, he received the means from the duke of Wurtemberg, in 1706, to go to  other universities to perfect himself in the knowledge of the Oriental tongues. He visited with this design several universities of Germany, Holland, and England. Upon his return to Stuttgard in 1709, he was employed to accompany the hereditary prince Charles-Alexandre to Italy, with whom he remained three years in Turin, occupied especially in copying from the libraries the unpublished fragments of ancient ecclesiastical authors. He afterwards went with the prince to Holland, where he spent two years, and to Paris, continuing his researches in the libraries, and placing himself in connection with the most renowned learned men. Appointed in 1716 professor of theology at Tubingen, he became in 1720 dean of the faculty and chancellor of the university; he also received several high ecclesiastical positions, and became among others, in 1727, abbe of Loch, which gave him the entree to the states of Wurtemberg. In 1724 he was gratified with the title of count-palatine, and was elected in 1731 member of the Academy of Berlin. In 1756 he became chancellor of the University of Giessen, dean of the faculty of theology, and general superintendent of the churches.

Possessing extensive and varied knowledge, he carefully avoided the bitter tone of the theologians of his confession, and he even made, but without the least success, several attempts to unite the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches. He died at Giessen November 19, 1760. Pfaff's erudition was immense, and his works so numerous that they fill a whole sheet of the German bibliographies. Among his numerous works and dissertations we mention, De genuinis Librorum Novi Testamenti lectionibus (Amst. 1709, 8vo): — Demonstrations solides de la virite de la Religion Protestante contre la Religion pretendue Catholique (Tub. 1713, 1719): — De Evangeliis sub Anastatio imperatore non corruptis (Tubing. 1717, 4to); reprinted, with several other dissertations of Pfaff, in his Prinistiae Tubingenses (ibid. 1718, 4to): — De liturgiis, missalibus, agendis et libris ecclesiasticis Ecclesice orientalis et occidentalis veteris et modernce (ibid. 1718,4to): —De origine juris ecclesiastici veraque ejus indole (ibid. 1719, 1720, 1756, 4to): — Dissertationes Anti-Boelianae tres (ibid. 1719, 1720, 4to): —Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae et moralis (ibid. 1719, 8vo; Frankf. 1721, 8vo); one of the first theological works written in Germany in which the rationalistic tendency is recognised: — Introductio in historiam theologiae litterariam (ibid. 1720, 8vo; ibid. 1724-1726, 3 volumes, 4to): — De variationibus ecclesiarum Protestantium, adversus Bossuetum (ibid. 1720, 4to): — Gesammelte Schriften so zur Vereinigung der protestirenden Kirchen abzielen (Halle, 1723, 2 volumes, 4to); a collection of writings  tending to the reunion of the Protestant churches: — De titulopatriarchee tecumenici (Tubing. 1735, 4to): — De ecclesia sanguinem non sitiente (ibid. 1740, 4to): — De sterconanistis medii cevi (ibid. 1750, 4to): — De aureolis virginum, doctorum et martyrum (ibid. 1753, 4to). As an editor, Pfaff published Epitome Institutionum divinarum Lactantii (Paris, 1712, 8vo), first edition complete: — S. Irenaei fragmenta anecdota (La Haye, 1715, 8vo); a publication followed by a dispute with Scip. Maffei, who had cast some doubt upon the authenticity of these fragments: — Ecclesiae evangelicae libri symbolici (Tubingen, 1730, 8vo). Finally, Pfaff directed the publication of the new German translation of the Bible, which appeared at Tubingen (1729, fol.), a work on which, in connection with others, he actively labored. Pfaff was a learned man of the very first rank, but of doubtful moral character. He is the real founder of the so-called collegial system, which regards the Church as a collegium: as a corporation possessing corporate rights, the Church can make her own statutes and laws, and can insist upon their observance. The attitude of the state towards her is but incidental, or similar to the position it occupies with respect to any other association. The magistratus politicus does not belong to her; the Church consisting solely of teachers and taught. It is only by transference, by virtue of silent or express compact. that the magistracy can receive rights originally inherent in the Church. Results were, however, at first, and till after the commencement of the 19th century, in favor of the territorial system. The Bible known among the German Protestants as "the Bible of Tubingen" was published under Pfaff's direction in one folio volume in 1727. See Strieder, Hessische Gelehrtengesch.; Rathlef, Gesch. jetztlebender Gelehrten, part 1; Schrockh, Unparteiische Kirchengesch. 4:787; Sax, Onomasticon, 6:138, 648; Bauer, Gallerie, volume 5; Dbring, Die Gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, volume 3, s.v.; Hirsching, Handbuch; Meusel, Lexikon, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 39:794; comp. Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist.. 18th and 19th Centuries, 1:110 sq., 410; Ebrard,Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch. 4:131. (J.H.W.)

## Pfaff, Johann Christoph[[@Headword:Pfaff, Johann Christoph]]

             a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Pfullingen in 1631, and was educated at the university in Ttibingen, where he afterwards flourished as professor of theology. He was also for a time pastor at St. Leonhard's Church in Stuttgard. He died in 1720. He was the author of about forty works and exegetical and dogmatical dissertations, but none of them are of much value in our day. A list of them may be found in Winer's Theol.  Literatur, s.v. See also Bickh, Gesch. der Universitat Tubingen; Lepoin, Leben der Gelehrten, and Bibliotheca Bremensis (1720). (J.H.W.)

## Pfannkuche, Heinrich Freidrich[[@Headword:Pfannkuche, Heinrich Freidrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born November 28, 1766. For some time private tutor at Goittingen. he was in 1803 called to Giessen as professor of Oriental languages, and he died October 7, 1833, doctor of  theology. He wrote, Exercitationes in Ecclesiastce Salomoni Vulgo — Tributi Locum Vexatissim. — cap. 11:7 — 12:7 (Gottingen, 1794): — Observat. Philolog. et Critic, ad quaedam Psalmorum Loco, Specimen (Bremen, 1791): — De odicum MSS. Hebr. Veteris Testamenti et Versionum Chaldaicarum in Lectionibus Anti-masorethis Consensu (Giessen, 1803). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:213; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:81 sq. (B.P.)

## Pfauser (Phauser), Johann Sebastian[[@Headword:Pfauser (Phauser), Johann Sebastian]]

             a German Roman Catholic divine, was born at Constance in 1520. He came by recommendation of the bishop of Trent to Vienna as court- preacher of emperor Ferdinand I, but was obliged to quit that place on account of his anti-Roman tendency. He was thereafter employed as confessor and preacher by the emperor's son, Maximilian, and all efforts to supplant him here were unsuccessful until the Bohemian crown question arose, and it became necessary for the court to have the favor of all Ultramontane prelates. In 1560 Pfauser became pastor at Lauingen. He died in 1569. To the last Maximilian kept up a friendly correspondence with this good man.

## Pfefferkorn, Johann (originally Joseph)[[@Headword:Pfefferkorn, Johann (originally Joseph)]]

             a noted Jewish convert to Christianity, was born in Moravia in 1469. He embraced Christianity. and was publicly baptized at Cologne with his wife and children in 1506 when thirty-six years old. All the efforts of this man, who, with many faults, was certainly not wanting in merit, were early directed to the conversion of his brethren according to the flesh. The means he first made use of were highly laudable; for he treated them with gentleness, and even defended his former co-religionists against the calumny of their enemies. But fanatical and misguided, his zeal afterwards was less well advised when he began to forbid and condemn the reading of any Hebrew book excepting the Old Testament. With the aid of the Dominican monks, he prevailed on the emperor Maximilian to adopt his views, and in 1509 an edict was published which enjoined that all writings emanating from the Jews against the Christian religion, should be suppressed and condemned to the flames; this edict was soon succeeded by another, July 6, 1510, enjoining the destruction of every Hebrew book with the sole exception of the Old Testament. The execution of this edict was, however, suspended until the opinion of the electoral archbishop Uriel of Mayence had been obtained. By reason of this delay, Prof. John Reuchlin, whose opinion in this matter was sought for, was enabled to publish a voluminous treatise, in which he divided the Jewish works into seven different classes, and afterwards proved which of these classes might be considered dangerous or injurious to the Christian religion. Among the  books which he thinks in part harmless and in part useful, and even valuable to theology, and which he would in consequence preserve, were not only the commelltaries of Rashi, the Kimchis, lbn-Ezra, Gersonides, Nachmanides, etc., but the Talmud and the cabalistic book Sohar (q.v.). On the other hand, Reuchlin maintained that those only should be destroyed which contained blasphemies against Christ, such as the Nizzachon and roledoth Jeshu. He further pointed out the impossibility of suppressing books by an imperial decree which were dispersed in all parts of the world, and might easily be reprinted in other places. The contest soon grew warm between the adversaries of the books and their defenders; the former consisting of the Dominicans and their partisans, and the latter of all moderate and enlightened theologians.

The affair was finally left by an appeal to pope Leo X. Hochstraaten, an inquisitor, and a man fulily qualified for that cruel office, repaired to Rome. supported with remonstrances from several princes to bias, with money to bribe, and menaces to intimidate. He even threatened the pope with rejecting his authority and separating from the Church, unless Reuchlin, and the Jews whom he defended, were condemned. But all his efforts were in vain, and he was obliged to return, mortified and disgraced. The victory which his opponent had gained exposed him to the enmity of the monkish party. But he informed them "he was persuaded that Martin Luther, who then began to make a figure in Germany, would find them so much employment that they would permit him to end his days in peace" (Villers on the Reformation, page 107). Soon, indeed (by reason apparently of the Reformation movement), an end was put to the whole dispute. When and where Pfefferkorn died is difficult to say. Of his works, which obtained such unenviable notoriety, we mention, Der Judenspiegel, or Speculum adhortationis Judaicae ad Ckristum (Nirnb. 1507): — Die Judenbeichte, or Libellus de Judaica confessione sive Sabbate afflictionis cum figuris (Colog. 1508): — Das Osterbuch, or Narratio de ratione Pascha celebrandi inter Judaeos recepta (Colog. and Augsb. 1509): — Der Judenfeind, or Hostis Judaeorum (ibid. 1509): — In Lob und Ehren dem Kaiser Maximilian, or In laudem et honorem illustrissimi im7peratoris Maximiliani, etc. (Colog. 1510): — Ein Brief an Geistliche und Weltliche in Betreff des Kaiserlichen Mandats die judischen Schriften zu vertilgen: — Der Handspiegel, against Reuchlin (Mayence, 1511): — Der Brandspiegel (ibid. 1513): — Die Sturmglocke, against Reuchlin (Cologne, 1514): — Streitbiichlein wider Reuchlin u.s. Junger, or Defensio contra famtosas et criminales obscurorum verorums epistolas,  dedicated to the pope and the college of cardinals (Cologne, 1516): — Eine mitleidige Clag' gegen den unglaubigen Reuchlin (1521). (Where the Latin title is given, the work was also translated into Latin.) Comp. First, Bibl. Jud. 3:82; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1:985 sq.; 3:940 sq.; 4:956 sq.; Meiners, Lebensbeschreibung der Manner aus den Zeiten der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften (Zurich, 1795), 1:99 sq.; Meyerhoff, Reuchlin u.s. Zeit; Erhard, Geschichte des Wiederaufbluhens der wissenschaftl. Bildung, volume 2; Lamey, Reuchlin u.s. Zeit; Strauss, Ulrich v. Hutten, volume 1; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:98. 101 sq., 103, 110 sq., 115 sq., 130 sq., 140, 142, 158 sq., 168 sq., 209, 211, 218, and Appendix, note 2, page 7 sq.; L. Geiger, Das Studium der hebr. Sprache in Deutschland, page 38 sq. (Breslau, 1870); Kalkar, Israel u.d. Kirche, page 90 sq.; Basnage, Histoire des Juifs, page 730 (Taylor's transl.); H. Adams, Hist. of the Jews, 2:47 sq. (Boston, 1812); Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, page 464 sq.; Johannes Pfefferkorn, in Geiger's Zeitschrift fur Wissenschqft u. Leben (1869), pages 293-309; Aktenstucke zur Confiscation de judischen Schriften in Frantkfurt a. M. unter Kaiser Maximilian durch Pfejeirkorn's Angeberei, in Frankel-Gratz's Monatsschr. (July 1875), page 289 sq.; Weyden, Gesch. d. Juden in Koln am Rhein (Cologne, 1867), page 259 sq.; Palmer, Hist. of the Jewish Nation (Lond. 1874), page 288. (B.P.)

## Pfefferkorn, S. Michael M[[@Headword:Pfefferkorn, S. Michael M]]

             a German theologian, was born in the year 1646 at Iffta, near Eisenach, and was the son of a minister. Having received his preparatory education at Creutzburg and Gotha, he went to Jena, where in 1666 he was created magister. From Jena he went to Leipsic, and after having completed his studies, he was appointed professor at the Altenburg gymnasium. Having occupied several stations as anl educator, he was called in 1676 to the pastorate of Friemar, near Gotha. For fifty years he faithfully discharged his ministerial functions. He died March 3, 1732. Besides other works, he is the author of some very fine hymns, which found their way into our hymnbooks, as "Was frag' ich nach der Welt und allen ihren Schatzen" (Engl. transl. by Mills, "Can I this world esteem," in Hymns from the German, page 101). See Brickner, Kirchen- und Schulenstaat im Herzogthum Gotha (Gotha, 1760, 3 parts), 4:80-82; Koch, Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes, 4:63 sq. (B.P.)

## Pfeffinger, Daniel[[@Headword:Pfeffinger, Daniel]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Strasburg, who died November 24, 1724, doctor and professor of theology, is the author of, De Malo ejusque Causis Iintrinsecis: — De Cretensiumn Aritiis ad Tit 1:12 : — Duce Disputt. in Prophetiam Haggai: — De Nethinceis ad Jos 9:27 et Esdr. 8:20: — De Viro Perfecto ad Eph 4:13-14 : — De Cultu Angelorum. ad Coloss. 2:18: — De Christo pro Nobis Exciso ad Dan 9:26 : — De Poenitentiae Dei ad Genes. 6:6, 7: — De Propheterum Falsorum Furtis ad Jer 23:30 : — De Michaele Algelorum Auxiliatore, etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Pfeiffer, August Friedrich[[@Headword:Pfeiffer, August Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Erlangen, January 13, 1748, where he also commenced his academical career in 1769. In 1776 he was professor of Oriental languages, in 1805 head librarian of the university, and he died July 15, 1817. He wrote, De Ingenio Oratorio (Erlangen, 1770): — De Jobo Patientiam et Christunu Prcedicante (1771): — De Jobcei Libri Scopo (eod.): — Progr. in Versionem Syriacam ad 1 Timothy Epistolae (1776): — Ueber die Musik der alten Iebriier (1778): — Hebrmaische Grammatik (3d ed. 1802): — leue Uebersetzung des Propheten Hoseas (1785): — Philonis Judei Opera Omnia, etc. (1785-92, 5 volumes; 2d ed. 1820): — Progr. super Psalms 110 (1801): — Progr. super Psalms 72 (1803): — Bibliorum hebraicorum et Chaldceorum Mlanuale ad Prima Linguarum Studia Concinnavit (1809). See Doring, Die gelehrtens Theoloyen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:83; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:115, 45, 522. (B.P.)

## Pfeiffer, Augustus, D.D[[@Headword:Pfeiffer, Augustus, D.D]]

             a learned German Lutheran divine, noted as an Orientalist, was born at Lauenburg October 30, 1640, and was educated at Wittenberg. In 1673 he entered the ministry, and thereafter held several important pastorates. In 1681 he became archdeacon to the church of St. Thomas at Leipsic, in which city he also held a chair in theology at the university. In 1689 he was made superintendent of the churches at Lubeck, and died there January 11, 1698. Pfeiffer was one of the most skilful philologists of his time. He is said to have known seventy languages. His library was rich in Hebrew, Arabic, Coptic, Armenian, Persian, and Chinese MSS., and he left many learned writings. His philological works were all collected under the title Opera omnia philologica (Utrecht, 1704, 2 volumes, 4to). His other publications were, Theologia Judaica atque Mohanmmedica (Lips. 1687. 12mo): — Antiquitates selectae, ab Ugolino notis illustratae (in Ugolino, 4:1173): — Exercitatio de Theraphim (ibid. 23:549): — Diatribe de poesa Hebr. recognita (ibid. 31:899; transl. into Engl. by D.A. Taylor, with additions, in the Bibl. Repos. volumes 6-9): — Manuductio nova etfacilis ad accentuationen, etc. (Ugol. 31:927): — Specimen de monzialibus Vet. Test. (ibid. 32:657): — Specimen de voce vexata , סלה(ibid. 32:743): — Specimen de Psalmis Graduum (ibid. 32:675). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.; Rotermund's Suppl. to Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. Pipping; Memoriae theologorum, s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Pfeiffer, Christoph[[@Headword:Pfeiffer, Christoph]]

             a German divine, noted as a hymnologist, was born at Oels in the year 1689. For two years he was assistant-preacher at Dirsdorf, when he was called, March 28, 1719, by the duke H. Chr. von Landskron to the pastorate at Dittmansdorf, near Frankenstein, in the principality of Munsterburg. Having occupied this position for twenty-seven years, he was called to Stolz, where he spent the remainder of his life, and died December 23, 1758. His picture in the church there has the motto, "Mea Christus Portio," and the following epigraph: "Mors tua vita mea est, tuaque, O dulcissime Jesu, vulnera sunt animae Pharmaca certa meoe." Pfeiffer is the author of many hymns, several of which are found in our modern hymn-books. See Wezel, Hymnop. (Herrnstadt, 1728), 4:397 sq.; Koch, Gesch. d. deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:742 sq. (B.P.)

## Pfeiffer, Joachim Ehrenfried[[@Headword:Pfeiffer, Joachim Ehrenfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, and father of August Friedrich, was born at Giistrow, Pomerania, September 6, 1709. He studied at Rostock,  and commenced there his academical career in 1737. In 1743 he accepted a call to Erlangcen as professor of theology, was made doctor of theology in the same year, and died October 18, 1787. He published, Diss. de Malo Morali, etc. (Jena, 1737): — De Lege Intetpretandi Prima et Fundamentali (1740): — Elementa Hermeneuticae Universalis (1743): — De Calore sub Nube Torrente, etc. (eod.): — Trinitas Personarum in Unitate Dei, etc. (eod.): — Messias θεάνθρωπος ad Jer 23:5-6 (eod.): — Messias Satisfactor Hominum ex Ies. 53:4, 5, 6 (1744): — Processio Spiritus Sancti a Filio Dei ex Ies. 45:3 (1745): — Messias non Spiritus Saonctus sed Dei Patris Filius ex Psa 2:7 (1751): — Lux Orta Populo in 7 Tenebris Sedenti ex Ies. 8:23 (1754): — Cognitio Justi Servi Dei Justifica ex Ies. 53:11 (1755): — Spes Ressurectionis apud Jobum 19:25, 26, 27 (1760-61), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (who gives sixty-seven titles of Pfeiffer's works); Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:83 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:105, 422, 425, 603. (B.P.)

## Pfeiffer, Madame Ida[[@Headword:Pfeiffer, Madame Ida]]

             a German lady, whose maiden name was Reige, is noted as a traveller in the East, and as a valuable contributor to Palestinian topography. She was born in Vienna, October 15, 1797. From her very childhood she longed to see the world, and ever read with delight books of travel. In her girlhood she travelled to some extent with her parents, and subsequently with her husband. After the death of her husband and the maturity of her sons she determined to undertake a journey to Palestine, that she might have the ineffable delight of treading those spots which our Saviour had hallowed by his presence. With the accumulated wealth of twenty years, she left Vienna in March 1842. Her joulrney included Constantinople, Broussa, Beirut, Jaffa, Jerusalem, the river Jordan and the Dead Sea, Nazareth, Damascus, Balbec, the Libanus, Alexandria, Cairo, and the Desert to the Red Sea; then back by Malta, Sicily, Naples, Rome, etc., to Vienna, where she arrived in December of the same year. Upon her return she published anonymously the diary she had kept during her trip, under the title of Reise einer Wienerin in das Heilige Land (Journey of a Vienna Woman in the Holy Land). In 1845 Madame Pfeiffer visited Sweden, Norway, and Iceland. In 1846 she made her first journey round the world. In 1851 she made a second expedition, visiting the United States, and upon her return published an account of all her travels. But of all her descriptions those of the Holy Land are far more interesting than any of the others; owing doubtless to haying been less hurried then than while making her trips round the world. Throughout the whole of her arduous journeys Madame Pfeiffer displayed great courage, perseverance, and womanly tact. The mere fact of her having accomplished what no male traveller ever has done is conclusive evidence that she was possessed of great endurance and fortitude. She died October 27, 1858.

## Pfeil, Christoph Carl Ludwig Von[[@Headword:Pfeil, Christoph Carl Ludwig Von]]

             a descendant of an old knightly family, was born January 20, 1712, at GrNlnstadt, not far from Worms. When ten years of age he was left an orphan, and his uncle, the Reverend Justus S. von Pfeil, of Magdeburg, took him into his house. Here he remained for six years, when, at the age of sixteen, he entered the University of Halle for the study of jurisprudence. In the year 1729 he went to Tubingen to continue there his studies, where he became a faithful follower of Christ. In 1732, at the age of twenty, he was appointed secretary of legation of the Wiirtemberg  government at Regensburg, and in 1737 he was appointed counsellor of law at Stuttgard. For thirty years he held the highest honors in Wiirtemberg, until, in the year 1763, he removed to Prussia, when Frederick the Great awarded to him new honors. Pfeil died March 28, 1776. He was a very pious man, and the different stages of his life are best marked in his poetical productions and hymns, which number about 940. Not all of his hymns have found their way into hymnbooks, especially as most of them are influenced by Zinzendorf and Bengel, whose ideas are more or less reproduced in them. T'hose, however, which are found in our hymn-books are really jewels of German hvmnology. A collection of his hymns has been published by the Reverend G. Knack, of Berlin (1850, 1853), under the title Evangel. Herzensgesdage. Besides his hymns, Pfeil left in MS. a rhymed translation of Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, the Lord's Prayer, the apostolic epistles, etc. See Teichmann's biography in the preface to his Christl. Hausschatz (Stuttgard, 1852); Merz, Das Leben des christlichen Dichters und Ministers C.C.L. von Pfeil (ibid. 1863); Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:176 sq. (B.P.)

## Pfenninger, Johann Conrad[[@Headword:Pfenninger, Johann Conrad]]

             a German theologian, was born at Zurich, Switzerland, in 1747; studied theology at the university of his native place: in 1775 was made dean of the Orphans' Church, and later was appointed the successor of his friend Lavater (q.v.) in the pastorate, and was also made the dean of St. Peter's Church. He died in 1792. Pfenninger was a voluminous writer and much involved in controversy with the Rationalists, who then so very generally abounded in Germany. He was in close harmony with the theological views of Lavater, and with him attempted to give to his period a secure Christian impress, so as to lift Christianity from its Oriental vestments, and place it upon the ground of universal humanity. While the sceptics, and even Spalding among them, regarded modern Christianity rather as a purely comprehensible and abstract fact, and excluded every contribution of the imagination, Lavater and Pfenninger, like Klopstock (q.v.), thought it best to render aid by the Western imagination. They made Christianity not only accessible to the modern understanding, but to the modern feeling. Most valuable of all of Pfenninger's publications are his Judische Briefe aus der Zeit Jesu v. Nazareth (1783-92), which have been freely used by Stier in his Words of Jesus (transl. by Strong and Smith, N.Y. 3 volumes, 8vo). These Jewish letters furnish a sort of Christian romance, in which the men  and women of the time of Jesus write letters to each other, just as sentimental men and women of the last century would hlave written, and Christianity was thus modernized to make it attractive and plain to the masses, and relieve it of the Oriental garb it wears in the Bible. (J.H.W.)

## Pfitzer, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Pfitzer, Johann Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was, born at Nuremberg, October 29, 1684. He studied at different universities, was in 1713 deacon at his birthplace, in 1717 professor of theology at Altdorf, in 1718 doctor of theology, in 1724 pastor at Nuremberg, and died March 10, 1759. He published, De Apotheosi Pauli et. Barnabae a Lystrensibus Frstra Tentatac (Altdorf, 1718): — De Appolline, Doctore-Apostolico ex Actor. 18:24-28 (eod.): — De Beneficiis Typicis (1723), etc. See Doring, Die gelehlrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:84. (B.P.)

## Pflug, Julius[[@Headword:Pflug, Julius]]

             a German theologian, noted in the Reformation history of his country's Church, was born at Merseburg near the opening of the 16th century. He was the son of a nobleman, and a favorite of the emperor Charles V, who sent him in 1541 as one of the collocutors to the synod at Regensburg (q.v.), which resulted in the adoption of the Augsburg Interim (q.v.). Pflug was selected by the emperor as president of the approaching synod at Regensburg. About that time the chapter of the cathedral at Naumburg- Zeitz elected him bishop, but he was unable to assume his episcopal duties until after the battle at Muhlberg. In 1557 he presided at the Synod of Worms, and died in 1564. Pflug was a moderate Romanist, and though associated with Eck, shared none of his extravagant and extreme ideas. He earnestly desired peace, and though he may here and there have consented to measures rather equivocal and questionable, he probably sought only the peace and union of the Church. See Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1:117 sq.; Planck, Gesch. der protest. Theol. volume 6; Alzog, Kirchengesch. 2:309 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Phaath-Moab[[@Headword:Phaath-Moab]]

             (Φαὰθ Μωάβ v.r. Φθαλεὶ Μωαβείς), a Graecized form (1Es 5:11) of the Heb. name (Ezr 2:6; Neh 7:11) PAHATH-MOAB SEE PAHATH-MOAB (q.v.).

## Phacareth[[@Headword:Phacareth]]

             (Φακαρέθ v.r. Φαχαρέθ), a corrupt Graecized form (1Es 5:34) of the Heb. name (Ezr 2:57; Neh 7:59) POCHERETH SEE POCHERETH (q.v.).

## Phadrus[[@Headword:Phadrus]]

             an Epicurean philosopher, and contemporary of Cicero, became acquainted with the great orator in his youth at Rome, and during his residence in Athens (B.C. 80) Cicero renewed his acquaintance with him. Phaedrus was at that time an old man, and was president of the Epicurean school. He was also on terms of friendship with Velleius, whom Cicero introduces as the defender of the Epicurean tenets in the De Nat. Deor. (1:21, § 58). He occupied the position of head of the Epicurean school till B.C. 70, and was succeeded by Patron. Cicero (Ad Att. 13:39) mentions, according to the common reading, two treatises by Phaedrus, Φαίδρου περισσῶν et ῾Ελλάδος. The first title is corrected on MS. authority to Περί θεῶν. Some critics (as Petersen) suppose that only one treatise is spoken of, Περὶ θεῶν καὶ Παλλάδος. Others (among whom is Orelli, Ononm. Tull. s.v. PhIedrus) adopt the reading et ῾Ελλάδος, or, at least, suppose that two treatises are spoken of. An interesting fragment of the former work was discovered at Herculaneum in 1806, and was first published, though not recognised as the work of Phiedrus, in a work entitled Herculanensia, or A rchceological and Philological Dissertations; containing a Manuscriptfound among the Ruins of Herculaneum (Lond. 1810). A better edition was published by Petersen (Phcedri Epicurei, vulgo Anonymi Herculanensis, de Nat. Deor. Fragm. Hamb. 1833). Cicero was largely indebted to this work of Phaedrus for the materials of the first book of his De Natura Deorusm. Not only is the development of the Epicurean doctrine (c. 16, etc.) taken from it, but the erudite account of the doctrines of earlier philosophers put in the mouth of Velleius is a mere translation from Phaedrus. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 3:608; Krische, Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der alten Php 1:27, etc.; Preller, in Ersch and Gruber's Encykl. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. and Mythol. s.v.

## Phaedo(n) Of Elis[[@Headword:Phaedo(n) Of Elis]]

             a noted ancient Grecian philosopher, was a native of Elis, and of high birth. He was taken prisoner in his youth, and passed into the hands of an Athenian slave-dealer; and being of considerable personal beauty was compelled to prostitute himself. It was in the summer of B.C. 400 that  Phmedo was brought to Athens. A year would thus remain for his acquaintance with Socrates, to whom he attached himself. According to Diogenes Laertius he ran away from his master to Socrates, and was ransomed by one of the friends of the latter. Suidas says that he was accidentally present at a conversation with Socrates, and besought him to effect his liberation. Various accounts mentioned Alcibiades, Crito, or Cebes as the person who ransomed him. Cebes is stated to have been on terms of intimate friendship with Phaedo, and to have instructed him in philosophy. Phaedo was present at the death of Socrates, while he was still quite a youth. From the mention of his long hair it would seem that he was not eighteen years of age at the time, as at that age it was customary to cease wearing the hair long (Becker, Charikles, 2:382). That Phaedo was Mn terms of friendship with Plato appears likely from the mode in which he is introduced in the dialogue which takes its name from him. Other stories that were current in the schools spoke of their relation as being that of enmity rather than friendship. Several philosophers were ungenerous enough to reproach Phaedo with his previous condition, but LEschines named one of his dialogues after Phaedo. Phsedo appears to have lived in Athens some time after the death of Socrates. He then returned to Elis, where he became the founder of a school of philosophy, which appears to have resembled in tendency and character the Megaric school. Anchipylus and Moschus are mentioned among his disciples. He was succeeded by Pleistanus, after whom the Elean school was merged in the Eretrian.

Of the doctrines of Phaedo nothing is known, except as they made their appearance in the philosophy of Menedemus. Nothing can safely be inferred respecting them from the Phaedo of Plato. None of Phaedo's writings have come down to us. They were in the form of dialogues. There was some doubt in antiquity as to which were genuine, and which were not. Panaetius attempted a critical separation of the two classes, and the Ζώπυρος and the Σίμων were acknowledged to be genuine. Besides these, Diogenes Laertius (2:105) mentions as of doubtful authenticity the Νικίας, Μήδιος, Α᾿ντίμαχος ἤ πρεσβίται, and Σκυθικοὶ λογοι. In addition to these Suidas mentions the Σεμμίας, Α᾿λκιβιάδης, and Κριτόλαος. It was probably from the Zopyrus that the incident alluded to by Cicero (De Fato, 5; Tusc. Disp. 4:37, § 80), Maximus Tyr. (31:3), and others, was derived. Seneca (Ep. 94, 41) has a translation of a short passage from one of his pieces. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 2:717; Scholl, Gesch. der Griech. Lit. 1:475; Preller, in Ersch and Gruber's Encyklopedie,  s.v.; Preller, Phaedons Lebensschicksale u. Schriften in the Rheinisches Museum fur Philosophie, 1846, page 391 sq., now in his Kleine Schriften, ed. by R. Kohler.